

**East Hertfordshire District Council
Harlow Regeneration/Economic Growth
Draft Findings by
Strategic Planning Advice Ltd**

2nd March 2005

Introduction

Brief

Our brief for the present study was: to question whether the core strategic aim for Harlow – its economic regeneration and growth – can be brought about by the specific development proposals contained in the East of England Plan.

Research

The study was essentially a desk exercise, involving review of the following documents:

- East of England Plan (policies & proposals)
- Cambridge Sub-Regional Report, 2001
- Herts Housing Capacity Study & Spatial Strategy Audit, 2004
- Regional Economic Strategy, 2004
- Stansted/M11 Corridor Development Options Study, 2003
- Harlow Options Study, DFR, 2003
- Harlow Regeneration Strategy, 2004 (evidence on Harlow needs)

In addition we undertook a small amount of research to illustrate or test some of the issues being analysed. This included:

-

Study and Report Structure

The study was designed to go through the following stages:

This report follows the same structure.

Harlow: Regeneration Needs

We first record the evidence of the regeneration needs of Harlow that has been set down in the Harlow Regeneration Strategy 2004 (HRS). A full summary of the needs of the town, as recorded mainly in HRS, is provided in the first column of the table in Appendix 1. We then present our own diagnosis of those needs.

In broad terms the needs of Harlow derive from three features of the town:

- The simultaneous obsolescence of urban infrastructure & facilities
- Recent underinvestment in renewal
- A negative image which deters business investment & growth

We now consider the needs of the town under the following headings:

- Economy
- Population, housing and labour supply
- Shops and services
- Transport and access

Economy

The needs of Harlow in relation to its economic well-being can be summarised:

- A poor choice of industrial premises except in the Business Park
- The main employment sites have poor access to the strategic transport network
- Manufacturing is an important sector (relative to other settlements of similar size) but there have been major declines in jobs, for example in:
 - Pharmaceuticals
 - Radio & TV
 - Telecommunications
- Weak employment growth overall
- Low rates of self-employment, SME's and new business formation
- Low commercial and industrial rents, which reflect low demand for such premises
- An unbalanced labour supply (see below).

Against these weaknesses there are strengths:

- Low unemployment
- The presence of major high value companies e.g. GSK & Nortel Networks
- A very strong Research and Development presence.
- Strategic location in relation to London, Cambridge, M11 and Stansted Airport

Population, Housing & Labour Supply

The key features of the town from the perspective of the population, the supply of labour that the population offers and the housing that accommodates the population are:

- Population loss 1981-2001
- Selective out-migration especially of younger and more affluent people
- The housing offer is unattractive to the higher skilled workforce
 - 5300 more residents are qualified to NVQ3 or less than the number of appropriate jobs in the town

- 3700 more jobs in the town require NVQ4/5 than there are appropriately qualified residents (unbalanced labour supply)
- Poor skill levels: 1:4 have problems with literacy and numeracy
- Very low participation rates of 16-17 year olds in education or training
- 24% of Harlow statistical areas (SOA's) are in the (10%) most deprived areas in the East Region for education, skills and training
- But Harlow performs better than the regional averages for deprivation in relation to:
 - Income
 - Employment
 - Living environment

The key features of the housing stock are:

- The social sector accounts for 35% of the total stock, which compares with Essex at 15%
- But there is a shortfall of affordable homes (987 over next six years)
- Harlow Council, in the wake of years of rights to buy being exercised, has been left with the worst stock.
- There are growing maintenance needs in both public and private sectors
- The housing stock offers limited choice especially in the middle and upper sectors of the market.

Shops & Services

The main features of the retail and other services provided by Harlow are:

- The town centre has slipped from being ranked 78 to 130 in 20 years
- Some residents are travelling to alternative centres e.g. Cambridge & Chelmsford for their higher order shopping
- The town centre south development has added 21739 s.m. of new retail space
- A number of the neighbourhood centres are nearing the end of their lives.

Transport & Access

The main features of Harlow relating to transport and access are:

- A number of the roads proposed in original plan for Harlow have not been implemented
- The employment areas in the west and north of the town are poorly connected to the M11
- The road network in the town is more suited to private than public transport.
- The ring round the town centre has a considerable barrier effect on movement in and out of the centre
- There is poor access and severe congestion in the peak hours
- Junction 7 on the M11 is operating at 120% of capacity at peak hours.
- There is an overall transport deficit in the town: high car dependency and low car ownership, together with poorly developed public transport.

Harlow: Regeneration Needs – Diagnosis

The above description of the symptoms of regeneration need is derived from the PACEC/Halcrow Harlow Regeneration Strategy 2004. In order to evaluate the adequacy of the EEP proposals in addressing the regeneration needs of Harlow, we have undertaken our own diagnosis of the problems, which we now present in this chapter. In summary we see the fundamental issues to be addressed as:

- The housing stock which is key to the role Harlow plays in the sub-region and which affects:
 - who moves to, stays in or moves out of Harlow
 - the skills mix and thus the labour supply, which is fundamental to the local economy
 - the available spending power, the support for commercial services and the need for public services
 - the aspirations of the population e.g. in relation to education

There is a fundamental question to be answered which is the extent to which Harlow is a place of transition, a stable community or a trap for the households which live there. The answer is probably that it plays all these roles for different sections of the community.

- Economic diversification which needs to address
 - The dependence of the town on major sectors which have been declining; these sectors are “export” sectors which bring new income and jobs to the town; they are therefore very important to the future health of the town.
- Defective layout
 - This relates mainly to the town-level problems of access and transport, the transport deficit described above.
 - There are also issues about the land use layout of the town, for example the fact that a substantial part of the potential walk-in catchment area of the town centre is occupied by green space
- Under-investment
 - Not only was the original plan for Harlow not implemented in full, but the infrastructure that was created has not been maintained or modernised sufficiently
- Residents’ aspirations & achievement
 - The low participation rates of young people in education and training indicate that low expectations of education may be being passed from one generation to the next, creating successive generations of citizens and workers who are poorly trained and poorly motivated
 - This phenomenon is having an adverse impact on skills, incomes, expenditure, investment, the image of the town and on civic participation

Alternative Models to Address Regeneration Needs

In order to evaluate the proposals in the East of England Plan (EEP) we have considered whether there are alternative models for achieving the regeneration of Harlow.

We characterise the proposals in the EEP as regeneration driven by planned growth, where the prime consideration is the need to accommodate a given quantum of development and where that growth is intended to stimulate the regeneration of Harlow.

An alternative model is where regeneration is driven by a Harlow regeneration strategy rather than by a growth strategy.

In the next chapter we consider how effectively the proposals in the EEP can be expected to deliver the regeneration of Harlow.

East of England Plan: Evaluation of Overall Harlow Proposals

The main components of the EEP proposals for Harlow are:

- 20,700 additional housing units to 2021 (Policy ST4)
- A proportionate (to Harlow's share of the additional housing in the sub-region) share of additional sub-regional jobs (40,000; ST2) gives 23,600 additional jobs in Harlow
- The town centre to become a sub-regional centre serving the majority of the Stansted/M11 sub-region (ST3)
- Major sub-regional and urban transport improvements (ST6)

In our view the assumption underlying the EEP proposals is that:

- Planned, mainly peripheral, growth allied to regeneration will deliver the regeneration of Harlow

In order to check this assumption we have devised a number of tests:

- The efficacy of the EEP proposals in addressing the regeneration of Harlow
- The aptness of Harlow as a location for major growth
- Competition for resources
- The realism of the proposals.

Housing Growth (ST3)

The EEP intends that the planned housing growth should:

- Diversify the housing stock in terms of its age, tenure and quality
- Provide for the higher skilled and better off to stay in/move to Harlow
- Increase the population and hence the demand and need for services
- Improve the locally accessible supply of labour, both numbers and range of skills.

In our view the targeted additional diversity will not be achieved. If 20,700 additional housing units are built with 30% affordable housing, then the overall proportion of social housing would drop only to 33% (cf 35% now). The diversification would be even less if the aspirational (EEP) 40% of social housing were built. If alternatively, say, 10,000 open market houses were developed, distributed (or pepperpotted) in the urban area of Harlow, then the overall affordable proportion would fall to 27%.

A further alternative would be to provide sufficient and appropriate housing to raise the proportion of people in the top three groups of the Standard Occupational Classification to the average for the East of England; this would require 2350 additional dwellings, assuming they were all occupied by the targeted groups (see Table 1 in Appendix 2). Both alternatives would have a different and more appropriate effect of the supply of labour and the social mix of the town than the EEP proposal

An implicit assumption in the EEP (explicit in the Draft Harlow Regeneration Strategy) is that a larger settlement will inherently be a more healthy urban area. There is however no evidence that **size** is essential for urban health:

- The popularity of market towns, which tend to have about 10-20,000 population, and their rapid recent growth suggest that small towns can be very successful.
- The greatest concentrations of regeneration problems are in the UK's major cities.

- We have examined travel to work patterns in Harlow and three larger towns in the region, Cambridge, Chelmsford and Colchester, (Tables in Appendix 2) and draw the following conclusions:
 - Harlow has a smaller proportion of people working from or at home, reflecting the small scale of self employment and small business activity in the town.
 - Cambridge, with its distinctive urban geography, economy and travel patterns, generally scores better than the other settlements in terms of more short journeys to work and fewer long ones, more cycling and walking and less car dependency.
 - Harlow scores better than Colchester and Chelmsford in having higher percentages of short journeys to work which are suitable for walking or cycling, i.e. less than 2 kms and 2-5 kms.
 - Harlow also generates fewer long (more than 20 kms) journeys to work than the other two towns.
 - Harlow residents are more dependent on the car for their journey to work, probably reflecting the inadequacy of the town's layout for attractive public transport.

We see no case for a larger Harlow in itself.

Clearly growth of a town is often positive. This is however usually organic growth not planned growth, and it is a sign of success rather than a cause of success.

It is acknowledged that a larger population will justify a higher level of services, for example major facilities such as a department store, a university or a district general hospital become viable when population reaches certain threshold sizes. The question of services is addressed below, where we also consider the question of competing centres.

Employment Growth

The Plan proposes 40,000 additional jobs in the Stansted/M11 sub-region, but does not allocate them to individual settlements or growth centres. If Harlow were to take the same share of sub-regional jobs as it does of housing, then there will need to be 23,600 net additional jobs (text 5.127). The growth is said to be “employment led” and to derive from the following sub-sectors:

- University-level & research based institutions
- European HQ's, regional offices
- Media & culture
- Biotechnology
- ICT/telecoms
- Airport related
- Logistics & distribution

In order to assess the realism of these proposals we have looked at how the increase proposed might be achieved. An increase of 23,600 jobs would be an increase of 61% on the 2003 total of jobs in Harlow. It should be recalled that this is a net increase; the required gross increase to offset any decreases in jobs will be larger.

Jobs in services tend to follow population. On a broad estimate some 74% of Harlow jobs are in services. This leaves 26% of the 23,600 to be attracted to Harlow from a wider market (26% is probably an underestimate as some service activities will serve wider markets than Harlow). 26% equates to 6136 net additional jobs in “export” sectors, a 62% increase on the current number.

There must be some doubt about the realism of achieving this scale of increase in employment in Harlow, for a number of reasons. The first is that the recent performance of the Harlow economy indicates that a major turnaround will be required to achieve the anticipated scale of increase:

- Overall employment, including service jobs, declined by 1% between 1998 and 2003.
- Manufacturing employment, which includes many of the export sectors, declined by 28.9% in the same period.
- In research and development, which includes much of the bio-technology sector, employment declined by 12.3% in the same period.
- ICT/telecommunications employment declined by 3%.
- Media and culture increased by 30.7% but it still accounted for less than 1% of employment in 2003.
- Pharmaceuticals and logistics and distribution both declined by two-thirds or more.

It has been acknowledged that the spin-off development and employment from Stansted Airport will not be very significant for a town such as Harlow.

The other major constraint on the growth of Harlow is the competition from other centres. Most investment in “export” activities is quite mobile, that is, it can locate in a range of places and is not tied to particular markets or natural resources. Harlow will certainly be competing with other locations in the region, probably also with other locations in the Home Counties and London and maybe with other locations elsewhere in the UK or overseas (witness the scale of outsourcing to the Far East of even skilled work such as architectural and engineering drawing, and software design).

Even within the EEP a large number settlements or groups of settlements are identified as priorities for economic development:

- Key centres in EEP: Cambridge, Colchester, Chelmsford, Stevenage
- Regeneration areas in EEP: Bedford/Kempston, Colchester, Stevenage and parts of Cambridge
- Potential large new settlement (SS2)
- Maintaining vitality of market towns.
- Supporting economic well-being of rural villages.

Urban Renaissance in the Town Centre

The EEP sees the renaissance of the town centre as being founded on its development as a sub-regional centre serving most of the sub-region. Again the scale of turnaround required is significant:

- Expenditure is currently leaking from Harlow to Cambridge and Chelmsford
- All towns in the sub-region will be upgrading their town centre facilities to exploit growth opportunities, creating competition for Harlow as it tries to move up the centre hierarchy. Many of the centres will have support from EEDA in upgrading their services and facilities.
- The poor image of Harlow is a deterrent to both inward investment and to shoppers from a wider catchment area; the retail mix in the town centre extension has confirmed Harlow’s role as serving the middle-lower end of the market, which will exclude significant groups in the wider catchment area.

Realism of EEP development objectives?

More generally Harlow will be competing with other regeneration priorities (Bedford, Lea Valley, Stevenage etc) for:

- Inward investment (see above)
- Immigrants esp those with higher skills, wealth
- Infrastructure investment (for new development & regeneration areas)
- Regeneration funds e.g. for social housing

Many of competing locations have fewer disadvantages than Harlow. The identified growth locations and a possible new settlement will also be competing with Harlow.

The Plan anticipates that new development will pay for a significant amount of other investment (ST3 & text 5.132):

- Packages of greenfield and redevelopment
- A high proportion (30% standard, 40% aspiration) of affordable housing of high quality
- Contribute to renewing community facilities

These represent heavy calls on developers' funds in a low value market which is competing with attractive non-regeneration growth areas/housing markets e.g. Great Dunmow, Broxbourne. The above list also omits the need for new infrastructure in the new development areas, which will also be a burden on the developers.

Aptness of Harlow to accept major growth?

The EEP criteria for growth areas (SS1) include:

- In or adjacent to major urban areas where there is good public transport accessibility & where strategic networks (rail, road, bus) connect.

But current transport accessibility in Harlow is generally acknowledged to be very poor and only capable of improvement at considerable expense. EEP Policy ST 6 sets out the extensive transport improvements required in the Stansted/M11 sub-region.

Further EEP criteria for growth areas (SS3) include:

- SS3: LDD's may make provision for development in or adjacent to urban areas where scale & location of release:
 - Does not run counter to maximising the use of brownfield land.
 - If greenfield.
 - Access to good public transport or where development can assist new provision
 - Utilising existing physical and social infrastructure
 - Good access to housing, jobs, shopping and leisure facilities
 - Avoidance of adverse impacts on environmental assets.

In our view the Reports on the regeneration needs of Harlow all point to Harlow performing badly on the above counts. In relation to the environmental impacts Harlow North always seems to score least well among the different Harlow growth options. It is interesting to note that the EEP leaves the judgement on the scale and location of new development to Local Development Documents; this seems to conflict with the way EERA has formed its growth area policies, which are quite prescriptive. It is interesting also that the above criteria imply that the growth locations have not been evaluated by EERA for their sustainability. Hence the soundness of the policies themselves must be questioned.

Policy SS7: Review of Green Belt states that the Green Belt boundaries around Harlow need to be reviewed and compensating additions to the Green Belt proposed.

This policy ignores the tests set out in PPG3:

- The need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances
- The need to assess the damage to the five purposes of the Green Belt
- The need to examine alternatives which do less damage to the purposes of the Green Belt.

Only when these steps have been taken does the question of compensatory additions to the Green Belt become relevant.

Provisional Conclusions

We have considerable doubts about the realism and efficacy of the EEP proposals for Harlow in delivering the regeneration of the town. There is a prima facie case for examining an alternative approach that focuses on the clearly understood role and needs of Harlow.

Evaluation of Harlow North Proposals

The EEP (policy but not supporting text) is silent on the location of new development in or adjacent to Harlow as between the four compass points; it is apparently left to LDD's and may be capable of being scaled down. Both Buchanan (2003) & Atkins (DFR 2003) see Harlow North as capable of accommodating no development or being the last of the four in the sequential test.

Further or Alternative Measures to Achieve Regeneration in Harlow

Some measures are implicit in above analysis, for example the potential for more limited housing development within the urban area of Harlow.

However certain prior questions to be addressed:

- How do Harlow residents see the role of their town and their expectations of its future?
- How do Harlow employers see the town as a place to do business and what are their expectations?
- What effects have been achieved in implementing current regeneration policies for Harlow e.g. how much impact has the new housing development in Church Langley/New Hall had?

We will set down the additional research that needs to be done to substantiate the case against the EEP proposals and to explore the provisional feasibility of an alternative approach to the regeneration of Harlow.

Appendix 1: Regeneration issues identified for Harlow (SPA, 2005)

| Regeneration Issues Identified in Harlow | PACEC Response | EEP Response |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>General view of ingredients of successful urban centres from UK research (page 14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attract & retain skilled & qualified labour force • Knowledge based industries key to competitiveness • Diverse industrial base • High quality of life & good environment • Good connectivity: physical and electronic; international connectivity especially • Many aspects of economic strategy, governance & service provision need to operate at the city-region or sub-regional level rather than a fragmented local level <p>Other sources added location and investment status. Size <i>suddenly</i> introduced as an important factor (p.16):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It creates the capacity for investment in terms of hard and soft infrastructure • Important to the potential for economic growth, evidenced by correlation between population growth and GVA per job (a lot of aberrant cases in the correlation) • Potential for social benefits | <p>Draft RSS to continue the existing RSS Strategy in the first 5-10 years, thereafter strategy will gradually change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise and make sensible provision for the stronger southern economies • Focusing greater attention on key regional centres and weaker economies • Support development & regeneration of the rural areas, mainly by focus on market towns. <p><i>Check RPG9 policies for H and how effective they have been.</i></p> <p>Major role for key centres incl Cambridge, Colchester, Chelmsford, Stevenage. Re-affirmation of the importance of all the regeneration areas proposed in RPG 6 & 9 plus Bedford/Kempston, Colchester, Stevenage and parts of Cambridge. <i>Harlow will be competing with many similarly prioritised centres for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inward investment</i> • <i>Immigrants, esp those with higher skills, wealth</i> • <i>Infrastructure investment</i> • <i>Regeneration funds.</i> <p><i>Many of these centres have fewer disadvantages than H</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Hence growth made possible by H's inclusion in the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough growth corridor. Growth not sufficient for regeneration but necessary.</p> <p>"Far reaching, decisive intervention is required to address the deep rooted structural problems and challenges facing Harlow.....a regeneration initiative is required which comprehensively tackles the causes and implications of the town's current underperformance." (p.17)</p> <p><i>Size and growth as drivers of regeneration etc need to be questioned e.g. any difference between imposed growth and organic growth?</i></p> | <p>SS1 Achieving sustainable development. "In most instances development will be focused in or adjacent to major urban areas where there is good public transport accessibility and where strategic networks (rail, road, bus) connect.....By locating housing, jobs and services in close proximity the need for long distance commuting will be reduced."</p> <p><i>How good is public transport in H?</i> <i>How well do networks connect in Harlow?</i> <i>There is evidence that long distance commuting is well established in spite of proximity of jobs etc. Tbc.</i></p> <p>SS2: LDD's will ensure a balanced and deliverable supply of land for employment, housing and supporting services and will adopt an appropriate community strategy approach.</p> <p><i>I.e. the detailed implementation of the strategy will fall to LDD's</i></p> <p>An early review of RSS will be undertaken to assess the longer term need for a large new settlement.</p> <p><i>Risks undermining the present strategy as it will be yet another potential competitor for investment and people.</i></p> <p>SS3 Development in and adjoining urban areas. LDD's may make provision for development in or adjacent to urban areas where the scale and location of the release:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not adversely affect the need to make maximum use of brownfield land & efforts to deliver sub-regional urban renaissance |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Greenfield, represents the most sustainable option by virtue of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing access to good quality public transport or where development can assist new PT provision ○ Utilising existing physical and social infrastructure ○ Having good access to housing, jobs, shopping and leisure facilities ○ Avoidance of adverse impact on environmental assets such as nature conservation and landscape conservation, historic features, mineral reserves, water resources and air quality. <p>Greenfield land releases should be appropriate in scale to the adjoining urban area. Significant urban extensions should be large enough to provide a sustainable form of development in relation to employment, public transport provision, and social, health, education and community facilities provision. Where development overlaps LA boundaries LPA's to cooperate on development of strategies, establishment of needs and implementation of the sequential approach.</p> <p><i>The clear implication of this policy is that the growth areas have yet to be tested for their sustainability and conformity with the sequential test, which must be done at the</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>LDD level. The criteria provide a useful test for the Harlow expansion proposals.</p> <p>SS7 Green Belt Review of Green Belt boundaries needed around, inter alia, Harlow. <i>Is the northern H growth area covered by GB policy? Or only the part of Harlow surrounds in Essex? If growth area is in GB then tests are demanding and not met by “compensating additions to the GB”</i></p> <p>Justification in para 4.32: GB sometimes has led to dispersal of development and unsustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region ST1: LDD's to provide for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieving a new vision for Harlow as an employment and housing growth area allied with physical, social and economic regeneration • ditto for Upper Lea Valley • improvement of strategic transport infrastructure & passenger transport services to overcome current infrastructure deficits and congestion, and provide new sustainable transport infrastructure for urban growth. • Restraint on development N of H/Stort Valley except that required for strategic growth • Strategic green wedge west of H <p>ST3 Harlow Regeneration Strong new delivery mechanism (4 DC's and 2 CC's plus EP; 5.147) to implement LDD</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>prepared by 3 DC's and 2 CC's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green infrastructure • Urban renaissance in TC • Urban renaissance throughout town to renew and redevelop housing stock & green & community infrastructure (possibly in association with development of new housing sites) • Transport infrastructure & measures • Range of new housing • Development of the town as a key regional centre for university-level and research-based institutions, and for the location of European HQ's, regional offices, media and culture, bio-technology, ICT/telecoms, airport-related enterprises, logistics and distribution • Growth of local SME's |
| <p>Simultaneous obsolescence of urban facilities and infrastructure & under-investment in recent past in renewal. Employment premises mainly obsolete & limited in size and availability (except H Business Park) Employment sites have poor access to strategic transport network Commercial & industrial rents among lowest in London Ring; little market interest.</p> | <p>"As a 'small town' Harlow is unlikely to attract the sizeable investment needed for regeneration." (p,19) "Its capacity is currently too small in employment and population terms to help reposition the town centre in the retail hierarchy or to justify necessary transport infrastructure investment." Potential benefits from an increased population:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased demand • Access to a larger workforce • Change structure of the residential population, increasing the economic | <p>Spatial implications of the strategy for economic development (4.14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the economy across the region, but particularly focusing on areas with particular need for regeneration • Maintaining the vitality and viability of market towns as focal points for access to employment,..... • Supporting the economic and social well-being of rural villages and the countryside by improving access to employment,.....encouraging economic diversification. <p><i>A lot of competition for economic</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>potential of the area, particularly as in-migrants are generally considered more likely to demonstrate the necessary entrepreneurial characteristics and skills required to support a thriving SME-based economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding employment land offers greater choice of options for investors & improved choice of jobs for residents, then higher incomes assist TC and image of H. <p>Risk that growth, if not managed correctly, could place further burdens on the town's infrastructure and exacerbate social and economic problems.</p> | <p><i>development.</i></p> |
| <p>Strengths on which to build:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High economic activity rates • Low unemployment • Steady employment growth • Inward investment performance • Presence of several high value companies in town (e.g. GSK & Nortel Networks) • H is 2nd and 5th highest in country in representation of manufacture of computers and instruments respectively. • R & D presence: 10% in H cf less than 0.5% nationally • Good location: relative to London, Cambridge and Stansted | | <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region Growth to be employment-led, capitalising on its role as a key aviation gateway and on its potential as a focus for hi-tech, knowledge-based employment related to the Cambridge clusters and London (5.122)</p> <p><i>What is an aviation gateway and how do Cambridge and London help Harlow? Why is the strategy employment-led?</i></p> <p><i>Are hi-tech industries the sectors in which major growth is likely to occur? Rather than services?</i></p> <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region ST2: LDD's to provide for 40000 net additional jobs in sub-region by 2021, including new strategic employment site N of Harlow and one of 25 has at N Weald, both 2001-2011.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Growth in jobs less likely from direct airport employment than proximity to London, Stansted and Cambridge. <i>Source for 40000 net additional jobs?</i> <i>How significant are the target sectors, in total and in growth potential?</i> Operational development & employment to be confined within airport; spin-off development to be provided for in H and nearby towns.</p> |
| <p>Economic restructuring; declines 1998-2002 in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturing, especially mfr of pharmaceuticals, radio & TV equipment, & aerospace • Transportation & storage • Telecommunications <p>Hence relative economic performance poor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment growth 1991-2002: 22% in Harlow Ring and 12% in Harlow, and low relative to nearly all London Ring districts. • VAT Reg'd businesses per 1000 EA Population: 38.4 in H and 78.6 in H Ring (N. England 49.6) • 53% of employment in SME's cf national avge 62%. • Low rates of business formation • Self employment: 9% of EA residents in H cf 16.1 in Harlow Ring • Factors in limited SME sector: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cost & availability of premises ○ Lack of skilled labour (see below) | <p>Increasing the market size will be key to achieving the necessary critical mass required to generate and support SME's. <i>Check correlation between town size and number of SME's per 1000 EA population.</i> Employment projections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experian BSL 7/04: 4000 net additional jobs by 2021 • PACEC more optimistic model: a further 7000 net additional jobs by 2021 • I.e. 11000 net additional jobs • Growth beyond this level depends on e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Devt of sub-regional shopping centre ○ Top quality business park building on H potential as centre of R & D e.g. Cambridge Science Park ○ Addition of R & D related HEI ○ Development of airport services cluster | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lack of supportive infrastructure ○ Absence of enterprise culture ○ Slow growth of market ○ Safety & security issues | | |
| <p>Population decline 1981-2001 cf 10% increase in H Ring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reduced labour supply ● Selective outmigration esp younger and more affluent ● Poor skill levels: 1 in 4 have problems with literacy and numeracy ● Very low participation rates of 16-17 yr olds in education or training | <p>To improve skills and aspirations in the workforce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve skills and aspirations of existing labour force ● Retain skills of those who might otherwise move out. ● Attract more diverse population to H for their skills and their spending | |
| <p>Housing offer unattractive to higher skilled workforce; economic imbalance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5300 more residents qualified to NVQ3 or less than jobs in the town ● 9300 jobs in town requiring NVQ4/5 against 5600 residents so qualified; net deficit 3700. ● 52% of jobs filled by H residents, rest by in movers | | <p>Affordable housing to be provided at 30% of total at least. Aspiration (SS13) is 40%. <i>Implications for social mix in Harlow extension.</i> New development to pay for other investment e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● developers to undertake packages of redevelopment and greenfield development. ● High proportion of affordable housing of high quality ● Development to contribute to renewing community facilities <p>Harlow will compete for private & public housing investment within the sub-region with significant growth in N Weald, Broxbourne/A10 corridor, Braintree, Bishop's Stortford North and Gt Dunmow. <i>None of the competing locations are</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | <p><i>regeneration areas with the reputation of Harlow. A major competitive challenge esp if developers are required to pay for all that is set out above, which omits infrastructure contributions in the greenfield areas. Not only private sector sensitive, but also RSL's who look to value increases to fund future development.</i></p> <p><i>All except B Stortford will also be competing for employment growth.</i></p> <p>10000 dwellings to N of Harlow, 8000 to E and within Harlow and lesser development to S and W.</p> |
| <p>Housing stock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social sector 35% cf Essex 15% • but shortfall of affordable homes (987 over next 6 years) • Council left with worst residual stock • growing maintenance requirements in private and public sectors • limited choice partic at middle and upper ends of market | | |
| <p>Deprivation, for the following components of the IMD 2004 more than 10% of H SOA's were in the most deprived in Eastern Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • education, skills & training 24% • crime & disorder 18% • barriers to housing & services 17% • health deprivation & disability 12% <p>For the following the percent of SOA's was less than 10%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income 6% | <p>Social inclusion for all.</p> <p>Needs community level investment in capacity building, intermediate labour markets, skills and community facilities.</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment 2% • Living environment 0% <p>Overall IMD 15%</p> <p>Deprivation relatively absent in Old Harlow and Church Langley (E end of town)</p> | | |
| <p>Decaying town & neighbourhood centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC slipped from 78 to 130 in national ranking in 20 years (Stevenage 103, Chelmsford 43) • Residents tending to travel to competing centres e.g. Cambridge and Chelmsford • TC South development: 21739 sq.m. of retail space £55m investment • NC's nearing end of lives | | <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region</p> <p>TC should develop as sub-regional shopping centre serving the majority of the sub-region (5.131)</p> <p><i>Means improving retail etc offer to compete effectively with Cambridge and Chelmsford to which H expenditure currently leaking.</i></p> |
| <p>Transport & access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads originally planned not implemented • Employment areas in W & N poorly connected to M11 • Road network more suited to private transport than public. • Ring round TC acts as barrier to accessibility • Poor accessibility & severe congestion in peak hours • M11/J7 at 120% of capacity in the peak. • Transport deficit: high car dependency & low car ownership, poorly developed public transport <p>Measures required on pp12-13</p> | <p>Needs a step change in the town's physical/transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Needs to reach the critical mass required to generate the necessary private sector investment in renewal and capacity improvements (p.18)</p> | <p>SS6 Transport Strategy</p> <p>Transport delivery agencies will improve accessibility and support the economic and spatial development of the region. This will be done through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the need, and hence the demand, for travel • An improved range of public transport provision to, from and within the Regional Interchange Centres (.....Harlow...) <p><i>Current experience does not bear out the assumed relationship between need and demand for travel.</i></p> <p><i>Is H capable of performing the Regional Interchange Centre role without major investment?</i></p> <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region (para 5.121):</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>southern part of sub-region is strongly related to London through daily commuting and its higher order retail, recreation and cultural facilities.</p> <p><i>Are there proposals to reduce this pattern of long distance travel?</i></p> <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region (5.137)</p> <p>Delivery of the strategic growth locations will require significant passenger transport improvements along two axes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/S linking key centres incl Epping, N Weald, Harlow East, Harlow Town Station & Stansted Airport • E/W linking key centres incl B Stortford, Gt Dunmow and Braintree. <p><i>Multi-modal studies encountered real difficulties in proposing new public transport services because of the dispersed patterns of trips. EEP seems not to address why people will suddenly change their travel habits.</i></p> <p>Development at Harlow East will require major improvements to the transport infrastructure and PT provision in Harlow.</p> <p>Stansted/M11 Sub-Region</p> <p>ST6 Transportation</p> <p>Priorities for sub-region are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail capacity enhancements on London to B Stortford incl intermediate station improvements • Improved road and rail access to Airport • Provision of modern passenger transport service to serve rail stations in S of sub-region to increase their catchment areas |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An outer by-pass to the north of the existing urban area of H from A414 to M11 to accommodate EW through traffic, improve access to strategic growth locations and improve external access into built-up area of H (jobs, TC); requires new junction to M11. • Transport improvements within H • Provision of P & R at N Weald and H Town Station to provide for high quality access to TC and airport • Provision of high quality PT link Epping, N Weald, H to Stansted with options for serving B Stortford and Sawbridgeworth (may need segregated route 5.145). • Provision of high quality PT link B Stortford, Airport, Gt Dunmow and Braintree (may need segregated route 5.145). • A study of l.t. PT improvements between London, N Weald and Harlow. • Improvements to JJ 7 & 8 of M11 • Improvements to A120 between A10 and M11 • Improvements to A1184 between H and B Stortford. • Study of the implications of airport related growth on access to N to Cambridgeshire. |
| <p>Negative image due to obsolete physical assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deters business investment & growth | <p>Negative image based largely on the declining urban fabric of the town. Needs investment in the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Housing stock to attract wider range of workers and to boost affordable housing provision <p>Re-brand Harlow through Flagship Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TC• Major housing renewal• Marketing• Infrastructure• Create housing choice | |
|--|---|--|

10. U.K. destinations of people moving from Harlow addresses in the year preceding Census 2001

| County of residence at the time of Census 2001 | LAD of residence at the time of Census 2001 | All "outmovers" ¹ | % of all "outmovers" ² | % of all outmovers moving outside Harlow |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Bedfordshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 21 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| | Bedford (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Mid Bedfordshire (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | South Bedfordshire (LA) | 12 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Cambridgeshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 108 | 1.5 | 4.7 |
| | Cambridge (LA) | 36 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| | East Cambridgeshire (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Fenland (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| | Huntingdonshire (LA) | 26 | 0.4 | 1.1 |
| | South Cambridgeshire (LA) | 34 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| Essex (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 5,793 | 78.7 | 31.8 |
| | Basildon (LA) | 37 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| | Braintree (LA) | 70 | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| | Brentwood (LA) | 22 | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| | Castle Point (LA) | 13 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| | Chelmsford (LA) | 74 | 1.0 | 3.2 |
| | Colchester (LA) | 44 | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| | Epping Forest (LA) | 287 | 3.9 | 12.5 |
| | Harlow (LA) | 5,061 | 68.7 | ... |
| | Maldon (LA) | 12 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | Rochford (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Tendring (LA) | 21 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| | Uttlesford (LA) | 146 | 2.0 | 6.3 |

Continued over page

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Hertfordshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 473 | 6.4 | 20.5 |
| | Broxbourne (LA) | 70 | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| | Dacorum (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | East Hertfordshire (LA) | 363 | 4.9 | 15.8 |
| | Hertsmere (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | North Hertfordshire (LA) | 31 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
| | St Albans (LA) | - | - | - |
| | Stevenage (LA) | - | - | - |
| | Three Rivers (LA) | - | - | - |
| | Watford (LA) | - | - | - |
| | Welwyn Hatfield (LA) | - | - | - |
| Suffolk (County) | | - | - | - |
| Buckinghamshire (County) | | 12 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| North and East London Boroughs | Total | 221 | 3.0 | 9.6 |
| | <i>of which:</i> | | | |
| | Barking and Dagenham | 6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Barnet | 9 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| | Camden | 6 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Enfield | 33 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| | Hackney | 15 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| | Haringey | 15 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| | Havering | 32 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| | Islington | 10 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| | Newham | - | - | - |
| | Redbridge | 57 | 0.8 | 2.5 |
| | Tower Hamlets | 8 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Waltham Forest | 30 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
| North and West London Boroughs³ | | 49 | 0.7 | 2.1 |
| South London Boroughs⁴ | | 69 | 0.9 | 3.0 |
| Other UK | | 838 | 11.4 | 36.4 |
| Total | | 7,363 | 100.0 | ... |

Source: ONS, Census 2001

Notes:

1. "Outmovers from Harlow" are defined as those who were resident in Harlow (Local Authority District) one year before the census, but changed address during the year preceding Census 2001.
2. "Inmovers to Harlow" are defined as residents of Harlow (LAD) at the time of the census, who changed address in the year preceding Census 2001.
3. North and West London boroughs are defined as: Brent, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Kensington and Chelsea, and Westminster
4. South London Boroughs are defined as all London boroughs not included in the North and East, and North and West London Borough classes

11. U.K. origins of people moving to Harlow addresses in the year preceding Census 2001

| County of residence one year before the census | LAD of residence one year before the Census | Number of "inmovers" | % of all "inmovers" | % of all inmovers less those who moved within Harlow |
|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Bedfordshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 12 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Bedford (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Mid Bedfordshire (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | South Bedfordshire (LA) | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cambridgeshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 42 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| | Cambridge (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | East Cambridgeshire (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Fenland (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Huntingdonshire (LA) | 21 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | South Cambridgeshire (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Essex (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 5,760 | 64.2 | 17.9 |
| | Basildon (LA) | 18 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | Braintree (LA) | 37 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| | Brentwood (LA) | 22 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| | Castle Point (LA) | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Chelmsford (LA) | 34 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| | Colchester (LA) | 12 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Epping Forest (LA) | 414 | 4.6 | 10.6 |
| | Harlow (LA) | 5,061 | 56.4 | ... |
| | Maldon (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Rochford (LA) | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Tendring (LA) | 45 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| | Uttlesford (LA) | 111 | 1.2 | 2.8 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Hertfordshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 520 | 5.8 | 13.3 |
| | Broxbourne (LA) | 147 | 1.6 | 3.8 |
| | Dacorum (LA) | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | East Hertfordshire (LA) | 299 | 3.3 | 7.7 |
| | Hertsmere (LA) | 12 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | North Hertfordshire (LA) | 16 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| | St Albans (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Stevenage (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Three Rivers (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Watford (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Welwyn Hatfield (LA) | 19 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Suffolk (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 27 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| | Babergh (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Forest Heath (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Ipswich (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Mid Suffolk (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | St. Edmundsbury (LA) | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Suffolk Coastal (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Waveney (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Buckinghamshire (County) | <i>of which:</i> | 12 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| | Aylesbury Vale (LA) | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | Chiltern (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | South Bucks (LA) | 3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| | Wycombe (LA) | 6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| North and East London Boroughs | Total | 662 | 7.4 | 16.9 |
| | <i>of which:</i> | | | |
| | Barking and Dagenham | 18 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | Barnet | 25 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| | Camden | 9 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | Enfield | 187 | 2.1 | 4.8 |
| | Hackney | 24 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| | Haringey | 43 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| | Havering | 22 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| | Islington | 21 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| | Newham | 43 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| | Redbridge | 65 | 0.7 | 1.7 |
| | Tower Hamlets | 41 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| | Waltham Forest | 164 | 1.8 | 4.2 |
| | | | | |
| North and West London Boroughs³ | Total | 64 | 0.7 | 1.6 |
| South London Boroughs⁴ | | 100 | 1.1 | 2.6 |
| Other UK | | 1,770 | 19.7 | 45.3 |
| Total | | 8,969 | 100.0 | ... |

Source: ONS Census 2001

Notes:

1. "Outmovers from Harlow" are defined as those who were resident in Harlow (Local Authority District) one year before the census, but changed address during the year preceding Census 2001.
2. "Inmovers to Harlow" are defined as residents of Harlow (LAD) at the time of the census, who changed address in the year preceding Census 2001.
3. North and West London boroughs are defined as the Boroughs of: Brent, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon, Hounslow, Kensington and Chelsea, and Westminster
4. South London Boroughs are defined as all London boroughs not included in the North and East, and North and West London Borough classes

12. Migration by economic activity, Harlow, 2001

| | Outmovers from Harlow ¹ | | Inmovers to Harlow ² | | Inward migration ratio ³ |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Number | % | Number | % | |
| Economically active | 4,113 | 76.7 | 5,450 | 80.4 | 1.3 |
| <i>Of which:</i> | | | | | |
| <i>Economically active: Self-employed</i> | 327 | 6.1 | 391 | 5.8 | 1.2 |
| <i>Economically active: Unemployed</i> | 239 | 4.5 | 350 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Economically inactive | 1,250 | 23.3 | 1,329 | 19.6 | 1.1 |
| Total | 5,363 | 100.0 | 6,779 | 100.0 | 1.3 |

Source: ONS, Census 2001

Notes:

1. "Outmovers from Harlow" are defined as those who were resident in Harlow (Local Authority District) one year before the census, but changed address during the year preceding Census 2001.
 2. "Inmovers to Harlow" are defined as residents of Harlow (LAD) at the time of the census, who changed address in the year preceding Census 2001.
 3. Inward migration ratio is the ratio of inmovers to outmovers
- Outmovers and Inmovers groups both include people who moved within Harlow LAD.