

Essential Reference Paper 'D'

Meeting Notes

Preferred Options	Date	Page
Ware North and East	24 April 2014	2
Gilston Area and South of Bishop's Stortford	6 May 2014	10
East of Welwyn Garden City and West of Hertford	16 May 2014	25
North of Hertford	9 June 2014	34
South of Hertford	9 June 2014	42

1. Ware North and East

Ware North and East (WARE3) Project Group Meeting
Wednesday 24th April, 11:15-13:15
East Herts Council Offices, Wallfields, Hertford SG13 8EQ

Attendees:

Kay Mead (KM)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Martin Paine (MP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Tim Hagyard (TH)	East Herts Council – Development Management
Paul Chappell (PC)	Herts County Council – Highways
Rupert Thacker (RT)	Herts County Council – Rail/Passenger Transport
Sue Jackson (SJ)	Herts County Council – Transport Modelling
Kate Ma (KMa)	Herts County Council – Secondary Schools
Bethan Clemence (BC)	Herts County Council – Primary Schools
Alice Carrington (AC)	Herts County Council – Property
Julie Greaves (JG)	Herts County Council – Minerals and Waste
Richard Reeve (RR)	Thames Water
Chris Santer (CS)	Leach Homes – site promoter
Jim Hatch (JH)	Leach Homes – site promoter
Steven Barker (SB)	Barker Parry – agent for Leach Homes
Hugo Kirby (HK)	Ptarmigan Land – site promoter
Craig Neilson (CN)	Ptarmigan Land – site promoter
Steven Kosky (SK)	Barton Willmore – agent for Ptarmigan Land
Claire Hutchinson (CH)	Sworders – agent for current land owners

Apologies:

Neil French	Herts County Council – Passenger Transport
Andrea Gilmour	Herts County Council – Property
Carol Lodge	HMWT

Meeting Notes

1. KM welcomed all to the meeting and explained that this was the first location-specific meeting involving site promoters, following the Site Promoter Briefing Session on 4th April. It was intended to continue to maintain maximum transparency and that the meeting notes would be published along with any material received which might have a bearing on the decision-making process, first through the District Planning Executive Panel and then on the Council's website.
2. East Herts Council had established the District Plan on the basis of independent technical studies, the Landowner/Developer Questionnaires in Summer 2012, and follow-up meetings with ATLAS during 2013, but there had been no direct contact between planning officers and any landowners or developers. However, it was considered necessary to engage with site promoters now in order to enable continued testing of the feasibility of the District Plan and the site allocations and Broad Locations. Ensuring that the Plan met National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements in terms of deliverability was essential.

3. KM explained that Ware North and East (Draft District Plan Policy WARE3) was identified as a Broad Location for Development (BLD), for a range of between 200 and 3,000 homes to meet Ware's identified housing need of over 2,200 homes. A further Development Plan Document (DPD) – effectively a mini-District Plan - would enable more detailed work including a Green Belt review of the location, but the location would remain in the Green Belt until adoption of the DPD, estimated in 2021. CN queried where this date came from and expressed an aspiration to commence development in advance of this date. KM responded that the year 2021 was the Council's estimate of when the Ware DPD would be adopted but acknowledged that timescales were not fully confirmed at this stage.
4. The main aim of this meeting would be to log the main issues requiring further testing through the District Plan. These would be written up and agreed in order to focus efforts.
5. KM explained that the District Council was currently undertaking a 2-stage Gypsies and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Assessment in order to comply with the statutory requirement to meet the need for pitches. All the emerging site allocations and Broad Locations were being considered as potential options. A consultation on the proposed locations would be undertaken later in 2014.
6. KM and MP explained that the Council's preferred approach was for both major sites promoters to work closely together on all technical work, including transport modelling, and other testing work. Should further work identify that large-scale development was feasible, a legal agreement between the site promoters was considered desirable in order to avoid disputes about sharing of infrastructure and other costs. HK said that some form of agreement should be possible although the precise form would need further consideration.

Viability and illustrative masterplanning

7. MP stated that, as explained on 4th April, the District Council would appoint consultants to undertake a Delivery Study over the summer. This study would require the main items of infrastructure and funding sources to be identified and to understand the level of contributions which could be expected from site promoters. The Delivery Study would be an important factor in deciding what scale of development would be most appropriate.
8. MP explained that the Delivery Study would require inputs from site promoters to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to allow for a comprehensive analysis of the overall scale of costs of development. These inputs would be verified by the infrastructure providers and the appointed consultants. It was reiterated that any work which could be done on this by the end of June would play an important role in

assessing the deliverability of the plan and help ensure NPPF compliance.

9. In order to understand the viability parameters it would be helpful if the site promoters could produce illustrative concept plans showing a proposed layout including the main infrastructure items and mix of uses. These should be prepared jointly by both site promoters in order to enable a coherent approach.
10. For the Broad Locations detailed masterplanning is not considered necessary because much of this work could be undertaken through the subsequent Development Plan Document. However, MP requested that early thought should be given to the provision of a good range of facilities within a Neighbourhood Centre.
11. CN queried whether the introduction of CIL would run in parallel with the DPD and MP replied that the Council is still in the process of considering whether it will introduce CIL and will make a decision in due course. CIL may not necessarily be the most appropriate tool considering the scale of this site.

District Plan consultation

12. CN asked for clarification of the significance of the District Plan consultation deadline on May 22nd. KM replied that whilst it would be appropriate for site promoters to submit their initial work through the consultation, the proposed engagement process would run in parallel in the lead up to examination in public in 2015, and would need to be pursued to the point at which sufficient evidence was in place to satisfy an examiner.

Transport

13. SJ outlined the work completed to date using the HSGTM strategic model, testing the impact of 1,300 dwellings to the east and 1,700 to the north. This work had flagged up areas of concern including the A602 and the A1170/Ware Road, and possibly also the A10 Corridor. However the level of modelling was rather coarse and further work would be needed. The Transport Update (November 2013) is available on the Council's website at www.eastherts.gov.uk/technicalstudies
14. PC explained that Ware was a gap in the transport model coverage. A microsimulation (Paramics) model would need to be created to understand the impacts on the local road network including the High Street, and the impacts of mitigation measures, which should also take into account passenger transport initiatives. KM explained that the work in collection of data would need to be completed prior to the summer holidays.

15. KM explained that the County and District Councils would be looking to the site promoters to fund the construction and running of the Paramics model. This would require the promoters to work closely with SJ and PC to ensure that model met County requirements and the data could be verified. It was agreed that a further meeting would be arranged in due course to look into this further. SJ would advise on what data the County Council holds.
16. CN advised that it was proposed that TPA (Transport Planning Associates) would be appointed to carry out the work and that Rupert Lyons would be the contact for the company, which is based in Welwyn Garden City.
17. The need for a potential northern link road connecting the potential development area with the A10 was discussed. A single carriageway link was assumed. RT suggested that such a road would need to be 6.3 metres wide to accommodate 2-way bus traffic.
18. In answer to a question regarding the potential for Park and Ride to be introduced, KM explained that the Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan (UTP) had considered the issue. However, it was suggested that even combining Hertford and Ware, and taking account of a possible urban extension of up to 3,000 homes at WARE3, a Park & Ride facility was considered unlikely to be viable.
19. RT asked whether the site promoters could prepare some case studies of how they had approached travel planning at other sites.

Waste Water

20. RR explained that the site would drain to Rye Meads Treatment Works which currently serves a population catchment of over 400,000 people in the wider area.
21. The Water Cycle Study that was undertaken in 2008/9 forecast growth and the consequential impact on Rye Meads STW; however, the growth was not realised due to the downturn in housing development. The predicted capacity limitation dates within the study will effectively move forward; however, ongoing works to change the way the sewage is treated have provided a further period of relief to between 2021 and 2026. After that time it is likely that additional capacity provision will need to be made. . Additional tanks could be provided without any extension of the Treatment Works site and without any encroachment into the adjacent SSSI. However, it is important to note that the overall impact and treatment requirement cannot be predicted at this time as the cumulative effects of development from all the adjacent local authority areas also served by Rye Meads is not fully defined.
22. RR explained that in terms of connections to the sewerage network, the simplest solution would be for connection to the heads of the pipes, but

this would only be feasible for small scale development in the High Oak Road area for development to the North of Ware and also to the East of Ware. For larger scale development or development in other parts of the North of Ware area, it would be necessary to establish a new connection to the outfall sewer. This would require a new pipe around the northern and eastern edges of the town, with a pumping station to the north to address the slight dip in the valley to the north. While the route could be open to variation and layout would influence what form drainage could take, the end point of the existing sewer in the River Lea locality would be a fixed matter.

23. In response to a question from HK, RR suggested that the costs of provision could be in the region of around £4-5million. Some funding could become available through OFWAT but, with a single site or consortium, the option of a requisition could also be explored. Under a requisition, Thames Water's contribution would be approximately 12 x the annual income from sewerage charges from the new properties with the developer/s contributing the balance. The planning process for implementation generally takes around five years from initial conception to construction.

Schools

24. BC explained that there was very little capacity in the existing primary schools and very little potential to expand the existing schools, beyond that currently under construction at St Catherine's. Strategic scale development would be expected to support itself. 500 to 850 dwellings would yield 1 Form of Entry (FE) of 30 pupils. The same calculation applies to Primary and Secondary School. A development of 3,000 would equate to six forms of entry (FE) across the development. Priors Wood Primary School, adjacent to the proposed development area, may have the potential expand if a land-swap agreement could be put in place.
25. CN queried these figures by contrast with an urban extension of 1,200 houses on the edge of Norwich, where Norfolk County Council used a ratio of 1 secondary school per 7,000 houses. BC explained that the child yield in Hertfordshire is high, and may be attributable in part to inward migration.
26. In response to a question from CN regarding the potential for the expansion of existing secondary schools, KMa stated that both Chauncy and Presdales schools are academies and therefore HCC influence over admissions/expansion is limited.
27. HK queried whether it would be possible to share some of the open space/sports requirements with Wodson Park Sports Centre adjacent? KM explained that, while it may be a possibility, this may prove difficult given that Wodson Park is privately run by a trust rather than being a Council concern and its facilities are already well used.

28. HK asked whether a secondary school would need to be co-ed, and KMa confirmed this would be the case, with admissions arrangements to serve the local community. Funding would be expected from developers for the capital costs of schools provision and could be in the region of around £24m for a secondary school. The Education Funding Agency <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/education-funding-agency> provides further information on school provision. Running costs would be down to the operator.
29. In response to HK's question on the minimum size of a secondary school, there is a range of provision. However, a school must be able to deliver the KS4 curriculum. Minimum effectiveness is around 4FE, with HCC preferring the provision of 6-10FE schools.
30. HK stated that this would mean a minimum of 2,000 dwellings to support a secondary school from that development area but also queried whether there would be a requirement to accommodate pupils from a wider area. He further queried how much land would be required to be sterilised for education purposes so that this could inform masterplanning of the area and costs for the development.
31. KMa stated that a secondary school would be likely to serve strategic needs both for the development and wider afield due to the catchment area and that pupils would realistically travel up to three miles. However, further work is required to be carried out in respect of the Hertford and Ware Schools Planning Area to ascertain how future arising needs could be met.

Wildlife Sites

32. KM explained that Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT) would be contacting the site promoters in relation to surveying 2 existing designated wildlife sites during 2015. It was important to make sure that any survey work is done accordance with the HMWT requirements. MP explained that the location of the two designated Wildlife Sites are shown on the current Local Plan 2007 Proposals Map.

Minerals and Waste

33. JG explained that East of Ware falls within Minerals Area 8. The County Council would want a detailed study to be carried out by the site promoters to assess the potential for minerals extraction and a proposed approach to phasing. This need not necessarily delay work but should include information based on boreholes to assess the depth and quality of any underlying mineral deposits to ascertain whether extraction would be economically viable. There may be opportunity to utilise any gravel extracted in the construction process on site. JG offered to circulate study examples.

Healthcare facilities

34. KM explained that GP surgeries in the towns were at capacity and therefore new capacity would be sought. This would certainly relate to additional dwellings provided in the area, but may also include the potential to relocate/expand existing facilities in the town. Liaison with the NHS/CCG would be required.

Masterplanning

35. MP stated that while detailed masterplanning would be carried out at the DPD stage, it would be necessary for a high-level concept masterplan/s to be produced. This would inform a spreadsheet of costs, which would be likely to undergo several iterations. All facilities should be factored in and important provisions, such as neighbourhood centres, should not be overlooked.
36. HK also queried whether there was a requirement for the scheme to provide employment space and KM advised that the Council would seek to ensure that the existing provision in the town was protected, but some additional employment provision in this broad location would be required. A study would need to be undertaken to assess the town's overall employment needs before a decision on this could be made on the quantum.
37. HK commented that this would not be a solely residential development and that the developers were conscious of the need to get it right.
38. MP stated that, in respect of the IDP, it was important at this stage that an idea of all costs (e.g. GP's, open space etc) was gained in order to inform the process to show that the District Plan would be deliverable and also to access any funding opportunities.

Next Steps

39. It was agreed that any actions agreed above would be carried out and that further meetings would be scheduled in due course to cover specific matters, as appropriate.

2. Gilston Area and South of Bishop's Stortford

Gilston Area (GA1) and South of Bishop's Stortford (BISH7)
Tuesday 6th May
East Herts Council Offices, Wallfields, Hertford SG13 8EQ

Meeting Notes (Morning Session)

Attendees – am session (10.30-12:15)

Martin Paine (MP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Laura Pattison (LP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Liz Aston (LA)	East Herts Council – Development Management
Bethan Clemence (BC)	Herts County Council – Children's Services (School Place Planning)
Andrea Gilmour (AG)	Herts County Council – Herts Property/Schools
Martin Wells (MW)	Herts County Council – Minerals and Waste
Chris Lovegrove (CL)	City and Provincial Properties (CPP)
Cody Gaynor	Spacecraft Architects (CPP)
Trenton Williams	Alan Baxter Associates (CPP)
Jane Barnett (JB)	Savills – agent for CPP
Joan Hancox (JH)	Herts Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
Olivier Spencer (OS)	Andrew Martin Associates – Agent for Countryside
Tom Dobson (TD)	Quod Planning – agent for Places for People
Fiona Sibley (FS)	Quod Planning – agent for Places for People
Gary Duncan (GD)	Countryside Properties
Liz Connell (LC)	Countryside Properties
Zhanine Oates (ZO)	Essex County Council – Spatial Planning
Neil Keylock (NK)	Essex County Council – Schools
Paul MacBride (PMB)	Harlow Council – Planning Policy
Jeremy Pine (JP)	Uttlesford Council – Planning Policy

Apologies

Kate Ma (KM)	Herts County Council – Children's Services – School Place Planning
Philip Murphy (PM)	Quod Planning – agent for Places for People
Mary Parsons (MP)	Places for People
Anna Cronin (AC)	Epping Forest Council

1. MP welcomed all to the meeting and explained it was intended to continue to maintain maximum transparency and that the meeting notes would be published along with any material received which might have a bearing on the decision-making process, first through the District Planning Executive Panel and then on the Council's website.
2. East Herts Council had established the District Plan on the basis of independent technical studies, the Landowner/Developer Questionnaires in Summer 2012, and follow-up meetings with ATLAS during 2013, but there had been no direct contact between planning officers and any landowners or developers. However, it was considered necessary to engage with site promoters now in order to enable continued testing of the feasibility of the District Plan and the site allocations and Broad Locations. Ensuring that the Plan met National

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements in terms of deliverability was essential.

3. MP explained the rationale behind the development strategy for the district. The site allocation south of Bishop's Stortford (Draft District Plan Policy BISH7) had been made to contribute to the housing need generated from Bishop's Stortford. The identification of a broad location for development in the Gilston Area (Draft District Plan Policy GA1) had been made to meet the unmet housing need from Bishop's Stortford and the rural area, where a policy approach had been taken to limit the amount of development on the grounds of sustainability and in order to preserve the rural character of the villages.

Development Strategy and phasing

4. MP summarised the development strategy outlined in the draft Plan. The proposed strategy was the result of a careful balancing of the NPPF requirements in the context of the way these are interpreted by the Planning Inspectorate. The strategy was part of a stepped approach to gradual testing and refinement. As required, the Council was making every effort to meet objectively assessed housing needs. However, there was also a need to ensure that the plan was effective, and that the Duty to Co-Operate should be met. Achieving all the requirements, and explaining these to both Members and the public, was very challenging.
5. In relation to the Broad Locations at Welwyn Garden City, Ware, and Gilston, all of these would be needed to meet objectively assessed needs. However, should further testing reveal that there is no reasonable prospect of delivery at one or more locations, then it would not be possible to take that particular location forward. The Council would then need to consider the implications of this for long-term housing supply. It was not correct to view the broad locations as alternative options and it was unfortunate that press coverage appeared to create this confusion in some quarters.
6. The Draft Plan suggested that, subject to further testing, the site allocation to the south of Bishop's Stortford could accommodate 500 homes in the period between 2016-2021. However, the land in the Gilston Area would be subject to the production of a further Development Plan Document (DPD) – effectively a mini-District Plan – which would enable more detailed technical work and testing to take place. The location would remain in the Green Belt until adoption of the DPD, estimated in 2021.
7. FS stated that she considered that there was more certainty supporting the delivery of Places for People's site than the identification of the location as a broad location for development seemed to imply. FS considered it could be a site allocation in the District Plan. MP stated that based on the evidence currently available to the Council, the

proposed Broad Location designation seemed appropriate, given the remaining uncertainties about the scale and feasibility of development. JB agreed that the Gilston site should be a firm site allocation in the District Plan and stated that there is potential for CPP and PfP to work together to provide evidence of deliverability and create certainty over the next few months.

8. MP asked whether there was sufficient market demand in Bishop's Stortford for additional homes pre 2021, given the recent planning permission granted on sites to the north of the town. GD considered that market demand would not be an issue as Countryside Properties' products would appeal to distinct customer groups. MP suggested that this was an area where further technical work may need to be carried out to support the allocation at Examination. GD stated that there had been a paradigm shift and that after years of little or no delivery, the market was ready to deliver homes.
9. MP introduced evidence from ATLAS on housing delivery rates (Appendix E from the Interim Development Strategy Report) and explained how ATLAS had looked at other examples of large scale development. He explained how this evidence had been used as a base to come up with the phasing schedule for development of the Gilston Area (Appendix D from the Interim Development Strategy Report). MP asked whether this phasing seemed reasonable.
10. FS stated that the build out rates currently proposed for the Gilston Area appeared to be on the conservative side at a maximum output of 350 dwellings per annum and that the site was capable of a higher build out rate, up to 500 dwellings per annum. This was backed up by Places for People's experience at the Brooklands development in Milton Keynes, and also by the ATLAS examples from elsewhere.
11. PMB queried whether that build out rate would be realistic in practical terms in respect of availability of labour etc. Anecdotal evidence had shown that even when planning permissions are in place, high build out rates can be difficult to achieve in practical terms.
12. MP suggested that the site promoters provide supporting evidence of delivery rates on large development sites. GD acknowledged that this was an issue that came up at examination and that some evidence could be provided in support of the site allocation south of Bishop's Stortford.

Delivery Study and illustrative masterplanning

13. MP explained that the Council would be appointing consultants to undertake a Delivery Study over the summer. This study would require the main items of infrastructure and funding sources to be identified and to understand the level of contributions which could be expected from site promoters. The aim of the Delivery Study would be to show

that the development strategy in the District Plan has a realistic prospect of delivery and to help ensure compliance with the NPPF.

14. MP explained that the Delivery Study would require inputs from site promoters to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to allow for a comprehensive analysis of the overall scale of costs of development. These inputs would be verified by the infrastructure providers and the appointed consultants. MP requested site promoters to advise the Council of any commercially sensitive information that could not be made public.
15. FS queried exactly what information was needed for submission to the Delivery Study. MP stated that site promoters would need to work with the Council to ascertain the exact level of detail required. The large infrastructure items would need to be costed, so a better understanding could be gained on the overall viability of the proposed development and therefore delivery. Post-meeting note: MP to provide clarification of site promoter input requirements to the Delivery Study.
16. JB queried how the Delivery Study would consider the housing range of 5,000 – 10,000 dwellings and whether the number of housing units needed to be fixed. MP indicated that the Planning Inspectorate had implied that a single figure rather than a range would be required for the Submission version. He suggested that the Delivery Study may test a couple of scenarios which was necessary to understand how different levels of development affected the requirement for/and funding of infrastructure.
17. MP stated that it would be helpful for both site promoters in the Gilston Area to outline their visions for their sites. FS explained that Places for Peoples have a landholding of 1,000 hectares which through detailed masterplanning had shown could accommodate 8,500 homes. It is a deliverable masterplan in its own right with all infrastructure requirements provided for.
18. MP asked for clarification that Places for People were not proposing more than 8,500 homes. FS stated that the broader area may be considered suitable for up to 10,000 homes, if 8,500 were accommodated on Places for People's land with the remainder on City and Provincial Properties (CPP) land. Places for People had no plans to extend beyond that in the future, with the unbuilt land subject to governance arrangements. FS confirmed that transport modelling that is currently being carried out has been testing development of up to 10,000 homes.
19. MP queried the relationship between the proposed development and the existing villages. FS explained that substantial buffers were planned around the villages of Eastwick and Gilston. The development parcels were located some distance from Hunsdon with no further

development planned in the future. A country park would be established between the development and Hunsdon.

20. JB stated that very initial work carried out to date had envisaged a development in the region of 5,000 houses on the north side of the A414, including the City & Provincial Properties (CPP) site. Initial concept masterplanning work and transport studies have indicated that there might be capacity for at up to 5,000 houses. MP queried how much development would be accommodated on the CPP site. JB stated that the CPP site might accommodate 1,500 – 2,000 homes with the remainder being on Places for People land, subject to further design feasibility as the next step. MP stated that it development of the CPP land appeared to be dependent on the prior delivery of the Places for People land, which was nearer Harlow.
21. MP explained that a high level masterplan covering the broad location would be required to enable concepts to be tested through the Delivery Study. It was agreed that the site promoters would engage prior to providing information to the Delivery Study.

Cross Boundary Issues

22. JP outlined the key headlines from Uttlesford's Local Plan which was currently out for pre-submission consultation, including details of a significant site allocation in Elsenham, as well as Great Dunmow and Saffron Waldon. MP commented on concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of cross boundary traffic flows, and that an officer level group had been formed to consider these issues, as well as cross-boundary transport modelling work. Other issues the Councils would need to consider would be the future growth of Stansted Airport. It had been agreed that employment areas at the airport would not be a threat to Bishop's Stortford but would complement the employment offer in the town.
23. PMB commented that Harlow had a constrained boundary and was physically limited in its ability to accommodate its housing need. Harlow Council considered that a high level of housing was required in order to meet affordable housing requirements and to ensure the delivery of the critical mass of development that would enable regeneration of the town. Therefore the bulk of the future development would need to be in adjoining districts. Harlow Council were mindful of the Duty to Co-operate; at officer level this had involved work on joint technical studies but mechanisms still needed to be established at Member level.
24. MP stated that he had been invited to a developer workshop at Harlow Council, along with officers from Epping Forest Council. The parallel developer engagement processes had been discussed with officers from Harlow and it was considered that the processes were complementary. Information obtained from both the Harlow and East Herts processes would be shared and considered. However, it was

important that any evidence used in the decision-making process should be in the public domain so that a clear audit trail could be maintained for use at examination.

Education

25. BC confirmed that all schools within the planning area were more or less at capacity so strategic scale development would be expected to support the pupil yield that it would generate. 500 to 850 dwellings would yield 1 Form of Entry (FE) of 30 pupils and this calculation would apply across all age ranges. BC explained that HCC tend to plan for the lower end of this dwelling range, as anecdotal evidence shows a higher pupil yield coming out of new development than historical trends.
26. Development in the Gilston area would be expected to provide for its own needs. 10,000 dwellings would generate a need for 20FE at both primary and secondary level across the development.
27. In terms of development south of Bishop's Stortford, a greater understanding of the scale of development and phasing would be needed. However 750-1,000 dwellings would require provision of a new 2FE primary school and a site allocation for a new secondary school would also be sought.
28. GD queried how the provision of a new secondary school north of Bishop's Stortford affected the draft District Plan which highlighted 3 potential sites for secondary school provision.
29. BC commented that development north of Bishop's Stortford was providing for its own need of 5FE, through provision of 3 primary schools and one secondary school site. **Post meeting clarification:** the proposed education infrastructure in Bishops Stortford North will include 5fe of primary provision to meet the peak yield arising from the development, and a new 6fe secondary school to meet both the needs arising from the development together with the forecast demand arising from across the education planning area of Bishops Stortford & Sawbridgeworth. The County Council is satisfied that this additional 6fe of secondary provision is sufficient to meet needs from both existing and new communities in the area for the next decade.
30. BC confirmed that to plan for the longer term future needs of Bishop's Stortford and Sawbridgeworth, it would be prudent to allocate land for a secondary school site at Whittington Way.
31. NK raised concern about the over provision of secondary school places in Bishop's Stortford due to the existing large outflow of pupils from Essex to Bishop's Stortford at secondary level. Although a significant amount of housing is being proposed around Elsenham in the Uttlesford Local Plan, NK suggested that pupil numbers would still

need to be managed to ensure that a fragile 11-16 school in Stansted would be adequately supported. MP queried how the education need from development at Elsenham was being addressed. NK commented that as Forest Hall School, Stansted was a small school with a relatively small number of pupils, there were currently no major concerns regarding the provision of school places for the proposed large housing allocation in Elsenham. However, a site has been allocated in the Uttlesford Local Plan for a new school in Elsenham. Options, including the potential relocation of Forest Hall School to the new site would be explored once Uttlesford's housing site allocations were confirmed.

32. NK expressed concern as to when primary and secondary provision would be provided in the Gilston Area as development of a school often follows the first phases of development. NK commented that this could place strain on both primary and secondary provision in Harlow in the early stages of development as there were currently no schools located in the Gilston area. BC stressed that HCC would be seeking clarification on the phasing of education infrastructure from the outset.
33. TD confirmed that Places for People had been in discussions with HCC and it was understood that education infrastructure would need to be provided at an early stage of development, and detailed planning would be achieved through continued engagement.

Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)

34. JH explained that the LEP was proposing to establish Growth Area Forums at the strategic level which would look at projects in East Herts and Broxbourne. Within this, there would be a sub-group that would look at potential development in the Gilston Area. Funding had been identified which could be used to help assess deliverability of development schemes. JH confirmed that £200k of funding had been agreed in principle for the Growth Area Forum and this funding allocation would be confirmed later in the year.
35. MP queried whether the Essex LEP had been involved. PMB said that the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) hadn't been finalised but that it could be used a vehicle to address funding gaps. Ie. Junction 7a on the M11.

Minerals

36. MW explained that the sites all lay within the sand and gravel belt and that HCC would seek to prevent underlying minerals from being sterilised. HCC would require the site promoters to prepare a report to assess the quality and depth of any underlying mineral deposits to ascertain whether extraction would be economically viable. MW explained that HCC would wish to see this evidence early on in the process, rather than alongside a planning application to enable prior

extraction to take place. There may be opportunity to utilise any gravel extracted in the construction process on site.

37. PMB queried who the onus was on to prepare the report. MW confirmed that it was the responsibility of the site promoter. MW offered to circulate study examples.
38. PMB queried whether this had been considered yet. FS explained that this assessment would be addressed at the appropriate time in the process. The evidence collated so far in respect of the site was considered to be proportionate to the current stage of production of the District Plan.
39. FS stated that this must be a consideration for the majority of the site allocations and broad locations identified as the sand and gravel belt covered the whole southern area of the district. FS queried whether there was a development threshold over which this assessment needed to happen. MW stated that there was no specific threshold, as HCC Minerals and Waste planners would assess sites on a site-by-site basis and advise whether such an assessment would be needed. OS commented that mineral extraction was less viable on smaller sites as extraction couldn't take place within 100m of an existing property.

Wildlife Sites

40. MP explained that Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT) would be contacting the site promoters in relation to surveying existing designated wildlife sites during 2015.
41. The Council had previously received advice from Natural England that the Harlow Northern Bypass connecting the A414 with the M11 would be likely to direct traffic away from Epping Forest SAC. Natural England were concerned that without a bypass the increased traffic along roads through the forest arising from 5,000-10,000 homes in the Gilston Area would negatively impact air quality and the SCA. MP explained that further work based on traffic modelling outputs would be necessary to further explore these impacts, including impacts on other European-designated sites in the Lea Valley and Broxbourne Hoddesdonpark Woods which lie with 200 metres of the A10.
42. Hunsdon Mead SSSI in the Stort Valley was downstream of the Gilston Area and it was expected that careful consideration would need to be given to this through Green Infrastructure and drainage strategies.

G&T and Travelling Showpeople

43. MP explained that the District Council was currently undertaking a 2-stage Gypsies and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Assessment in order to comply with the statutory requirement to meet the need for pitches and plots, respectively. Two separate studies have been

commissioned – a Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment and Gypsies and a Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Identification of Potential Sites Study. The latter study would involve consideration of all larger site allocations and broad locations as potential options in addition to smaller Call for Sites submissions.

44. JB queried the timescales for this study. LP stated that the needs assessment had recently been received by the Council and that the identification of potential sites study would be completed by the end of June, prior to reporting both studies to the District Planning Executive Panel meeting in July 2014. FS asked whether site promoters could input into the study. LP said that letters had been sent to site promoters by the consultants. FS said that Places for People hadn't received one. LP to check.
45. *Post-meeting Note:* The consultants carrying out the study wrote to all site promoters whose sites have not been proposed to be allocated or identified as a broad location for development in the draft District Plan. All site allocations/broad locations identified for development are already being considered through the study as potential options and the letters were sent to elicit information on any other land that could potentially be considered as available. As an independent technical study, the assessment will not be influenced by site promoters. A consultation on the proposed locations would be undertaken later in 2014. Site promoters are invited to comment at that stage.

Afternoon session (13:00-15:00) – Transport

Attendees

Martin Paine (MP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Laura Pattison (LP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Liz Aston (LA)	East Herts Council – Development Management
Paul Chappell (PC)	Herts County Council – Highways
Neil French (NF)	Herts County Council – Passenger Transport
Sue Jackson (SJ)	Herts County Council – Transport Modelling
Robert Blair (RB)	Arup – consultant to HCC
Ian Mitchell (IM)	Mayer Brown – consultant to Countryside
Anthony Tugwell (AT)	Vectos – consultant to Places for People
David Sprunt (DS)	Essex County Council – Transport
Jenny Volp (JV)	Highways Agency
Olivier Spencer (OS)	Andrew Martin Associates – Agent for Countryside
Fiona Sibley (FS)	Quod Planning – agent for Places for People
Gary Duncan (GD)	Countryside Properties
Liz Connell (LC)	Countryside Properties
Jeremy Pine (JP)	Uttlesford Council – Planning Policy

1. PC explained that Hertfordshire County Council had produced a Transport Update Note (October 2013) which identified potential concerns with both Bishop's Stortford South and the Gilston Area (north of Harlow). At this stage Hertfordshire County Council was not expressing a view on whether there were deliverable mitigation measures, but further testing was needed.
2. PC stated that Hertfordshire County Council's Urban Transport Plan for Bishop's Stortford and Sawbridgeworth would not address strategic transport planning issues, and this would instead be addressed in a Growth and Infrastructure Plan following adoption of the District Plan.

National Policy Issues

3. PMB stated that given the position of the Planning Inspectorate in relation to government policy in the NPPF, transport pressures are not considered a reasonable excuse for not meeting objectively assessed housing needs. Harlow Council wanted to ensure growth of the town subject to the provision of the necessary supporting infrastructure, but a positive approach was required to resolving any outstanding transport issues.
4. MP stated that one of the main challenges was understanding what was meant by 'severe impacts' in paragraph 32 of the NPPF: the Planning Inspectorate appeared to be setting the bar very high before accepting transport concerns as grounds for failing to meet objectively assessed planning need. The Council's proposed Delivery Study (see am session notes above) would go some way to addressing the viability implications (i.e. affordability) of the necessary transport infrastructure and could provide some additional guidance to the transport authorities as they reach a view on whether or not the transport impacts of any particular development proposal or combination of proposals would be severe.

Transport Modelling

5. SJ outlined the transport modelling work to date as interpreted by Hertfordshire County Council. Initial high-level work had been undertaken using a DIAMOND spreadsheet model. The Harlow Stansted Gateway Model (HSGTM) work demonstrated a need for a second Stort Crossing to the east at a 5,000 dwelling trigger point. It also indicated various problems including rat running through High Wych, pressure on the A1184 through Sawbridgeworth and the Amwell Junction with the A10.
6. AT explained that Vectos was undertaking further work on behalf of Places for People, working with Essex County Council and using the HSGTM. Vectos was preparing a microsimulation transport model, covering the wider Harlow area and additional smaller models where necessary to consider specific areas in Hertfordshire. . SJ stated that

there would also need to be consideration of the impact on the Amwell junction which is currently outside the model area.

7. SJ stated that a gap in the evidence to date related to the lack of a combined test of Bishop's Stortford South and the Gilston Area. FS and IM agreed to jointly fund an HSGTM model run and prepare a brief to submit to Essex County Council. This would be shared with SJ also.
8. JV stated that the HSGTM was adequate for use in strategic planning but not for detailed work. DS explained that Essex County Council was developing a new webtag compliant model which would be ready in October for more detailed testing of Junction 7a.
9. DS stated that Essex County Council had prepared a summary of the HSGTM modelling work to date and agreed to circulate this to the group.
10. MY stated that she was contacting Hertfordshire County Council to obtain details of any proposed mitigation measures along the A1184 for the next HSGTM model run.

South of Bishop's Stortford

11. IM stated that the work on the Whittington Way Schools applications had demonstrated that there were transport solutions south of Bishop's Stortford. MP pointed out that the previous work on Whittington Way did not include the residential component and comprehensive development of the site. Given the statements of BC during the morning session, the County Council would be seeking a Secondary School site at this location in addition to one within the development to the north of the town, the total cumulative impact of a residential and non-residential development needed to be factored in.
12. IM stated that options for access onto Obrey Way were being assessed, rather than relying solely on access to Whittington Way alone. It was believed that the southern bypass has capacity although capacity of the northern part of the town bypass needed further assessment.
13. DS stated that south of Bishop's Stortford would have a potentially negative impact on the network around Junction 8 of the M11, and although this was not beyond mitigation, resolution of the issue would require contributions from developers and was therefore a matter of financial viability.

Gilston Area/North of Harlow

14. DS stated that with the future-proofing measures proposed to the Essex Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) (consisting of a £30m package of improvements), Essex County

Council was of the opinion that 10,000 dwellings could be accommodated north of Harlow, with a second crossing to the east of the existing crossing and dualling of the current bridge crossing.

15. A northern bypass linking the A414 and the proposed new Junction 7a of the M11 was discussed. FS stated that a northern bypass was not considered to be necessary to support Places for People's proposals. As she understood it there was little advanced work on the route or feasibility of such a road.
16. DS suggested that the latest published studies suggested a cost of £200 million for the road between the A414 Eastwick Roundabout and a new Junction 7A. Emerging evidence suggested that the cost could be as high as £300-£400 million. Essex County Council believed that a northern bypass was not necessary to deliver the levels of growth being proposed in the Gilston Area and that the cost-benefit assessment of the proposal was very poor. This would come out in more detail at the future consultation proposed on Junction 7a early in the new year.
17. MP stated that from East Herts Council's point of view, based on the response from Hertfordshire County Council in their Transport Update there remained considerable uncertainty about the deliverability of transport solutions for the Gilston Area in Hertfordshire, and the transport aspects of the proposals would require careful scrutiny. It was agreed that HCC and ECC would meet to discuss further.

Cross-Boundary Mitigation measures

18. MP explained that officers from East Herts, Epping Forest and Harlow considered it necessary to pull together infrastructure information from the area into a single cross-boundary Infrastructure Delivery Plan for further testing, given that the transport impacts were likely to be cross-boundary. The work would be looked at by all the authorities.
19. DS stated that Essex County Council had submitted plans to the Essex Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) for funding for junction improvements within Harlow which would future-proof strategic-scale development around the town. Essex County Council would therefore not need to seek contributions from the developers towards these measures, which would probably amount to around £30 million in total (around £5 million at each junction). DS agreed to circulate this information on the specific proposals and costings to assist in the preparation of a coherent cross-boundary evidence base.
20. PC explained that there was a need to take account of key junctions on the A10, taking account of the Broxbourne Local Plan. It was understood that Broxbourne Council was currently commissioning

transport consultants to do additional work to assess the impact on the A10.

Air Quality

21. The Hockerill Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was discussed. RB, PC and IM agreed that it was unlikely that physical measures could be identified to resolve the issue, and banning right-turns at Hockerill to reduce waiting times at the traffic lights had been ruled out by the 2006 Bishop's Stortford Transport Strategy because of the lack of a suitable alternative link to Dunmow Road. IM agreed to do some work to look at the impact of the BISH7 proposals on the AQMAs.

Rail and Bus Provision

22. NF suggested that from a bus point of view large-scale development at the Gilston Area would be considered more sustainable, as it would be possible to include a circular bus link through the site connecting with Harlow Town station and into Harlow town centre.
23. NF stated that in relation to rail links, discussions would be needed with Network Rail to ascertain the scale and cost of upgrades needed. He understood that Network Rail was proposing to extend the platform lengths along the line to double capacity from 4 carriages to 8.

The meeting closed at 3pm

List of Actions – morning session

Task Owner	Para	Action
MP	14-15	Provide further clarification of site promoter inputs to the Delivery Study. <i>Post-meeting note:</i> Delivery Study input requests document issued on 23.05.2014
GD	8	To provide assessment of market demand in Bishop's Stortford, taking account of consented and proposed development across the town.
GD, FS, JB	12	To provide evidence for build-out rates as part of site promoter information provided for the Delivery Study.
FS/JB	21	To work together to provide information to the Delivery Study.
BC	29	To circulate the public report about school provision
MW	38	To circulate examples of minerals extraction reports

List of Actions – afternoon session

Task Owner	Para	Action
PC	10	To supply MY with details of relevant mitigation schemes

		proposed in East Herts to assist with next model run.
DS	9	To circulate ECC summary of HSGTM modelling work to date.
FS/IM	7	To co-ordinate HSGTM brief.
DS	19	To circulate costs and details of the proposed mitigation measures in Essex
IM	21	To assess the impact of BISH 7 on the AQMAs.
MP PMB	18	To commence work on cross-boundary IDP for testing purposes.
PC/DS	17	To arrange meeting between HCC and ECC to discuss Gilston area impacts.

Note: actions are not comprehensive for the various workstreams but highlight the items arising specifically from the above meetings.

3. East of Welwyn Garden City and West of Hertford

**Land East of Welwyn Garden City Broad Location
and West of Hertford Proposed Allocation**

**Initial Partnership Group Meeting
Friday 16th May, 10:00-13:00
East Herts Council Offices, Wallfields, Hertford SG13 8EQ**

Attendees:

Kay Mead (KM)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Laura Pattison (LP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Jenny Pierce (JP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Simon Chivers (SC)	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council – Planning Policy Team
Paul Chappell (PC)	Herts County Council – Highways
Ben Caspani (BC)	Herts County Council – Transport Modelling
Sue Jackson (SJ)	Herts County Council – Transport Modelling
Neil French (NF)	Herts County Council – Passenger Transport
Andrea Gilmour (AG)	Herts County Council – Property
Bethan Clemence (BCI)	Herts County Council – Primary Schools
Julie Greaves (JG)	Herts County Council – Minerals and Waste
Richard Reeve (RR)	Thames Water
Laura Griggs (LG)	NHS England / NHS Hertfordshire
Paul Atton (PA)	JB Planning Associates
Jonathan Dixon (JD)	JB Planning Associates
John Duffield (JDu)	Lafarge Tarmac
Anthony Downs (AD)	Gascoyne Cecil Estates
Allison Meigh (AM)	Savills
Sarah Phillips (SP)	David Lock Associates
Joseph Thomas (JT)	David Lock Associates
Simon Tucker (ST)	DTA Transportation
Duncan Wardrop (DW)	Wardrop Minerals Management
Katherine Munro (KM _u)	Savills
Geoffrey Springer (GS)	London & Regional
Jeremy Woolf (JW)	Woolf Bond Planning

Apologies:

Kate Ma	Herts County Council – Secondary Schools
Carol Lodge	HMWT

Meeting Notes

1. JP welcomed all to the meeting and explained that it was intended to continue to maintain maximum transparency and that the meeting notes would be published along with any material received which might have a bearing on the decision-making process, first through the District Planning Executive Panel and then on the Council's website.
2. East Herts Council had established the District Plan on the basis of independent technical studies, the Landowner/Developer Questionnaires in Summer 2012, and follow-up meetings with ATLAS during 2013, but

there had been no direct contact between planning officers and any landowners or developers up to this point. However, it was considered necessary to engage with site promoters now in order to enable continued testing of the feasibility of the District Plan and the site allocations and Broad Locations. Ensuring that the Plan met National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirements in terms of deliverability was essential.

3. KM and JP explained the rationale behind the development strategy for the district. The Draft District Plan suggested that the site allocation to the west of Hertford (Draft District Plan Policy HERT3) could accommodate 550 homes in the period 2016-2021 across two sites north and south of Welwyn Road, and this allocation had been made to contribute to the housing need generated from within Hertford. The identification of a Broad Location for Development (BLD) on land east of Welwyn Garden City (Draft District Plan Policy EWEL1) for approximately 1,700 homes had been made to meet the unmet housing need from Hertford and part of the rural area.
4. The BLD east of Welwyn Garden City would be subject to the production of a further Development Plan Document (DPD) – effectively a mini-District Plan – which would enable more detailed technical work and testing to take place. The location would remain in the Green Belt until adoption of the DPD, estimated in 2021.

G&T and Travelling Showpeople

5. KM explained that, in order to comply with statutory requirements and ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’, the District Council was currently undertaking a 2-stage approach to meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. KM explained that work had been commissioned by the Council for two separate firms of consultants to carry out work relating to meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The first study is concerned with the level of need arising in the district and this is being followed by a site scoping study to ensure that enough pitches and plots would be available to meet that identified need throughout the plan period. The meeting was informed that the consultants (Peter Brett Associates) are currently carrying out the Identification of Potential Sites Study. All the emerging site allocations and Broad Locations were being considered as potential options and therefore promoters should expect that contact might be made regarding this issue and seeking access to their sites. A consultation on the proposed locations would be undertaken later in 2014.

Delivery Study

6. JP explained that the Council would be appointing consultants to undertake a Delivery Study over the summer. This study would require the main items of infrastructure and funding sources to be identified and

to understand the level of contributions which could be expected from site promoters. The aim of the Delivery Study would be to show that the development strategy in the District Plan has a realistic prospect of delivery and to help ensure compliance with the NPPF.

7. JP explained that the Delivery Study would require inputs from sites promoters to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to allow for a comprehensive analysis of the overall scale of costs of development. These inputs would be verified by the infrastructure providers and the appointed consultants. JP requested site promoters to advise the Council of any commercially sensitive information that could not be made public.
8. KM introduced the proposal to complete a Site Investigation Sheet for each site allocation/broad location for development and there was a consensus from those present that this would be a useful exercise to undertake. However, as it is possible that some of this work could be duplicated or superseded by information submitted for the Delivery Study, the Site Investigation Sheets are not likely to be provided within the short term both because of this and due to resource constraints within Planning Policy team.

Cross Boundary Issues

9. JP stated that the Council would need to work alongside Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council with regard to further testing of the BLD east of Welwyn Garden City. Information submitted to either planning authority by the site promoters would be shared and considered to assist the plan-making process. East Herts and Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council are already engaged in meetings in line with the Duty to Co-operate but further discussions would be needed to agree a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the DPD approach.
10. SC commented that Welwyn Hatfield were slightly behind East Herts in the plan-making process. They have decided to move to the single document approach, producing a Local Plan, and are anticipating going out to public consultation in the autumn, with consultation on a final draft in late 2015 and submission early in 2016.
11. JP commented that East Herts would be carrying out further public consultation in the autumn on minor amendments to the Draft District Plan so there is the potential for the two planning authorities' timelines to re-align. Because a DPD approach would sit slightly outside plan production this would not delay plan preparation and vice versa.

Education

12. With regard to HERT3, BCI confirmed that at primary level all schools in Hertford were at capacity. Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) had implemented a number of temporary expansions in primary schools

across the town and is currently supporting Simon Balle secondary school to become an all-through school from September 2015. This additional provision would be to meet the forecast need from the existing community and therefore any further development in Hertford would be expected to support the pupil yield that it would generate. Therefore development of 550 homes to the west of Hertford would generate a need for an additional 1FE. HCC had identified a school in the vicinity of the proposed development that could be expanded to meet this need and HCC would expect this expansion to be fully funded by the developers.

13. At secondary level, the school planning area consists of both Hertford and Ware so development across the two towns would be considered when calculating future need. Current forecasts show that there is no capacity at secondary level beyond 2017.
14. In terms of development east of Welwyn Garden City, BCI explained that although the BLD had been identified as accommodating 1,700 homes, future development within Welwyn Hatfield's boundary would also need to be taken into account. Development would be expected to support the pupil yield that it would generate. SC confirmed that there were other sites being considered for development in the vicinity of the BLD by Welwyn Hatfield Council which would also generate additional need. BCI stressed that the phasing of development in this location would be critical and that a greater understanding of the scale of development proposed and phasing would be needed. As an example, BCI stated that development of 2,500 homes would generate the need for 1 secondary school and 2 primary schools.

Other community facilities

15. AG explained that S106 contributions would be sought towards childcare, nurseries, libraries and youth services and that it would be expected that development east of Welwyn Garden City would provide some community facilities on-site.

Healthcare

16. LG explained that healthcare had not previously been at the forefront of infrastructure provision. However, the existing GP surgeries in Hertford were approaching capacity and NHS England would be seeking contributions to provide additional capacity; either in the form of financial contributions or provision of a new health facility.
17. LG explained that development of 2,500 homes east of Welwyn Garden City could require provision of a new healthcare facility. As additional capacity would need to be planned in advance of development, site promoters should hold discussions with NHS England GP Premises Team and the East and North Herts Clinical Commissioning Group via local authorities, rather than direct with individual practices. Any

contributions will be requested following consultation between the joint estates group, comprising NHS England, the CCG and individual practices. It should also be noted that healthcare provision is generally moving away from single GP practices towards healthcare hubs.

Minerals and Waste

18. JG explained that, in relation to east of Welwyn Garden City HCC would seek to prevent underlying minerals from being sterilised. Minerals would need to be extracted prior to development. DW commented that they were further ahead with extraction and plans for further extraction within Welwyn Hatfield's land than within East Herts' land. JP queried whether work was being carried out on phasing and extraction. JT explained that they required a meeting to discuss different scenarios. SP said that a meeting would be needed quite soon. It was agreed that a meeting would be held with relevant officers to discuss matters of mineral extraction and delivery as soon as possible. In terms of Hertford, the mineral deposits had already been worked out and there would be no further requirement to extract.

Highways

19. PC explained that the key highways issue was the impact of development on the A414 corridor and that this was applicable to both the BLD east of Welwyn Garden City and the site allocations west of Hertford. The current position is that the A414 is close to capacity and also has a declared AQMA in Hertford. The highway authority is currently in the process of having consultants finalise a study to investigate the capability of adding additional capacity to the route through online improvements. However, it was to be noted that the A414 study has only tested current traffic flows to date and a future run would need to be completed which would factor in future growth.
20. SJ explained further that the study involves a paramics model of the A414 in Hertford and the testing of a package of online improvements. Some of these improvements, such as additional lanes and improvements to roundabouts, would free up some additional capacity but SJ stressed that there was no magic solution and that the route would still experience congestion. It was important to ensure that any potential solutions for individual junctions would not have a negative knock-on effect elsewhere. While work was on-going to find the best solution at the local level (which may involve additional modelling), it was also important to continue looking at wider options for east-west travel.
21. SJ explained that a Saturn model had been developed for Welwyn Garden City, which had identified key junctions of concern along the A414 as well as junction 4 of A1(M). Initial design options had been devised and these were currently being tested within the model. Results would be available in the next few weeks.

22. SJ explained that HCC would expect development east of Welwyn Garden City to be modelled by the developers.
23. JP stated that a separate meeting would need to be held on highways issues. ST confirmed that DTA were acting for LaFarge and AD confirmed that WSP had been instructed to act on behalf of Gascoyne Cecil Estates. JDu stated that there was further work to be done between the two sites, including the assumptions that had been made about the level of development on the site in the A414 study. SJ acknowledged that the A414 study had been completed based on current flow levels rather than future levels with fairly generic assumptions on future levels of development being used. These could be further refined as plans progress and masterplans are developed.
24. ST queried when the A414 study would be published. PC stated that as the report had only just been received from the consultants, there was not yet a confirmed date for publication.
25. NF explained that there was an existing local bus network in the area, but that there may be the possibility that service diversions could be required as a result of the development. The current services are run on a commercial basis. KM raised the issue of the potential for developers to share the costs of providing facilities, e.g. bus stops. A shared meeting could be held to discuss how costs should be shared between the two sites. NF stated that this would be useful. He also said that that adequate service provision should be made and that this should be self-supporting. Some services should feed into Hertford North Station. Any bus stop facilities should have real time passenger information (RTPI).

Passenger Transport

26. In terms of rail provision, additional capacity is due to be provided on Hertford loop services from Hertford North station as a result of the introduction of Thameslink. This will mean that pressures on Hertford North will be less severe than currently and may be more services. However, there are still capacity issues due to demand south of Gordon Hill.
27. Current service provision east of Welwyn Garden City is limited within the area. Development would be expected to fund new service provision. Bus priority measures should be considered as appropriate, particularly on east-west routes. NF explained that any new services have to be self-financing as HCC have no funds to subsidise any services. It was expected that the majority of trips associated with the development would be directed towards Welwyn Garden City and the A1(M) rather than towards Hertford. JP commented that 'travel to work' data from the 2011 census should be released later this year, which would clarify this position.

28. NF stated that new cycling routes should be provided, particularly to local railway stations. It was emphasised that site promoters should consider the context outside of their sites to ensure that alternatives to the car are readily available to new residents.

Waste Water

29. RR explained that the sites would drain to Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works (STW) which currently serves a population catchment of over 400,000 people in the wider area.
30. The Water Cycle Study that was undertaken in 2008/9 forecast growth and the consequential impact on Rye Meads STW; however, the growth was not realised due to the downturn in housing development. The predicted capacity limitation dates within the study will effectively move forward; however, ongoing works to change the way the sewage is treated have provided a further period of relief to between 2021 and 2026. After that time it is likely that additional capacity provision will need to be made. Additional tanks could be provided without any extension of the Treatment Works site and without any encroachment into the adjacent SSSI. However, it is important to note that the overall impact and treatment requirement cannot be fully predicted at this time as the cumulative effects of development from all the adjacent local authority areas also served by Rye Meads is not fully defined.
31. RR continued by discussing site specifics and explained that in terms of connections to the sewerage network, the site allocations to the west of Hertford were located on the extremities of the existing network and the capacity was unlikely to be able to support the demand from new development. The best option for the sites to connect to the existing network would be for a new sewer connection to be constructed to the south, towards the River Mimram, to connect to the trunk sewer in this location. Both site promoters would need to work together in terms of a drainage solution so that they would benefit each other and would not dis-benefit each other if the developments were not programmed to come forward at the same time.
32. In terms of development to the east of Welwyn Garden City, there was work undertaken approximately 10 years ago which provided new storage tanks to the south-east of Welwyn Garden City. RR indicated that there would need to be a targeted connection into this tank which would need to be funded by or carried out by the developers in accordance with relevant standards. Any works carried out would need to ensure that there were no impacts on the sewage network downstream.
33. RR explained that it was likely that Rye Meads Treatment Works would be expanded in the future. Thames Water is not currently planning a new STW. However this would be considered if Thames Water had extensive problems with pipes in the existing network. If there were a new facility, it

would be upstream from Rye Meads, between Stevenage and Hertford as there would be benefits in terms of managing flows from Stevenage alleviating demand on Rye Meads. There is nothing stopping developers from proposing their own works and not connecting to the Thames Water network or Rye Meads STW. This may be a more cost effective solution. Thames Water wouldn't drive that solution but would offer guidance. Developers would be expected to liaise with Thames Water and the Environment Agency. There was a possibility that in the future Thames Water could be asked to manage the works following construction but this does not need to be the case.

Wildlife Sites

34. KM explained that Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT) should have made contact with the site promoters to the west of Hertford to initiate the survey of existing designated wildlife sites. Both promoters confirmed that Carol Lodge had been in touch and that site survey work was currently underway.
35. JP stated that GIS layers would need to be shared as East Herts information stops at the district boundary and proper consideration of the impacts on wildlife sites and environmental assets would be necessary going forward, particularly where sites crossed boundaries.

Masterplanning

36. JP stated that while detailed masterplanning would be carried out at the DPD stage, it would be necessary for a high-level concept masterplan/s to be produced to inform the Delivery Study. There would need to be an acknowledgement of cumulative impacts in the wider area and there would be opportunities to discuss more detail over the next few months.

Next Steps

37. KM explained that this initial partnership meeting had been scheduled with multiple site promoters to enable the main issues that would require further testing through the District plan to be identified. It is envisaged that, going forward, smaller meetings would be scheduled to focus on specific issues, as deemed necessary.
38. JP confirmed that she and SC will continue to liaise at officer level but that there was still the need to arrange cross-boundary meetings at a corporate and political level.

4. North of Hertford

**Partnership Group Meeting: HERT4 North of Hertford
East Herts Council Offices, Wallfields, Hertford SG13 8EQ
15:00-16:20 Monday 9th June**

Attendees:

Kay Mead (KM)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
George Pavey (GP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Bethan Clemence (BC)	Herts County Council – Primary Schools
Andrea Gilmour (AG)	Herts County Council – Property
Paul Chappell (PC)	Herts County Council – Transport
Neil French (NF)	Herts County Council – Passenger Transport
Julie Greaves (JG)	Herts County Council – Minerals
Gemma Nicholson (GN)	Herts County Council – Minerals
Major Sheppard (MS)	Landowner – Bengo Nursery Site
Bob Sellwood (BS)	Sellwood Planning – Ware Park Estate
Gemma Field (GF)	Barton Willmore – Bengo Nursery Site
Richard Reeve (RR)	Thames Water

Meeting Notes

1. KM welcomed all attendees to the meeting and explained that this meeting was a follow up to the original briefing session in April and was intended to be used to discuss outstanding issues regarding site HERT4 within the group. It would deal with both sites specific matters and, where appropriate, wider strategic issues. KM reminded everyone that consultation on the Draft District Plan had closed on 22nd May and informed the meeting that the Planning Policy Team is currently assessing the comments made and working on responding to the issues which have been raised.

Briefing Session Recap

2. KM gave a recap of the site promoter briefing session, which had been held in April, where it had been explained that meetings would take place with key stakeholders to discuss any pertinent issues and ensure that the Council would be confident going forward in the process that its proposed site allocations would be deliverable in accordance with the policies in the Plan.

Review of Draft District Plan Policy

3. KM provided copies of Draft District Plan Policy HERT4 to aid discussions during the meeting and informed those present that the Preferred Options consultation had concluded on 22nd May. The Planning Policy Team was currently beginning to assess the comments and would be formulating responses to them, which would be reported to the District Planning Executive Panel in due course.

4. A brief overview of Draft District Plan Policy HERT4 was provided, detailing the main areas of discussion for the meeting, which mainly centred on matters relating to education, transport, waste water and minerals.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

5. KM explained that work had been commissioned by the Council for two separate firms of consultants to carry out work relating to meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The first study, to be considered at the next District Planning Executive Panel, concerns the level of need arising in the district and this is being followed by a site scoping study to ensure that enough pitches and plots would be available to meet that identified need throughout the plan period. The meeting was informed that the consultants (Peter Brett Associates) who are currently carrying out the Identification of Potential Sites Study are to examine all proposed Allocated Sites and Broad Locations within the District Plan and therefore promoters should expect that contact might be made regarding this issue and seeking access to their sites.

Delivery Study Inputs

6. Attendees were provided with a copy of the District Plan Delivery Study diagram, which had been part of the presentation to the meeting in April. This outlined the process which the Council intended following to ensure that it would be confident that any sites allocated in the Plan would be deliverable. An email had been sent by Martin Paine (MP) on 23rd May reminding site promoters that the Council is in the process of commissioning consultants to undertake a delivery study over the summer.
7. KM explained that site promoters are being requested to provide inputs to this study by the deadline of the end of July. If any issues arise regarding the requested information, then contact should be made directly with MP (martin.paine@eastherts.gov.uk). It was appreciated that some of the information requested may have already been supplied in responses to the District Plan Preferred Options consultation, but it was important that the consultants working on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan would have the information in the same format from all sites. MP would be able to advise further on the level of detail needed in the study if required.

Site Investigation Sheets

8. KM explained that at the meeting held in April, it had been anticipated that Site Investigation Sheets would be produced to highlight outstanding issues for each site. However, it is likely that much of this work would be duplicated or superseded by information submitted for the Delivery Study. Therefore, the Site Investigation Sheets are not likely to be

provided within the short term both because of this and due to resource constraints within Planning Policy team.

Schools

9. BC explained that Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) has a statutory role in the provision of school places and that, in assessing the likely pupil generation from development, 500 to 850 dwellings would yield one Form of Entry (FE) of 30 pupils. The same calculation applies to both Primary and Secondary Schools.
10. BC described the stress currently being placed on schools within Hertford. In terms of primary school places, there is currently significant pressure for places and this demand is likely to shortly follow on to Secondary Schools (anticipated in about 18 months' time). To accommodate the primary issue in particular, it is being proposed that Simon Balle School should be expanded (pending planning permission etc.). It is expected that a planning application to provide the facilities to enable Simon Balle to become an 'all through' school, to take children from the age of 4/5 to 16+ and sixth form, would be submitted in the next couple of months. It is anticipated that the primary element of the school will open in September 2015.
11. Contributions towards educational provision would therefore be expected from developers. Further feasibility work is required to establish the whether additional places could be provided at Bengo Primary School. BC further highlighted that the existing Secondary population will be at capacity in the future. BS asked whether land could be made available for school development within the general vicinity, but beyond the boundaries of, the proposed development site within his client's ownership. BC confirmed that she had been notified of the potential for land to become available, but was currently unsure of exact details and that this was an issue for potential consideration going forward.

Transport

12. PC explained that the main concern of the highway authority in respect of road users is the effect on the A414 corridor, both from this individual development area and from other locations in the town. HCC is currently in the process of having consultants finalise a study to investigate the capability of improving the capacity of the A414 westbound, in particular looking at the potential of providing more lanes and improvements to roundabouts. All the HCC modelling work to date has only tested current traffic flows to date and at least one further run would need to be completed which would factor in future growth. However, the funding available to HCC will only allow for one more run with updated input figures in respect of future anticipated development levels. KM expressed the importance of clarifying any housing numbers in advance of the model run and queried what would happen if there was a discrepancy in numbers, as it was noted that the response to the draft

District submitted by BS proposed a doubling of that would exceed the amount stated within the EHDP. PC confirmed that clarification would be sought over numbers used in any future model run and that any further runs beyond that to take into account differences in housing numbers would require funding from developers. Also, PC stated that any necessary mitigation measures and infrastructure work will be required to be funded from developers, proportionate to the level of development proposed.

13. Work would also need to be undertaken beyond the A414 corridor to take into account the effects of development on the road network in the vicinity of the proposed site and the wider area. The Old Cross junction, in particular, was a cause for concern and the response to the draft District Plan consultation appeared to focus on the Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan scheme as a solution. However, it was pointed out by PC that this was a concept scheme only and that the details had never been fully investigated. There were particular concerns regarding pedestrian access across this junction and that more detailed work would need to be carried out by the site promoters to ensure that acceptable mitigation works at this junction could be successfully achieved at no detriment to both ambulant and non-ambulant users.

Passenger Transport

14. In respect of passenger transport, NF explained that the 333 bus service runs from Bengeo, through Hertford town to Foxholes and runs approximately every hour. However, particularly at peak times, this service experiences problems with congestion and therefore can be unreliable as a service. To ensure that new residents would be able to access the bus service within a reasonable distance, properties would therefore have to be no further than 400m away from a bus stop.
15. With regard to rail services NF explained that pedestrian or cycling modes would need to be used to access Hertford North Station as no bus service from Bengeo covered that area. It was also noted that car parking facilities at the station currently operate at capacity. Although it wouldn't solve parking capacity issues, new trains are to be introduced to help alleviate some capacity issues for passengers on the trains themselves.
16. In terms of Hertford East Station, situated on the other side of the town, Crossrail 2 is being promoted by TfL, which could increase capacity, but is currently constrained by the line reducing to a single track in the Ware area. As well as this, the general built environment between the site and the station provides a barrier to pedestrians trying to access Hertford East. NF stated that pedestrian access to trains would need to be well thought through.

Working with other Site Promoters

17. BS clarified that both parties are neutral towards each other's aspirations regarding the phasing of delivery of each element of the overall site, and the total size of HERT4, and would therefore have no problem working together. KM asked whether it would be possible to look at the site as a whole rather than as separate sites with the land owners working together. BS noted that there were positives in working together and GF said they would be happy to liaise. This then shifted to focus upon time targets and in particular the need for figures to be retrieved and in turn inputted into the various models. BS asked whether the 150 dwellings in the draft District Plan and the 300 figure proposed as part of the submission on his client's behalf would be compared and contrasted when modelling took place. PC confirmed that this would be agreed, subject to the necessary funding being in place to carry out any additional model runs required. KM explained that timing was critical to ensure that deadlines could be met to ensure submission of the District Plan in a timely manner.

Waste Water

18. RR explained that the site would drain to Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works (STW) which currently serves a population catchment of over 400,000 people in the wider area.
19. The Water Cycle Study that was undertaken in 2008/9 forecast growth and the consequential impact on Rye Meads STW; however, the growth was not realised due to the downturn in housing development. The predicted capacity limitation dates within the study will effectively move forward; however, ongoing works to change the way the sewage is treated have provided a further period of relief to between 2021 and 2026. After that time it is likely that additional capacity provision will need to be made. Additional tanks could be provided without any extension of the Treatment Works site and without any encroachment into the adjacent SSSI. However, it is important to note that the overall impact and treatment requirement cannot be fully predicted at this time as the cumulative effects of development from all the adjacent local authority areas also served by Rye Meads is not fully defined.
20. RR continued by discussing site specifics and explained that the sewerage would move down the hill to the River Lea connection where the sewerage system is already stressed. There are some problems near to the river in terms of flooding but in general the existing system would be OK. BS asked if there would be any benefit in the site being able to access two separate sewerage pipes but RR explained that both eventually join together further down the route. Modelling would be required to be undertaken to ascertain what improvements to the system would be required, which itself would be dependent on the level of development proposed for the site.

21. KM questioned who would be responsible for the sewerage modelling that would need to take place and RR confirmed that it would be a developer cost; however, Thames Water would complete the modelling. RR went on to explain that trunk sewer further down the run is currently ok capacity wise but mitigation works would be required to enable a successful connection to that trunk sewer without dis-benefitting existing users. Thames Water also would expect mitigation measures on surface water to be taken by the developers.

Minerals

22. JG said there is a need to safeguard minerals and that this particular site's proximity to the identified preferred area further to the north remains an issue. BS explained that planning application was due to be submitted on the extraction of minerals (expected to be in July) and that there was an agreement in place with the approved contractor for the works to strip, extract and restore the southern part of the minerals site, immediately north of HERT4, by 2020. GF said that if it were possible for a substantial buffer on the site to be confirmed then this might provide the potential to allow the development of the southern part of the overall site to move forward quicker than originally timetabled in the draft District Plan.

Wildlife Sites

23. KM said that site studies were being undertaken by the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, subject to a prioritised programme. Surveys would be undertaken on designated wildlife sites on or in the vicinity of proposed development locations. For the HERT4 site no surveys would be conducted this year, but it is likely that they would be completed in 2015.

Masterplanning Concepts and Other Issues

24. As discussed earlier in the meeting, KM reiterated the benefits of working together to provide a single comprehensive site vision rather than piecemeal development. Figures requested as part of the Delivery Study inputs may potentially be more cost effective to both development parties if undertaken together. Martin Paine should be contacted in respect of any queries on the Delivery Study. BS explained that since the Ware Park Trust is a private landowner and not a developer or housebuilder, it would not be in a position to respond to some of the questions on developers assumptions.

Next Steps

25. While there is currently no intention to hold any further large scale meetings in respect of this location, KM requested that she be copied into any further relevant correspondence and meeting notes held where East Herts staff were not in attendance to ensure that the Council would

be aware of any matters arising that it would not otherwise be aware of. GF agreed to follow up the provision of critical information needed to support the developer's aspiration to bring forward that element of the site at an earlier stage and that this would be provided to Martin Paine with the Delivery Study information.

5. South of Hertford

South of Hertford (HERT5) Project Group Meeting
Monday 9th June 2014, 13:00-14:00
East Herts Council Offices, Wallfields, Hertford SG13 8EQ

Attendees:

Kay Mead (KM)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
Claire Sime (CS)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
George Pavey (GP)	East Herts Council – Planning Policy Team
David Burt (DB)	Herts County Council – Highways
Paul Chappell (PC)	Herts County Council – Highways
Neil French (NF)	Herts County Council – Passenger Transport
Andrea Gilmour (AG)	Herts County Council – Property
Bethan Clemence (BC)	Herts County Council – Primary Schools
Julia Krause (JK)	Deloitte
James Williams (JW)	Deloitte

Apologies:

Julie Greaves (JG)	Herts County Council – Minerals and Waste
Richard Reeve (RR)	Thames Water

Meeting Notes

1. KM welcomed all attendees to the meeting and explained that this meeting was a follow up to the original briefing session in April and was intended to be used to discuss outstanding issues regarding site HERT5 within the group. It would deal with both sites specific matters and, where appropriate, wider strategic issues.

Briefing Session Recap

2. KM gave a recap of the site promoter briefing session, which had been held in April, where it had been explained that meetings would take place with key stakeholders to discuss any pertinent issues and ensure that the Council would be confident going forward in the process that its proposed site allocations would be deliverable in accordance with the policies in the Plan.

Review of Draft District Plan Policy

3. KM provided copies of Draft District Plan Policy HERT5 to aid discussions during the meeting and informed those present that the Preferred Options consultation had concluded on 22nd May. The Planning Policy Team was currently beginning to assess the comments and would be formulating responses to them, which would be reported to the District Planning Executive Panel in due course.

4. A brief overview of Draft District Plan Policy HERT5 was provided, detailing the main areas of discussion for the meeting, which mainly centred on matters relating to education and transport.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

5. KM explained that work had been commissioned by the Council for two separate firms of consultants to carry out work relating to meeting the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The first study, to be considered at the next District Planning Executive Panel (17th July 2014), concerns the level of need arising in the district and this is being followed by a site scoping study to ensure that enough pitches and plots would be available to meet that identified need throughout the plan period. The meeting was informed that the consultants (Peter Brett Associates) who are currently carrying out the Identification of Potential Sites Study are to examine all proposed Allocated Sites and Broad Locations within the District Plan and therefore promoters should expect that contact might be made regarding this issue and seeking access to their sites.
6. JW confirmed that JK is the relevant contact. She will contact the school estate manager directly.

Delivery Study Inputs

7. Attendees were provided with a copy of the District Plan Delivery Study diagram, which had been part of the presentation to the meeting in April. This outlined the process which the Council intended following to ensure that it would be confident that any sites allocated in the Plan would be deliverable. An email had been sent by Martin Paine (MP) on 23rd May reminding site promoters that the Council is in the process of commissioning consultants to undertake a delivery study over the summer.

Delivery Study Inputs

8. KM explained that site promoters are being requested to provide inputs to this study by the deadline of the end of July. If any issues arise regarding the requested information, then contact should be made directly with MP (martin.paine@eastherts.gov.uk). It was appreciated that some of the information requested may have already been supplied in responses to the District Plan Preferred Options consultation, but it was important that the consultants working on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan would have the information in the same format from all sites. MP would be able to advise further on the level of detail needed in the study if required.

Site Investigation Sheets

9. KM explained that at the meeting held in April, it had been anticipated that Site Investigation Sheets would be produced to highlight outstanding issues for each site. However, it is likely that much of this work would be duplicated or superseded by information submitted for the Delivery Study. Therefore, the Site Investigation Sheets are not likely to be provided within the short term both because of this and due to resource constraints within Planning Policy team.

Transport

10. DB and PC explained that the main concern of the highway authority in respect of road users is the effect on the A414 corridor, both from this individual development area and from other locations in the town. HCC is currently in the process of having consultants finalise a study to investigate the capability of improving the capacity of the A414 westbound, in particular looking at the potential of providing more lanes and improvements to roundabouts. All the HCC modelling work to date has been carried out using the current figures available. DB confirmed that a meeting had been arranged to confirm a future programme of work. However, the funding available will only allow for one more run with updated input figures in respect of future anticipated development levels. KM expressed the importance of clarifying any housing numbers as it was noted that the response to the draft District submitted by Deloitte proposed an additional 30 dwellings to that stated in the Draft District Plan.
11. JW confirmed that to date limited work on transport access had been undertaken but that Deloitte were looking to appoint Mott MacDonald to assist in this respect and wanted to confirm the full scope of what would be required prior to instructing them. KM confirmed that PC should be contacted directly to agree the scope of what information is required (including potential for both mitigation and sustainable transport measures).
12. KM drew attention to the particular transport constraints in the Mangrove Road area and highlighted the importance on understanding the proposals for expansion of Simon Balle School (see paragraph 17 below).
13. NF explained the position in relation to sustainable transport. The A414 is a particular barrier to movement across the town. In respect of passenger transport, it is not anticipated that it will be possible to provide direct bus access into the site or the area generally beyond the school related services. Opportunities around walking, cycling and car clubs will therefore need to be explored. The Hertford & Ware Transport Plan should be referred to in this respect (<http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/tranpan/tcatp/handwutp.pdf/>).

14. With regard to rail services NF explained that potential to expand Hertford East is limited. In terms of Hertford North Station, Crossrail 2 is being promoted but is currently constrained by the track being reduced to a single track in the Ware area. Consequently the network is heavily congested with limited capacity to expand.
15. JW asked if there was a standard formula to the calculation of contributions. PC explained the two strand approach set out in the planning obligations toolkit (<http://www.hertsdirect.org/your-council/hcc/resandperf/hertsprop/planningobs/>). PC noted that this is the current document used; however, it is likely to be subject to a review.

Education

16. BC explained that Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) has a statutory role in the provision of school places and that, in assessing the likely pupil generation from development, 500 to 850 dwellings would yield one Form of Entry (FE) of 30 pupils. The same calculation applies to both Primary and Secondary Schools.
17. BC described the stress currently being placed on schools within Hertford. In terms of primary school places, there is currently significant pressure for places and this demand is likely to shortly follow on to Secondary schools (anticipated in about 18 months' time). To accommodate the primary issue in particular, it is being proposed that Simon Balle School should be expanded (pending planning permission etc.). It is expected that an application to make the school an 'all through' facility, to take children from the age of 4/5 to 16+ and sixth form, would be submitted in the next couple of months with an anticipated opening date of September 2015.
18. One of the most significant issues being raised is the impact on the transport network, in particular in the Mangrove Road area. HCC's transport consultants (Stomor) have suggested 'in' and 'out' access/egress points to the school, therefore alleviating the issue of queuing on the road and also the potential for a mini roundabout at the Mangrove Road/Hagsdell junction.
19. AG confirmed that contributions towards educational provision would be expected from developers. The amount will be calculated using HCC's planning obligations toolkit, together with any bespoke modelling taking into account the type and mix of development proposed.

Waste Water

20. RR from Thames Water was unavailable to attend the meeting. However, KM was able to confirm that there are known issues in the town. It will therefore be very important that RR's views on the proposed higher level

of development are sought. KM suggested that RR should be contacted directly in this respect.

Post Meeting Note: After the meeting RR provided the following information regarding sewerage issues:

- a) The site would drain to Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works (STW) which currently serves a population catchment of over 400,000 people in the wider area.
- b) The Water Cycle Study that was undertaken in 2008/9 forecast growth and the consequential impact on Rye Meads STW; however, the growth was not realised due to the downturn in housing development. The predicted capacity limitation dates within the study will effectively move forward; however, on-going works to change the way the sewage is treated have provided a further period of relief to between 2021 and 2026. After that time it is likely that additional capacity provision will need to be made. Additional tanks could be provided without any extension of the Treatment Works site and without any encroachment into the adjacent SSSI. However, it is important to note that the overall impact and treatment requirement cannot be fully predicted at this time as the cumulative effects of development from all the adjacent local authority areas also served by Rye Meads is not fully defined.

Masterplanning

21. The importance of Masterplanning was discussed, including an indicative layout and type and size of dwellings. KM explained the importance of the treed area, to ensure that the green finger is not impacted on by development. JW confirmed that public access to this land would be retained in perpetuity.
22. JW queried the proposed density, suggesting that up to 80 dwellings could in fact be accommodated. PC reiterated that the next transport model run would only test 50 dwellings. If an additional model run is required to test a higher number of dwellings then then this would need to be funded by the landowner/developer.
23. JW confirmed that the landowner would fund any work required at this stage, prior to a developer coming on board.
24. JW asked if we were able to assist with land contamination or archaeology. KM advised that Alison Tinniswood at HCC should be contacted directly for assistance on archaeology. In respect of contaminated land, while KM was not aware of any generally known contamination issues, the Council's Environmental Health department would be a good starting point in understanding if there were either any currently identified matters, or what investigative works could potentially be required.

Next Steps

25. It was agreed that any actions agreed above would be carried out and that further meetings could be scheduled in due course to cover specific matters, as appropriate. Attendees to these meetings would be invited as required, rather than all being requested to attend.

The meeting closed at 14:00.