

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 07/09/2011
Southern A10 Corridor

Attendees

Invitees

James Barham – Bayfordbury Estates
Robert Barker – Baca Architects
Karen Beech – Bidwells
Ross Blumire – Taylor Wimpey
Michelle Crees – HCA
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Jim Hatch – Leach Homes
Peter Haynes – Paul Wallace Land
Belinda Irons – Standon Parish Council
Beryl Matthews – Brickendon Liberty Parish Council
Carolyn Morgan – Hertford Heath Parish Council
Duncan Murdoch – Moulton-Walker
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Rachel Padfield – Sworders
Simon Poole – Cresthaven
Tim Waller – JB Planning Consultants

East Herts District Council (EHDC)

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Martin Paine – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Laura Pattison – Assistant Planning Policy Officer, Planning Policy

Introduction and Market Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• General consensus that there is huge demand for housing in East Herts. The current problem with the housing market is primarily to do with obtaining mortgages/finance for house purchases.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Query the Hometrack slide in the presentation, which stated that house sales were up 3.6%. Didn't feel that that this was reflective of the market.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• House prices are being kept high by the shortage of property in East Herts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distinction should be drawn between sale prices of new build and second hand properties (second hand sales account for 80-90% of the market). Sellers of second hand properties do not have to drop prices as they do not have to sell whereas house builders have to adjust prices to shift stock.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing market is very up and down from month to month.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern expressed over mortgage valuations for new build properties; these used to be at a premium but this is becoming less so.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National house builders are looking 6-18 months ahead in terms of where they want to build. Location is key and this means that the home counties are particularly desirable. The new government has returned to a policy position that allows house builders to build the houses that people want; houses with gardens and garages.
<p>Affordable Housing</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing agencies will need to step up to the plate. They have been subsidised by central government but now need to become more pro development themselves.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlined the design and quality standards that affordable housing needs to meet; space standards and code level 3 of Code for Sustainable Homes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market housing is usually 1 level behind.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a national scandal that as a country we are unable to house our population.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific site in Braughing where the house builder had amended the scheme from 3-bed house to 5-bed houses through minor amendments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't blame the developer for trying to maximise profit as they are the ones that are taking all the risk.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be written in policy what profit a developer could expect to obtain; stated that 20% return on sales value would be a reasonable expectation. This would help the developer when negotiating the purchase of land and would make the process more transparent.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every Council wants something for nothing. Doesn't see why house builders should provide affordable housing. Tesco wouldn't be expected to provide free food to people who were poor and hungry.
<p>Strategic Issues</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has EHDC taken into account the effect of what you are proposing on the A10? Draft A10 capacity study prepared to inform Broxbourne LDF has concluded that £133million of road improvements will be needed on A10 and J25 of the M25. The county position is that no development should proceed in Broxbourne until an IDP is prepared which outlines how work is to be funded. Traffic generated in the central area of East Herts will feed onto the A10 and the current view is that developers will have to fund all road improvements, which will affect viability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is EHDC's view on the NPPF and the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'? - The Council is preparing a response to the NPPF consultation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is EHDC continuing work on an LDF or a Local Plan? LDF has taken 7 years to get to this stage which suggests that your current timetable is optimistic. Developers are ready to submit planning applications as soon as the NPPF is published. The market will jump the system, which is what the Government wants developers to do.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why isn't Harlow North in the plan? EHDC is running the risk of a legal challenge.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the position on the PCBD approach to distributing

development? Towns will continue to need to provide for their own need.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the position on CIL? Need a Core Strategy that recognises the financial difficulties of the industry
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC is aware of these policy issues and these will be addressed in the preparation of the LDF.
EHDC Approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC is approaching this the wrong way round. Should sort out the strategy before considering individual sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling that it was not appropriate to critically analyse another landowners site and would not be willing to provide detailed feedback on individual sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC should carry out the first filter of sites and then give reasons why the sites have been excluded. EHDC needs to go through a sieving process and there needs to be some level of technical detail. The process needs to be carried out more effectively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement that EHDC have adopted a slightly different approach to other Councils. Did not want officers' view to fetter discussions so wanted to get an industry perspective.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed to look at the sites in their wider context
11/001 – Land at Ashdene Road, Bayford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway access concerns as the access road to the site is the same road that is used to access the school; concerned about the safety of children walking to school.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local garage site, which should continue to be used for parking to reduce increased parking on the road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a local wildlife meadow to the east of the site, which may be impacted by development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions raised about what technical advice had been sought from other parties about the sites to help the partnership to form a view; urban design advice/DC advice/advice on car parking standards/visibility splays etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council can produce its own parking standards; e.g. Broxbourne Council has done this. What % of the site area will be taken up by car parking?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within the village envelope so can't see anything wrong with development here.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will not get off the ground on this site due to the affordable housing requirement on smaller sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment that Category 2 villages are not working. Discussion about the policy designation of Category 2 villages and the need for village boundaries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued discussion on the process being followed and a general consensus was reached that the partnership could not take a view on whether sites were suitable and deliverable due to the lack of prior technical work that had been carried out by the Council. It was felt that the Council should form a preliminary assessment and view of each site and then this could be commented on.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a draft view of which options EHDC is going to follow? - No

<p>decisions have been taken. The approach taken to the SHLAA is that the Council has no pre-determined views on any of the sites. It was anticipated that the technical information already provided on each site would enable some initial conclusions to be reached.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't see the point in discussing all of these small sites that are only going to deliver a few houses; should concentrate on the larger sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision taken to move onto the larger, more strategic sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council need to form an initial view on the sites and then this can be discussed.
<p>12/001 – Land at High Trees Farm, Chapmore End</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current road infrastructure makes this a non-starter.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there potential for an enhanced settlement here? A satellite village to Hertford?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new scale settlement would need to be 10,000 homes to create a sustainability core.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy should be to enlarge selected villages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More villages need to be designated as Category 1 villages where 200+ houses can be built.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the designation of Category 2 villages; designate as growth villages with set boundaries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to approach the SLAA from a more strategic viewpoint.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites need to be sustainable.
<p>Site 17/002 – Land west of Brickendon Lane, Hertford</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoter of the site declared an interest: site would be an extension to Hertford and is in a good, sustainable location. Site is being promoted for mixed use; 100 houses and community facilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern raised about access from Brickendon Lane; this is a narrow road and would need widening in numerous places.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be suitable if it were part of a masterplan for south Hertford. This would need strategic landscaping which the house building industry does not do well.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs a grand vision; a southern bypass.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large sites need to have a properly thought out masterplan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council needs to be proactive and deliver the structure for developers to produce a masterplan. There is no vision anywhere for what we are doing today. The Council needs to identify where growth can occur, develop a vision for how the Council wants to see the site/area developed and then leave it up to developers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has EHDC established whether sites are available/deliverable? - No, that is what the SLAA Partnership to assist with.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion reached that site would be suitable for development subject to a comprehensive masterplan for the south of Hertford.
<p>Site 23/004 - Land at Amwell Hill, Great Amwell</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoter of the site declared interest: Clarified that site plan shows total area of land holdings but it is not expected that the full site would come forward for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment that at scale proposed, coalescence would be an issue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would most likely focus on the south-east corner of the site adjacent to Gipsy Lane. Other land could be used to help resolve

the car parking/access issues experienced by Van Hages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendees should be expected to criticise other people's sites. The Council need to do the planning work themselves.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> House builders will be happy to develop anywhere in East Herts but this site would not be considered by house builders as it is likely to remain contrary to policy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finding it difficult to make comments on sites before they have had some element of filtering. If the sites are filtered by the Council, attendees can then give their views based on a set list of criteria.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should not comment on the constraints of sites. That is the Council's job. Wants to be able to comment specifically on the suitability/availability/achievability of sites. EHDC needs to do more work to help us to help you. For example, Broxbourne's urban capacity study identified 2000 sites which the Council then filtered down to 700 for consideration.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to identify whether there are any covenants on the land, which will affect deliverability.
Comments from General Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Real issue in the district about the loss of employment land. Jobs are being lost hand over fist.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EHDC are going to get tested on local housing needs evidence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coalition government is adopting a carrot and stick approach. View from the house building industry is that planning by appeal will occur.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic sites are not going to come forward for years. If smaller sites are going to be left to the Site Allocations DPD, it will be years before there is any delivery of housing. This will leave the district extremely vulnerable to planning by appeal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 2 villages; threshold for affordable housing is too low and affects the viability and deliverability of schemes. The 'village envelope' is interpreted too strictly and restricts development on the edges of Category 2 villages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The population of villages is growing older and younger people can't afford to live there. Issue about how rural services are to be supported. Village live is now characterised by people getting into their cars and driving to work – dormitory villages.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infill sites in Watton-at-Stone and Stanstead Abbots have all been developed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should look at South Cambs policy on village development; have a criteria approach to development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should have urban extensions to the 5 main towns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic approach on distribution should broadly follow the PCBD approach with a more flexible policy on Category 2 villages and more villages designated as Category 1 and 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very impressed with how openly and freely the developers spoke and felt they were talking sense. Criticised piecemeal development and felt focus should be on providing infrastructure, buses, land for food etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about East Herts being under intense pressure due to the delays in the plan making process. Construction industry will help to pull

East Herts out of this mess.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Members should agree to amend LDF structure and proceed with a new Local Plan rather than separate allocations DPD. This will speed up delivery.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need proportional evidence gathering; currently collecting too much evidence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allow development in villages which can provide some additional facilities; e.g. small employment units.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are advantages of allowing limited development but this is often misconstrued as a bribe.
Concluding Remarks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Officers will consider the feedback provided today and will decide whether the remainder of the meetings scheduled will proceed as planned. An email will be sent out tomorrow informing the partnership of the decision reached.

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 09/09/2011
Hertford

Attendees

Invitees

James Barham – Bayfordbury Estates
Steven Barker – Barker Parry
Ross Blumire – Taylor Wimpey (North Thames)
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Peter Haynes – Paul Wallace Land
Guy Kaddish – Bidwells
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Neil Osborn – DLP Planning
Paul Pullin – East Herts District Council Economic Development
Spencer Warren – Heaton Planning

East Herts District Council (EHDC)

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Kay Mead – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Martin Paine – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy

Introduction and Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the context of Wednesday's meeting, the comments raised had been taken on board and that today's meeting would focus on larger proposed development sites, rather than smaller suggested areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmed that EHDC was seeking to tap into expert knowledge of the Partnership – particularly experience of marketing and delivering sites. What issues are the most important? What would make a developer wish to progress – highways issues etc?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outlined that all the sites under consideration at the meeting derived either from the Call for Sites or Urban Capacity work. It was stressed that no decisions are being made at this stage – the Council is currently looking for guidance.
03/001 – Bengoe Plant Nursery
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proposed residential
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic in Bengoe is a problem.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Breach of Green Belt – its release would set a precedent for wider

release in the area.
03/120 – Land North of Hertford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use 1,010 dwellings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding topography, the development would cross contours and would not fit in with the landscape. This is a very important consideration.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic implications important.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape Character Assessment – important to work with HCC. Plus highway issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this amount of housing is allowed traffic would be impossible. This would be exacerbated by the presence of Sainsbury's when it opens. There are better sites than this available. However, as a development it would sell well. There would be no highway solution unless the area was bypassed completely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a housing target for Hertford? Has EHDC got a view of what it is aiming at in settlement terms? - Not at town level, only district wide 8,500.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many of that will be required for Hertford? Will PCBD [Proportional Catchment Based Distribution] be carried forward? - That is not known yet, all the towns will contribute. If PCBD is carried forward then the contribution would be significant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site of this size would become significant. We need a guide of what we are aiming for instead of working in the dark. - In the absence of a definitive figure guidance is being sought on the suitability of these sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has EHDC considered what that might be? – Not yet.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's being driven by what is available, not what is needed. - It's a balance of the two.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an issue of strategic scale. There will be similar problems whichever way Hertfordshire grows. A strategic transport solution will be needed or there will be gridlock in the rest of the town. Developers will 'bite your hands off' to develop any sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would developers pay for strategic transport? - Of course not. It would depend on the level. 5,000 homes would normally meet the threshold for secondary education provision. All these things add up and development will not fund everything.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're looking for a steer regarding housing bonus. There has been a lack of infrastructure development in the county for years. Expecting developers to pay for this won't happen. E.g. as raised at the last session, the implications for the A10 and M25 junction of development in this district adding to existing difficulties raised at the Broxbourne Inquiry. There must be a clear policy from County on infrastructure. What is the joint council position with all the business rent about to come your way? What are attitudes to this income stream? It could be a realistic possibility if this was used.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding phasing, could a certain amount be built before the infrastructure was built? - Small sites would not contribute enough. Big sites could contribute more.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of thresholds, larger sites provide comprehensive benefit. CIL should help small sites, but large ones contribute to strategic infrastructure.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cashflow issues – large strategic schemes are initially cash negative. There needs to be a different range of affordable housing types as central government funding is not there. • There are employment issues to stop out commuting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would this site be suitable for employment? - Again, there would be traffic infrastructure implications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should be mixed use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. Would it help if there was restricted access to the site from the A602 only? - No, this would divorce the site from the town.
<p>17/002 – Land west of Brickendon Lane</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that this site was discussed on Wednesday when it was suggested by the agent that 100 dwellings would be provided. To clarify, this number should be 766 dwellings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not without strategic highways.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. Would a smaller site in the south be better than the north? - Possibly, but not a highways engineer and there are also cultural issues in the south.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was an extension of the road A10/A414 planned at Balls Park when it was granted permission? - Don't know.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could take the traffic away from the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bypasses help people escape and would not bring people into Hertford.
<p>03/002 Marshgate Drive</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fine.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obvious place for employment, subject to traffic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the Mead Lane Urban Design Framework, its aims, the consultation carried out, and the intention to bring this SPD forward prior to the adoption of an Allocations DPD.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site not considered appropriate for housing due to noise emissions from the substation. The only thing going for it is its proximity to the river. Any future development must be associated with the dual carriageway network. Suggest an alternative site that would be more suitable. The Council should provide sites that utilise existing infrastructure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a strategic strategy for the whole town. There must be strategic planning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers will go where there are opportunities, which are not necessarily the best sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has contamination issues. There is a risk element with decontamination.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is also flood risk at this site. Can the market take more flats? - No. Barclays Bank will not fund any more flats in the area. The ability of banks to fund flats has declined.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In other areas, a lot of time has been spent changing flat schemes to other uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all the flats in the Broadmeads scheme in Ware have sold after two years.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should remain in employment use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Higgins development is the best of what is there at the moment. Can't see anyone developing Mead Lane for housing – it would be

commercial suicide.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a need for employment? - There is a need to retain employment locally to retain the economic spend. Increased employment locally is very desirable, particularly in Hertford rather than anywhere else in the district. In terms of housing the district is getting full up. Every site should be looked at in terms of employment and there are some issues with this site in relation to traffic and travel to work. While agreeing with a number of points made, if housing can fund regeneration then that will provide the most employment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a direction in EHDC on how to spend Housing Bonus? LABGE money (business rate payments reallocated from the Government) has been used quite a lot for local employment development. There has been the political will to try and benefit people that put the money in. East Herts is the only authority in Hertfordshire that has used this fund in this way instead of going into the corporate pot.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broxbourne has done extremely well in its assessment of employment need to the north of the town. 1million sq ft was taken up almost immediately. Pindar Road and Essex Road also.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> But Broxbourne has better roads – no one will come to Hertford.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hertford has A roads – employment should take advantage of those roads. There must be a strategic overview of how the whole thing is looked at.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion illustrates that the SLAA process is not worth bothering with – if you concentrate on strategy land will come forward. However, it's recognised that this is what the Council is obliged to do. It's extremely frustrating that the Government doesn't seem to understand the process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the Council just allocates areas, will they come forward? They always did in the past – the more transparency there is, the more you paralyse it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People won't come forward without certainty.
03/004 – North Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is in a floodplain.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looked at this site 10 years ago – Environment Agency were not happy for this to progress.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is in floodzones 2 and 3, and also in the Green Belt.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some developers are constructing floating houses elsewhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Fens the ground floor is used for parking and other floors for living accommodation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The floodzone prohibits development.
03/005 – Mangrove Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspector knocked this out last time. Highways are not easy to improve. Also projects into a Green Finger. If these problems were resolved, it would be OK.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The river valley is very attractive.
03/006 – Balls Park Estate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same issues apply.
03/010 – Thieves Lane
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 230 units
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good site.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good site (declared interest in site)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has designations of Historic Park and Garden and Ancient Woodland.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a long term promise of a major country park between Welwyn Garden City and Hertford which was in a S.52 agreement many years ago. Housing in this area could promote this. It could provide access from Sele Farm. Layout and spatial contribution should not be neglected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is one of the best sites in the process – it rounds of the Green Belt, with the statutory woodlands. There is good access onto principal highways and Hertford North Station is nearby. It ticks all the boxes. It's the most sensible site on the table. Declared ancient interest in the site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree it's a sensible proposition.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would the phasing be? - It could come forward soon.
03/128 – Welwyn Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do many of the same issues apply? No, this would be a Green Belt intrusion, whereas the other constrains it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site has been a problem for the local authority for years. The land has been despoiled with waste dumping etc. However, it should be looked at in the round and shouldn't be thrown out when it could be improved for the residents of Sele Farm.
03/019 Goldings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 160 dwellings proposed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the land had permission for housing post war.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is part of a Registered Garden.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That would count it out.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should be listed as rural rather than peripheral.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would be the prospects for residential or employment? It would make some sense with the A119 and London access. It could be mixed use with B1 offices.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment would never sell.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posh offices in the countryside are not being taken up. The trend is to convert to residential. Location is very important. It is very difficult to recruit staff as they wish to access facilities during the working day.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It depends on the facilities in the village – Stanstead Abbots has a good offer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was exactly this scenario that caused Bayfordbury Estates to leave Bayfordbury.
03/022 – Chelmsford Lodge
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 units proposed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is Green Belt and covered by TPOs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obvious choice, subject to usual DC requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the density? 30 dwellings? Depends on how many trees are wanted to be saved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the market moving towards lower density? It depends on the site.
03/025 – Land adjacent to Mangrove Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same issues as for other sites in the area discussed above.
03/024 and 03/051 - Sorting Office/BT Exchange
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sorting Office element is part of the Call for Sites. There are

archaeological and conservation issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is just the sort of site that should come forward for elderly people. There would be no harm to the townscape.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should this be on its own or with the BT Exchange? It should be joined to make better development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding care homes, has the Council identified where these should be? Not yet.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Christ's Hospital is very successful in this respect
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other uses for this site? The site is the wrong side of the road [A414] for retail or employment.
3/100 Land opposite 361 Ware Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment or residential? Should be residential.
3/102 – Merchant Drive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is listed as Amber in the Employment Study.
3/110 – Mimram Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has various constraints including flood issues. Listed as Amber in the Employment Study. Views on continued employment use?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railway noise. Employment regeneration is very important – just as much as housing.
03/111 – Taylor Trading Estate, Ware Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific designation, but is in employment use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is well occupied and in good use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable for housing as 80ft cliff at rear.
03/113 – Caxton Hill Employment Area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site listed as Red in the Employment Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The biggest problem is access. The link between Foxholes Business Park and Caxton Hill should have been put in place after the permission was issued. Council should use CPO [Compulsory Purchase Order] powers to achieve this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explained that efforts have been made over many years to try and achieve this but the difficulties relate to non-adopted roads and legal issues. However, the scheme currently features in the Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan [H&WUTP], and it is hoped that it can be resolved in the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been on the cards for a long time and would stop industrial traffic using Ware Road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could be picked up in EHDC Economic Development's work programme - will discuss after the meeting to bring it forward.
03/132 Former Police Station
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has permission for mixed-use development for 90 residential flats, 36 houses, 80 bed hotel, 60 bed nursing home, 2 retail units and nursery, together with underground and off street parking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the market bear 90 flats in this location? - Not in that location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's a good housing site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the hotel be likely to be brought forward in this market? - Yes, as there is little provision in Hertford.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not an ideal location but would be fine for a chain like Premier Inn or Travelodge. With a public house it would be viable, but not on its own.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding strategy – a fundamental decision needs to be taken on bigger

sites and infrastructure. How big? Capacity? This is the key to what needs to be done. Not that many larger sites are identifiable for Hertford.
03/011 - Mangrove Lane
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the south side. May need a southern bypass.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implications for Brickendon Lane. New homes bonus [NHB]/TIF [Tax Increment Financing] not enough for that kind of infrastructure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council is having detailed discussions and debate over NHB and what happens when the six years run out and has a reluctance to commit to programmes that will be running out.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be put towards capital schemes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This could be where it will be used.
General Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does TIF pay towards infrastructure, as in the US? - The finance direction of the CIL [Community Infrastructure Levy] publication has a Plain English Guide in its guidance notes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income should be used for the promotion of growth. Developers are not going to pay for it all.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it's not going to be viable in East Herts then it won't be anywhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of affordable housing – how is it to be funded? - Currently the Council has £700,000 per year for funding.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the rest to be funded? - HDA [Housing Development Agency] etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about a different approach, where housing developers fund construction and these units are sold at a 25% discount where the Council brings forward people on its waiting list which are sold at this discount. The developer would be obliged to sell at these discounts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The problem would be that the definition of affordable housing relates to it being available in perpetuity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A covenant could be put in place.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Government's definition specifically states that low cost market housing is not affordable housing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q. Any views on whether a better range of affordable housing is where we should be going?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's the developer that takes the risk – the Council just brings forward its people from the waiting list. This has worked in the past – in 1984 in Hertford Heath 50 units sold in 2 days. No Council or Housing Association funding was involved. Complex schemes could be tightened in a simple arrangement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any other models offering flexibility? E.g. free fixtures and fittings? - It's not in the interest of competition to limit to a certain type of market. Developers will be creative to sell their product.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies and the mechanism for delivering affordable homes is to a large extent down to central government policy and funding and not really in the control of planning authorities. Councils are in a straight jacket.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The funding of affordable housing is a strategic issue that the Council should be looking at.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the Government holds the purse strings this is not going to happen.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timetable for distribution – when is the decision on strategy going to be taken. Is the first the public knows about it going to be when the Preferred Options is published next Spring? - Yes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If EHDC asks for views before that stage then the deluge of responses will hold the process up.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPPF [National Planning Policy Framework] will be in place before the Core Strategy is adopted. Developers will be bringing forward schemes – and these will be granted with no plan in place.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan will be in place – we have an adopted Local Plan in the meantime.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't envy the Council's position.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the Council be submitting an application for certificates of conformity? - If required to do so.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a danger of running out of housing on this side of the district.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will sites be included in the Core Strategy? The intention is that strategic sites will be included. Most sites will be in the Allocations DPD.
<p>Concluding Remarks</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is seeking feedback on the merits of continuing with this approach. We have to produce a SLAA. Any views are appreciated. We don't want to hold six more sessions if not much value – but today has been extremely valuable to us.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exercise should be widened to look at the policy on category 2 villages. There are three or four where some form of development could be allowed. Policy has denied meaningful development in these villages and there should be opportunity in these sessions to promote policy views.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Today has been useful as it has concentrated on bigger sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other matters could determine that none of these sites are OK, which could lead to another approach e.g. a new settlement. The meetings should be carried forward for the rest of the district.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an idea of what the strategy/policy will be. The Council should have focussed on where they might be prepared to go, as in Broxbourne. If this is done then we can come back with a response.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will next week be along the same lines as today? - It will proceed with the larger sites. An email will be sent today confirming arrangements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed disappointment that Cabinet members have not been present to listen to the debate. Politicians should be present to ask questions. Members may now ignore this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is not likely.

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 14/09/2011
Bishop's Stortford

Attendees

Invitees

Mike Allen – Bishop's Stortford Chamber of Commerce
David Bailey – (Retired Surveyor)
Ross Blumire – Taylor Wimpey (North Thames)
Michelle Crees – HCA
Gillian Davidson – Portland Planning
David Digby – Hill Residential
Jon Fardell – Little Hadham Parish Council
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Peter Haynes – Paul Wallace Land
David Irving – CPRE
William Jewson – HPG Developments Ltd
Guy Kaddish – Bidwells
Peter Luder – Weston Homes
Rachel Padfield – Sworders
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Neil Osborn – DLP Planning
Andrew Stevenson – East Herts District Council Engineering
Robin Stretton – RST Environmental
Spencer Warren – Heaton Planning

East Herts District Council (EHDC)

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Martin Paine – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Jenny Pierce – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy

Introduction and Market Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the context of Wednesday's meeting, the comments raised had been taken on board and that today's meeting would focus on larger proposed development sites, rather than smaller suggested areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmed that EHDC was seeking to tap into expert knowledge of the Partnership – particularly experience of marketing and delivering sites. What issues are the most important? What would make a developer wish to progress – highways issues etc?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlined that all the sites under consideration at the meeting derived either from the Call for Sites or Urban Capacity work. It was stressed that no decisions are being made at this stage – the Council is currently looking for guidance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What infrastructure is being considered as part of the strategy? E.g. the Water Cycle Study and the infrastructure issues raised relating to capacity, flood water drainage, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Local Transport Plans (LTPs). - A Hertfordshire-wide Infrastructure Study was undertaken which will be considered. All growth will need to be deliverable and viable with regards to the infrastructure study criteria.
<p>01/024 Areas of Special Restraint to the North of Bishop's Stortford</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the site subject to flooding and therefore automatically excluded?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One criteria for suitability is its impact on policy. If the whole site was developed for residential purposes it will be contrary to policy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing policy doesn't preclude changes to the development type.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy states it should contain 2,700 homes with mixed use. What type of mixed use would the site contain? – Variety of uses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including neighbourhood centres? - Yes although the site would be constrained to policy limits.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site excluded Site 01/022 as it is not included in the Masterplanning Study and could be brought forward independently of any larger ASR proposal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified that the Site 01/024 included a variety of smaller sites (01/001, 01/008, 01/021, 01/022 and 01/036) as part of the Consortia interest. Would it be useful to discuss the site as a whole or at the smaller sites? Also need to consider the relationship of the site with the town centre and the implications on both if the development was brought forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What stage is the Masterplan at? In principle it is a logical extension of the town. The site should contain both employment and housing and could be done in phases – various parts being developed at the same time, rather than from one end of the site to the other. It should have one comprehensive Masterplan to aid direction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2005 Masterplan covers a 10-year period. Is this still adequate? It equates to approximately 300 dwellings per annum.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you have multiple developers you could have a quicker phasing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purple on the plan washes over all the land within the by-pass. Is the green wedge excluded from development or washed over?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be down to the final Masterplan. As part of a mixed use scheme it should include an area of open land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be a new Masterplan? - Not sure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be an Access Strategy for the site prepared in conjunction with Herts Highways and the Highways Agency before any development occurs. The site will not deliver any employment whatsoever as the plan stands. There may be some neighbourhood areas and facilities. Taylor Wimpey has land interests in Uttlesford on employment sites. There should be more joined up work to combine interest with neighbouring area as the function, location and access to their site is of benefit to Bishop's Stortford. The Inspector in their

<p>Uttlesford site will no doubt ask about the implication of their site in relation to Stortford and will raise joint working.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stortford needs more employment floorspace. Coopers moved out because of the lack of space to expand its interests here. The District really needs to do something about employment land. Bishop's Stortford North is a prime site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurred with previous comments and suggests that local interest groups are against the development if it contains masses of housing. There would be more support for the scheme if more employment was included. Access is a major issue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do local employment markets make this a suitable location? - Location is a key issue. Policies requiring just B1 Hi-tech jobs do not work. There should be 1.5 jobs for every house made. Policies need to be flexible. Braintree is one example where the policy only wanted B1 but they lost investment. Once they moved towards more flexible employment approaches investment has grown considerably.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the site fare well in terms of the types of jobs Bishop's Stortford needs? There are vacant sites near the town centre. Are they suitable for employment? If not where is the best place for employment? What type of land should we be working towards – big shed or hi-tech smaller units?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whatever we provide it should be high quality. There is a range of surveys (Savills cited) into salaries and jobs. The question is how you measure high quality. We have a variety of skills and society and employment types should reflect those skills. Sites should have decent access to town centre facilities including the station.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to consider why someone should invest in Bishop's Stortford or anywhere in the district over other locations. Good quality housing, decent schools and a good environment in general increase interest. What is the strategic offer of the town and how can we capture the entrepreneur?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All occupiers want lots of car parking. Hours of operations restrictions also put employers off. In a 24-hour society businesses often need to operate 24 hours. Low business rates, flexibility of space, car parking and access are key issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the town centre play a role? The Goods Yard site was originally for employment uses rather than residential. The ASRs are a prime employment location. There is a desire to improve on international connections building on links to the airport.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Hatfield the old aerospace site is a mixed use development but because the access to the site to its surroundings are so good people still go elsewhere rather than into Hatfield town centre.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It comes down to the quality of the offer in the town centre. In order to make a strategic employment site there needs to be 0.5million square feet in order to provide the critical mass to attract investors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there anything wrong with this site? - Only that the proposals include only residential and no employment land. And it is in the Green Belt.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the airport a factor? - Investment in the airport is likely to be constrained until its sale. The ASRs may be appropriate for housing but not popular. There needs to be massive social infrastructure investment

as well as access. Parking is also an issue but it is a logical site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may look logical on a map but not on the ground.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has it been allocated for so long but never developed? We need to look to the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be community facilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should have employment included. Joint decisions should be taken on jobs and houses. Bishop's Stortford needs 5,000 additional jobs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the ASR proposals included employment land then it would be more popular.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would East Herts be in a difficult position in terms of land supply if it didn't come forward? Yes. Can smaller sites come forward independently?
01/001 Land at Rye Street
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site consists of a green wedge that penetrates into the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates to other sites along the river. Flooding is an issue but could technically be addressed. The site should be kept open for flood management purposes. There could be some tidying up of the edges of the site. The site should be considered as part of a wider consideration of all floodplain land and its role.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site plays an important role in green infrastructure into the town as it is a wild area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How big is the site? The whole site is 2.9ha with the northern quadrant comprising 0.5ha of developable land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes it is deliverable but it depends on what the position is on green fingers. If you want to develop all site possible then it is deliverable but with access issues and potential traffic impacts.
01/008 Land at Hoggates End
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been discussions about waiting to bring forward this site until proposals for the development of land to the north of the site had been published to ensure that development of site 01/008 would relate well to the wider development. It is technically possible to bring forward on this site 15 to 20 homes independently should proposals for the larger area be delayed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there trees on the site? Is it a developable site?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What access would it have? - Access would be from Whitehall Lane along Foxdells. Trees wouldn't be affected.
01/021 Whitehall Leys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest declared on this site). It is suitable and deliverable and can be brought forward independently from the ASRs. Allowing for the retention of TPOs, the site can provide 5-7 dwellings. Site not part of the Masterplan Study. The whole site will be developed but at a low density to allow for TPOs.
01/022 Land at Rye Street
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site was part of Masterplan Study. It is suitable and deliverable. It would be part of the ASR land. Allotments not included as it is in Town Council ownership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings? - 45-50 at medium density so it could be lower. It depends upon access and land uses according to the Masterplan.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would allotments be included? - Suggested as a semi-formal open space in the Masterplan Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have discussions taken place with the Town Council? Are they statutory? What is their continuing interest? - They are not interested in bringing forward the site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand for allotments has changed recently and a new population could increase demand and bring it back into use as allotments.
<p>01/036 Land North of 171 Hadham Road</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't the unknown affect deliverability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified the sources as Call for Sites etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there has been no Call for Sites submission with no further information does this impact on deliverability within the 5 year land supply.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where did it come from? - No one has submitted a case for it.
<p>41/002 and 004 Whittington Way</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is currently opposing the school applications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan Review Inspector dismissed taking the land out of the Green Belt. There is public opinion against this site. It is a prominent site which retains the openness of the location. Just because it is within the by-pass doesn't mean it has to be developed up to it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a good site for development. Need to consider the Secretary of State direction on schools. There is a fine judgement between inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the need for schools. Should consider the wider district context of school supply. The by-pass was originally going to be further out from the town. The Green Belt needs to be reviewed to accommodate the needs of the town. Access is good. Even if the schools didn't go ahead it would be a good site for development.
<p>01/030, 01/033 and 41/005 Sites to the south east</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites have flooding issues and are isolated from the core by the railway line.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The northern most (01/030) site is a short distance to the town centre and could be brought forward quickly with less infrastructure costs and delays.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 01/030 is subject to flooding but is reasonably developable. Site 41/005 is more important in terms of the floodplain but the situation is better towards the railway.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this area suitable for employment land? - Access is an issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it not already an employment site? - If the site was rated as amber in the employment land review is it more appropriate to discontinue the employment use?
<p>01/007 Dolphin Way</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is adjacent to the railway with flooding issues and TPOs on site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has potential with some constraints, but is it deliverable? Was there a ransom strip which might prevent development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner of the ransom strip is fully supportive of the development of this site.

01/028 Causeway Site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the development come forward? It is a retail led mixed-use scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consensus is that if the proposal was brought forward in a manner that made more sense with less massing, people will accept something on the site. But it is bringing too much development too soon with big impacts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The retail sector is static with leakage out of the town. Some level of development is appropriate and required but the scheme proposed is too much.
01/010 Bishop's Stortford Football Club ground
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They have interests in the site as a future employment site. The Park & Ride site was given consent for B1, B2 and B8 so it is logical to consider this site as an extension for employment land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concur that the P&R site adjoining is promoting the site for industrial use. Additional employment or other commercial development could be accommodated in the short-term without adversely impacting on the football ground because there is ample spare land within the site. My understanding is that the Council is actively looking for site(s) around the town to accommodate a major new sports facility.
01/014 Land at Bishop's Stortford Golf Club
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If this site is to be released from the Green Belt is there a defensible boundary on the ground?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declares an interest with a hedge line as a boundary. The site is unused land between the golf course and the urban fringe. It is accessible.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will need to be a Green Belt Review to look at this site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is happening to the football club?
01/017 Land north of Hadham Road / east of Monkwood Drive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again this site would have to be considered in the light of any approach to green fingers but the site is proposed for residential.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is deliverable and developable. Any development could still maintain the value and effect of the green finger. It represents an opportunity to be taken.
01/019 Junior School Site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is proposed for non-residential land use for school buildings in the Local Plan. Is there still a need for a school on this site and in the town?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is for the redevelopment of the Junior School at Bishop's Stortford College and for this use only. The majority of the site is within the development limits for the town, however, the southern part of the site is within the Green Belt and this element of the site is crucial in creating sufficient floor space to cater for the growing number of junior school pupils
01/013 and 01/026 Reserve School Site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is too small for a new school and is tied in with other developments in the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the ASRs are developed there will be social implications from the housing. Why should all the school development be located in the south

of the town when the housing will be to the north?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site needs to be considered as part of the wider strategy. HCC say the site is too small for a school although it could possibly accommodate 250 units. Is there a conflict if the ASRs came forward too? Will there be too many new houses?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would contribute to choice and competition but it has no problems as a potential housing site.
01/117 Raynham Road
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As it is an employment site already is this about redeveloping the site for employment or otherwise?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is rated as amber in the employment land review. What is the perspective on investment potential or if there are significant constraints would it be better used as alternative uses?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was recently 40,000 square foot of new units delivered with high demand as many of the units were let prior to completion. The site as a whole could benefit from some investment to boost the prestige of the location. Units should range from 5,000 to 13,500 square foot.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is known as an employment area with a long history so it should stay as one.
01/119 and 01/120 Goods Yard and Mill Site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will they stay vacant?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is very little resistance to the redevelopment of the Goods Yard by local residents. They would prefer something on the site with an iconic building or structure to help improve this area of the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site has been allocated for some time. If it hasn't come forward in the peak of the market will it now?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer viability is the main issue. The owners paid too much for the site so they will not build anything on it unless they can make their money back with profit. The problem is that sites can be un-fundable and no one can get a mortgage so the site remains undeveloped.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could employment come forward on the Goods Yard if it was the right product?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would depend upon costs but generally yes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The owners of the Mill Site are not interested in re-locating.
Furneux Pelham - 22/014 Land adjacent Chapel House
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy currently retains this site as a means of retaining the two separate parts of the village. Is it right as a location if we were looking to build up rural locations?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a Category 2 village so development would be restricted, requiring lots of affordable housing. The approach to developing villages requires a re-think. They often need more population to enhance viability of the community. Small infill sites should be suitable for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are flooding issues, which is why the village is in two halves. Concur that there needs to be a critical mass to keep a village going.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should look at infilling within the two separate parts of the village rather than trying to join the two together.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The designation of much of the village as a conservation area with a proliferation of listed buildings is constraining development.

Little Hadham - 31/002 Land and Buildings at Little Hadham

- The development would require a by-pass. In terms of strategy is this a good location if we were looking at the major expansion of one or two of our villages?
- This site needs massive social infrastructure and not just roads. Is the by-pass going ahead? - It has been on the cards for years but there has been not enough funding. It would be independent of any village expansion but if expansion was planned then it could possibly help to fund the by-pass.
- Heard that the by-pass would not be within the next 10 years. The River Ash flooding catchment causes infrastructure problems in this location.
- The by-pass would only be fundable through development.
- What funding streams would make this viable? Can the scheme deliver the by-pass and the other necessary infrastructure components?
- The Issues and Options consultation showed no overwhelming desire to push development towards smaller villages. Notwithstanding the merits of a by-pass this is not a suitable location to become the districts 6th major town. It should not be developed.
- Not sure whether the by-pass would come out of any development here. It is unrealistic and doesn't take account of how villages have evolved over the years.
- If the council is considering satellite villages then this is the right location for Bishop's Stortford.
- We need to look nationally to research what new settlements of this scale have been a success and what makes them such.
- There are other locations that could be expanded. In order to create a viable new settlement then development would have to occur on an even larger scale than that proposed here and in a different arrangement.
- If this was a satellite to Bishop's Stortford then it would create more traffic problems elsewhere such as in Standon and Puckeridge. We should question the suitability of the site.
- The site is topographically challenged. There is an example at Northstowe which was doomed from the start due to massive overspends. We should learn from this example.
- There would need to be careful consideration of the wider picture when dealing with this site.
- This issue comes up every ten years. Towns are at capacity - up to EHDC to decide what the strategy including political strategy will be. Infrastructure - same issues as Hertford. Need to support villages - schools under threat and other services. Village clustering - e.g. the Pelhams? Buntingford is remote. On A10 but no rail and no public transport.
- No point trying to maintain village if economy declining. Need a way of supporting villages by looking at the individual requirements of each village

Hadham Ford - 31/007 Field Behind Foxearth

- Infill concentration in villages allows for obvious opportunities for expansion on outskirts of village

Concluding Remarks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bury Green, previously GSK. Opportunity for something to happen. Planning permission for data centre but client dropped out.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Boils down to strategy and what we want to do for our villages

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 19/09/2011
West

Attendees

Invitees

Steven Barker – Barker Parry
Mike Cook – MJC Architects
David Digby – Hill Residential
Rosemary Farmer – HAPTC
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Caroline McFarlane – Clerk, Tewin Parish Council
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Rachel Padfield – Sworders
Simon Poole – Cresthaven
Wendy Prowle – Clerk, Datchworth Parish Council
David Russell – David Russell Associates
Nigel Smith – Stevenage Borough Council
Joseph Thomas – David Lock Associates
Tim Waller – JB Planning Consultants

East Herts Council

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Martin Paine – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Claire Sime – Team Leader, Planning Policy

Introduction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
10/002 – Coppers Field, Aston
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The feeling of the village is that if planning permission is granted for development then it tends to attract people from outside the village and therefore does not serve the needs of the local community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acknowledgement of the issue but in an open market you cannot fetter this choice.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerned about coalescence on the western side of the district
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Emphasised the importance of a balanced approach. The existing approach is to bring forward open market and affordable housing together. Asked whether or not more rural exceptions schemes will come forward under localism.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There has been quite a lot of activity in Tewin. Mainly infill and generally not to the detriment of the village. It is possible to accommodate development that isn't detrimental to character. The key issue is

infrastructure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. Regarding Aston, the road infrastructure is particularly poor. The roads are very narrow in places.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is meant by a 'viable village'?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good question – does growth = viability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer will be specific to each village; it's a case of defending what is already there. Supports the PCBD approach and the 'trickle down' effect that this has on smaller villages. There is no reason to deviate from this strategy in the LDF. If you only developed large urban extensions, then this would only serve to 'starve' rural communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a limit to infill development in the villages so that their character is not harmed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterated that the key issue when considering development in the villages is infrastructure e.g. drainage is a particular issue in Datchworth.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> So we're faced with a dilemma. If we develop large sites we can ask for infrastructure, however, this will have a much greater impact on character. Conversely, if you develop small sites, whilst this will have less impact on character, it's unlikely that significant infrastructure will be delivered. Made the point, however, that character can be changed for the better.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Aston, house prices are very high due to the limited availability of properties. 80% of the school children in the school are from Stevenage. Affordable Housing is the real issue. The affordable housing threshold in the villages should be raised as soon as possible to sites of 5 or more.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development in the villages needs to be very carefully managed. Not saying no to any development, but re-emphasised the need to avoid long term degradation of character.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 10/002 is too large in the context of the village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The problem is that Affordable Housing does not meet the specific needs of the community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the current policy position? Affordable Housing provided in Category 2 Villages is specific to the needs of that community, whereas Affordable Housing provided in Category 1 Villages is to meet the needs of the district. Recommendations in the SHMA suggest a single threshold of 5 units across the whole district.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villages with no facilities are an issue in East Herts– Affordable Housing is simply not viable in remote locations. The houses can't be let. Settlements need to be accessible. Ware, for example, whilst a small settlement with limited facilities, it has good access to Ware, so therefore it may be an appropriate location for Affordable Housing.
26/003 – Cole Green (East of Welwyn Garden City)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking to develop at the end of the plan period.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Interest Declared) Extraction on site due to commence in the next couple of years. So looking to bring site forward following completion. Proposing 2,000 houses with associated community infrastructure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioned the wider context.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land control goes across the local authority boundary into Welwyn Hatfield. Preference is for a 'strategic' site covering both districts. Housing market in this area 'bleeds' into East Herts in this location.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 26/004, which is being promoted by the Gascoyne Cecil Estates, is adjacent to 26/003. Happy to be included in the wider picture, to include areas for development and/or open space.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have developed a concept that will allow either the East Herts site or the WGC site to come forward. However, from a sustainability point of view they argue that it is much better to bring forward both sites together.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that although in East Herts, it would function as part of WGC. Is this the right approach for East Herts? - Have to consider boundaries. New 'Duty to Cooperate' now placed on local authorities. Can't deal with matters in isolation; we have to liaise with adjacent authorities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combined approach to development is the most appropriate one i.e. a strategy that incorporates both urban extensions and village development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you are looking to accommodate large scale development, then urban extensions would be the most appropriate way forward because of the availability of infrastructure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is distance from the town centre an issue? No, if you are providing 2,000 houses, then new facilities will also be required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site will function as part of WGC. How, therefore, do you ensure that it will serve the local needs of the East Herts community? - It is therefore a question of strategy, rather than developability.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Towns want growth and this won't necessarily disadvantage East Herts residents as they are already going out of the district to use facilities in neighbouring towns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed that we need to look at the regeneration of the New Towns, however, this should not just be about new build.
<p>26/004 – Hatfield Estate</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest Declared) The site is owned by Gascoyne Cecil Estates. Not suggesting a new town in this location, rather a series of sustainable extensions to the villages in the area, as advocated in the recent 'Hertfordshire Guide to Growth' document. Infrastructure available in this location – including a shop, school etc. If well designed, small additions, proportionate to the size of the village, can complement existing character.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can villages work better together than they do on their own - village cluster' approach?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does Site 26/002 also belong to Gascoyne Cecil Estates? - No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks like a better site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels that the 'village cluster' approach has a lot of merit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of deliverability, then east of WGC presents an opportunity for EHDC to work with landowners and parish councils. Easy land assembly, therefore a potentially deliverable solution from a commercial point of view. Also on a bus route.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intention is to work closely with local communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-emphasised the importance of working with local communities.
<p>43/002 and 34/003 – East of Stevenage</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the Beane Valley would be very unfortunate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also issues with water and sewerage.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously agreed that Gresley Way should be the edge of Stevenage.

Need to consider impact on the landscape if development goes beyond the ridgeline.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be part of Stevenage so therefore not serving the needs of East Herts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a long way from the town centre.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of the Green Belt in preventing coalescence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to remember that this is one of several options for Stevenage. Other options may be more appropriate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term would we be looking at a boundary change?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Herts would benefit from the New Homes Bonus.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massive social infrastructure would be needed for 5,000 homes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who's need versus duty to cooperate?
40/001 – 40/17 – Tewin (Various)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various sites have been put forward in Tewin. Tewin is a Category 1 Village. Is the boundary suitable? Any comments on any of the sites?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is site 40/001 the existing school site? - No, it is adjacent to the school and represents a logical 'rounding off' of the village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the plan it would appear that the sites to the east are more logical than the sites to the west.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we take account of the fact that Tewin has already accommodated development? Permission recently given for 18 new houses, plus there has been various infill plots. Concerned about the impact of the sites to the west on views. Doesn't want to set a precedence to 'stretch' the settlement. Coalescence issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry changed the Tewin village boundary. Site 8 (now 40/003) not included within the new boundary. Consequently the Inspector said the site should be considered through the LDF.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queried whether the Inspector excluded the site on the grounds that it was an important visual break? - No, that comment related to the site further up on Tewin Hill.
Watton-at-Stone
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At first glance Watton at Stone is a good location for development; however, there appears to be limited land availability. Do attendees think it is an appropriate location for development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is an area that could cope comfortably with development, however, not sure about the site to the south (site 45/002).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it take into account the site that is currently under construction?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked for comments on a new expanded village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Watton at Stone and Stanstead Abbots are sustainable locations for development. More so than Buntingford. Shame that not more land is available at Watton.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited scope to expand further because of the railway line. This is a logical boundary to the village. But yes, we should be looking at villages with railway stations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you define sustainability?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If good road or rail connections are available, then you run the risk of 'sucking' people in who then commute out to work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged, however, their families will potentially use local facilities –

schools, shops etc.
43/009 – Land to rear of Aubries, Walkern
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked to discuss the site. Considered previously at the Local Plan Inquiry, however, not included by the Inspector. Site is deliverable and would help sustain vitality of the village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlighted that traffic is a major issue along the High Street but didn't feel that the site would exacerbate the issue due to its location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked whether there was any flexibility over density.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using indicative figures to help inform the process, so yes may be flexibility in due course depending on site characteristics etc.
20/009 – Land at Hawkins Hall Lane, Datchworth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioned why this site is being considered. Previous Omission Site, Inspector rejected it at the LPI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included to ensure all options have been considered. Acknowledged that it would change the character of the village
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area to west of road may be suitable.

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 22/09/2011
Buntingford and Northern A10 Corridor

Attendees

Invitees

Steven Barker - Barker Parry
Ross Blumire – Taylor Wimpey
Derek Cooper – Buntingford Civic Society
Gillian Davidson – Portland Planning
David Digby – Hill Residential
Graham Frary – Braughing Parish Council
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Michael George – Barratt Homes
William Jewson – HPG Developments Ltd
Jill Jones – Buntingford Town Council
Colin Marks – Hormead Parish Council
Duncan Murdoch – Moulton-Walker
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Neil Osborn – DLP Planning
Rachel Padfield – Sworders
Robin Stretton – RST Environmental
Spencer Warren – Heaton Planning

East Herts Council

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Laura Pattison – Assistant Planning Policy Officer, Planning Policy

Introduction and Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any thoughts on Buntingford as a suitable location for development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have noticed the pattern of people moving up the A10 corridor; people sell in London, buy in Buntingford and commute back to London, and then on retirement sell again and move to Norfolk etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The type of employment offer in East Herts is changing. There used to be more high skilled jobs, pharmaceuticals etc. but this is changing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Problem with affordable housing not being integrated within new developments. Need affordable homes integrated with the community for low skilled workers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is a concern within the rural area that housing permitted contains such a low proportion of affordable housing. This market housing just attracts people moving from the London area. The rural villages are fearful of becoming dormitories.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But we live in a free society which allows people to buy property wherever they wish. • Q. How should we pay for affordable housing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should promote the district for larger housing which will bring in people with higher spending power. Should make some allocations for large, on off executive houses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree about attracting people with higher spending power. This helps to increase the shopping offer in towns. This is already being seen in Buntingford.
<p>02/007 – Former Sainsbury’s depot, Buntingford</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Buntingford a suitable location for employment uses?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly encourage mixed-use development on this site. Suitable for a small village with employment/leisure/healthcare/housing. Would eliminate the unsightly depot buildings, whilst protecting the landscape of the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Council would like to see development here as a stand-alone development option.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does anyone have any experience of bringing forward employment land in Buntingford? There are no rail links but do the road links make it a suitable location?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An extension to the north side of the business park is currently being promoted so someone must think it has potential as an employment location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the relationship of the site to the town centre? What employment uses would be suitable on the site? B8/Mixed employment uses?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic to focus on light industrial uses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is site too small for modern distribution uses?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No access to motorways which is why Sainsbury’s left
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But Hamleys moved their warehouse to Royston a few years ago so motorway access isn’t important to everyone; Buntingford is similar to Royston.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to keep the football pitches adjacent to the site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royston has better links to the A1 etc. From Buntingford, the A120 needs to be negotiated to access the M11 and that has congestion issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any plans to dual the single lane section of the A10? - No plans at present.
<p>09/001 – Buntingford Business Park, Buntingford</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any further comments on the suitability of Buntingford as an employment location?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this extension is given approval, there is little to stop the employment use from spreading northwards along the A10 roadside. The A10 forms a natural boundary to the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buntingford has a lack of edge of town centre employment/industrial sites which the other main towns have.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site lies outside the town boundary. If houses are going to be built in Buntingford, new employment opportunities must also be provided and this seems to be an excellent site for this.

02/009 – Land west of Ermine Street, Buntingford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise the benefit of housing development in this part of the town. Would favour north/south development rather than development to the east or west to protect the character of the town. Need to consider social infrastructure; school places/healthcare are what people complain about.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of site lies outside town boundary. Would prefer development to the east of the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any sense that it is slightly removed from the town centre? - Currently there is no bus service that serves the whole town. By 2031, there may be a bus service that runs north to south or even potential for a park and ride site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is an ideal site to develop. It is a bit far from the town centre but there are ways that they could be better linked.
02/001, 02/002 & 02/004 – Land to the east of Buntingford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02/001; Could be a suitable site but the proposed access is down a very narrow lane. Would be better to develop the Sainsbury's site and obtain access through from that.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to development to the east of the town as wish to see the landscape character protected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02/004; (Interest declared). Development would only take place on the western part of the site. Hedge boundary planted to protect views from the east.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East of the town does not have a well-defined boundary. There are also flooding issues. The housing numbers proposed would lead to a further strain on services. As the town doesn't have a railway line, people will be forced into their cars to access services. This has implications for housing and employment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the Buntingford housing market? - The housing market is strong. The high quality of schooling is driving people with children into the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incomers will always have greater economic power so if you under provide housing you will be excluding local people from the local market. Therefore, need to over provide to meet both the demand from London and from the local area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of these sites went through the Local Plan inquiry. Inspector dismissed some sites on physical/visual issues and others primarily due to there being no need for any more housing sites to be allocated in the town. Check what the Inspector said about the sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02/004; Site was promoted through the Local Plan but as there was no identified need for the site, the physical/visual aspects were not considered.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledged that some sites were not looked at in detail as there was no identified need for them to come forward.
02/005, 02/006, 02/008 & 02/011 – Land to the south and west of Buntingford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 02/005; Concern about noise from the A10.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Interest declared) A noise survey has been carried out and the levels are fine.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise survey has been carried out on current patterns but hasn't considered increased levels of traffic.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has a clearly defined boundary and with appropriate buffers to mitigate road noise, development to the west should be the first priority.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counter to that viewpoint is to consider the setting of the town. This site is important to the setting of the town; development would mean the infilling of the front garden to Buntingford.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other comments on sites to the south? What about the presence of the sewage works?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 02/006 and 02/011; Sites off Aspenden Road; there would need to be road widening to provide suitable access to the sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would access to 02/005 need to come from the bypass? - There are a number of different access options being explored.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 02/011; Herts Highways have agreed access to site from Aspenden Road. Also in talks with landowners to east about obtaining access through the new development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a standard objection to development within 500m of the sewage works.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 02/005; There will be an adequate buffer area around the sewage works where no development will occur.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites 02/007 and 02/008 could form a gateway approach to the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are we getting assurances in this process about adequate water/sewerage for this number of houses? - Sewerage issues can be dealt with at a cost. Water supply and consumption issues are more difficult to deal with.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 3 developments underway and 1 more likely to occur. This will lead to a large increase in water consumption – how is water supply going to be increased? - Agree that this needs looking at.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EHDC will not be allocating sites that are undeliverable otherwise their strategy will be found unsound.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other comments on development in Buntingford? - If you are trying to achieve sustainability, something has to be done about transport; public transport and buses in particular need to be greatly improved.
<p>07/002 – Silkmead Farm</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated rural employment sites have been considered at previous meetings. Such sites that are not easily connected to towns will not encourage sustainable movements. People want to work in locations where they can walk into towns. In terms of residential use, it is not a sustainable location. There are no services or amenities and although there is a need for new housing sites, they shouldn't be just anywhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree that employment locations in rural areas do not work well. There is a need for some sites as otherwise villages will just become dormitories.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a local farm shop nearby? - The farm shop is located nearer to Hare Street.
<p>19/002 & 19/003 - Cottered</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19/002 – Site is agricultural land which is open and very rural. Not sure.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large extensions to villages have been considered in other meetings.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues with A507.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site will lead to encroachment towards Buttermilk Farm where an anaerobic digester is already causing residents of

Cottered great anxiety. The A507 is a dreadful road; safety issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will strengthening outlying (satellite) villages strengthen Buntingford?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where do Buntingford residents tend to go to access higher level services? Cambridge (personal view).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue is transport again. People have to use their cars to access Buntingford. Elderly people living in Cottered struggle to leave the village. But Buntingford is used as a hub for doctors/dentists/shopping etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider how many additional cars will be added to the roads if all sites are developed. Implications for parking. - Agree that this is another huge issue.
28/002 & 28/003 – Great Hormead
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the land to the east where the village hall is located a separate site? Yes, 2 alternatives have been suggested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presume that the farm buildings in the south eastern corner would be relocated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The larger site isn't all proposed for housing. Approximately 10 houses. Potential to add land to the school plot which is currently constrained. The smaller site is for a different proposal.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the village hall site? - Potential for land to be donated to the village hall or school for enhanced parking facilities as part of planning agreement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the other proposed sites in Great Hormead?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28/001 Proposed for leisure purposes; already has permission for use as football pitches. 28/004; Potential for rounding off of the village
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q. Were these sites not on the agenda because they are not considered to be exciting?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following feedback from the first SLAA meeting, the decision was taken to concentrate on the larger, more strategic sites. However, any other sites can be discussed if attendees would like to.
15/003 & 15/004 – Braughing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15/004; Landowner has put the site forward for leisure/recreation use. • 15/003; Object to development of this site; wish to see it remain as green space around the village. The landowner has already applied to put a different access in to enhance access to the land but this has been refused.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any comments on Braughing as a location for development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very desirable place to live. Ideal location for sensitive infill, particularly sites 15/001, 15/005 and 15/007.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently a big problem is the mix of housing on a site. 20 years ago, it was possible to develop 8-12 houses of the same size on a site but this is no longer possible. There tends to be a mix of housing on each site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravelly Lane; developers have to provide 3-4 affordable houses which means that they then place great big houses around the outside. This approach doesn't work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More smaller houses are needed in Braughing. Could allocate specific sites for smaller houses and specific sites for larger houses rather than having a mix on all sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we proactively look at sites and allocate some for smaller/larger

<p>housing only? Yes. Due to the localism agenda, Parish Councils will be able to have a say as to which sites should come forward and for what types of housing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want the green spaces around the village to remain to protect the setting of the village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When it comes to Site Allocations, are you suggesting that sites would be allocated specifically for a size of housing? This would be quite prescriptive.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be difficult to deliver. Developers may not be able to get the returns needed to make a site viable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that this would be very prescriptive. Would be difficult to say which sites should be used for which type/size of housing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of housing does make a difference as to whether or not the community support development. Pentlows Farm; proposed retirement scheme here was welcomed with open arms. Gravelley Lane; 6 affordable homes/11 large homes has resulted in lots of objections.
<p>Sites 35/004, 35/016 & 35/030 – Puckeridge/Standon</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A120 is a dividing feature between Puckeridge and Standon. Heavy traffic on this road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been lots of development in Puckeridge recently; feel that Puckeridge has taken its fair share of development. Don't see how further development here can be supported.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village is downstream from Buntingford and Braughing so the same water supply issues apply.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishop's Stortford is the main employment centre. A120 is incredibly busy; very congested, impact of Stansted Airport traffic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bypass of Little Hadham will make the situation worse in Standon/Puckeridge. There are currently gaps in the traffic due to the traffic lights at Little Hadham but if the bypass goes ahead, there will be a steady stream of traffic the whole way along the road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any comments on Puckeridge as an employment location?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 35/016; area is an AAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the issue on A120 with regards to a potential bypass of Little Hadham. Could the solution be to bypass all the way to the A10? - If the bypass were to go ahead, Standon would be keen to be involved and would favour a northern route. - Braughing would favour a southern route.
<p>Site 35/001 – Barwick</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a thriving existing business.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any other comments? We've covered the issue of development in rural areas through comments on Cottered.
<p>Sites 35/005, 35/007 & 35/013– Colliers End</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any housing there at the moment? Yes. Along the old A10.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aware of a case where a replacement dwelling has been refused nearby so why would this be considered as a suitable location for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We're planning ahead for the next 15-20 years so it may be that sites not previously considered as being suitable in the current policy context may come forward for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seems an isolated location.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Would be a dormitory. Has a pub but no other facilities. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 35/005; Site has an issue with flooding. |

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 26/09/2011
Sawbridgeworth and South-Eastern Parishes

Attendees

Invitees

David Bailey – (Retired Surveyor)
Richard Bowran – Sawbridgeworth Town Council
David Digby – Hill Residential
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
David Irving – CPRE
William Jewson – HPG Developments Ltd
Chris Lovegrove – City & Provincial Properties
Paul Macbride – Harlow Council
Philip Murphy – Qod Planning
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Rachel Padfield – Swords
Elaine Parker – Network Housing Group
Tom Pike – CBRE
Ian Potter – Hertfordshire Constabulary
Clive Thompson – Paul Wallace Land

East Herts Council

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Martin Paine – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Claire Sime – Team Leader, Planning Policy

Introduction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
Sawbridgeworth
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any thoughts on Sawbridgeworth as a suitable location for housing?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dependent on a western bypass (although acknowledged that it wasn't supported locally). However, need to consider accessibility and the quality of life of people living in the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Asked whether it would be helpful to have a discussion about the overall strategy before considering specific locations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Acknowledged. However, for the purpose of today we're seeking where possible your thoughts on specific locations, albeit in a strategic context. Asked whether anyone had any thoughts, from a market perspective, on whether Sawbridgeworth is a suitable location for development – does the size of the town, for example, constrain development coming forward?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confident that there is a market for new housing because there is keen

<p>developer interest in land to the west.</p>
<p>04/008 and 04/012 – North</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any thoughts on these sites, in particular their relationship with the town centre.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider the current function of the town. Clear links between Sawbridgeworth and Harlow. People may choose to live in Sawbridgeworth but work in Harlow.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both sites have access to higher order roads. However, both sites are in the Green Belt and in the flood plain.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thought that land to the south had been put forward? - Not aware.
<p>04/17 – Hayters, Spellbrook</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spellbrook is currently a Category 3 Village. The site is in the Green Belt. Any comments?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Interest Declared) Acknowledges that Spellbrook is a Category 3 Village and that the site is Green Belt, however, stated that this was a 'special case'. Hayters is very constrained on the existing site. Would like to expand the employment offer in conjunction with residential. Currently employs 170 people. They need to modernise in order to stay in the district. Employment Land Review states that the site is 'fit for purpose' – Hayters disputes this.
<p>04/014 and 04/015 – East (Esbies)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any thoughts? Relationship with Lower Sheering? How does the eastern part of the town function? Part of Esbies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the sites in the flood plain? Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites previously rejected at the LPI because of flooding issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Sheering functions as part of Sawbridgeworth.
<p>04/006 and 04/013 – West, 04/007 – Further West</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any thoughts?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Acting for site 04/006) can come forward without the bypass. Site has good linkages with the town. Considered previously at the LPI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is site 04/006 in the floodplain? - Yes, eastern edge is in Flood Zone 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 04/007 – any comments on accessibility. Is it viable to develop to the west? Currently Green Belt.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider how the Green Belt functions in an area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to look at the wider context. Can't separate from potential development to the north of Harlow. If we only had to consider Sawbridgeworth, then yes development here could be seen as sustainable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therefore important that we consider both the strategic and the local context.
<p>21/004 – North of Harlow</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any thoughts? You will all be aware that the Council objected to the identification of north of Harlow in the RSS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Interest Declared) Considers that the site is appropriate because of its relationship with Harlow and the benefits that will result from development. Good links to Harlow station (therefore allowing commuting to London) and to the employment offer in Harlow. The previously identified site constraints can be addressed through a strategic Masterplan for the area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The highway network is a particular issue?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site will benefit from economies of scale and therefore will be able to

address highway issues etc as well as providing significant other benefits.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the short term benefits? Already significant issues accessing Harlow.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be a number of solutions – roundabout improvements, expansion of existing crossing, new crossing, improved public transport.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How big is the scheme? - Can provide in excess of 10,000 new homes. - So, 2x secondary schools? - Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the landowners? - Acting for Harlow North Joint Venture (HNJV)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How confident are you about employment opportunities? - Very confident – because of relationship with Harlow and access to London. New opportunities will also be provided on site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised key infrastructure concerns – e.g. capacity at Rye Meads
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints are well known. Confident that capacity issues can be addressed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose needs are you meeting? - Housing market area covers both Harlow and East Herts therefore needs to be considered in this wider context.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the regeneration benefits been looked at?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the issues that Harlow has is that its social housing stock is in need of improvement, and that synergies may be possible with North Harlow to facilitate there improvement, such as decanting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority estates are being looked at. Need to balance with wider strategic needs and population projections. There is an opportunity to renew/replace. Ongoing programme of works.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Epping's view? - Behind us in terms of developing their strategic objectives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the Green Belt in this location? Strategic release v. nibbling. Is there a defensible boundary?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to look at the strategic context. What is the role of Sawbridgeworth? If you want to maintain its separateness then the role of the Green Belt needs to be strengthened in this location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the employment offer in Harlow? Has Harlow got a strong market?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key issue is the quality of the job offer. Enterprise Zones are an attempt to kick start and secure economic growth and regeneration.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to look at other schemes in the UK – and how successful they have been e.g. Northstowe. Success depends on public support and genuine cross boundary working.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public purse is constrained. North of Harlow can deliver significant infrastructure because of economies of scale.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the timeframe? - Not sure when development would commence on site. Land is available, however, subject to planning etc could take 5 years to get everything in place.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queried delivery rates. What can the market deliver? Again, we should look at some examples. Likely to be a development site for 15-20 years, how will this be planned and managed so that people actually want to live there?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant proportion of the site (as shown on the screen) will be retained as open landscape and will not be developed

21/008 – Gilston Great Park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An alternative proposal – any thoughts? - Landownership issues. Not deliverable.
21/002 and 21/009 – North and South of Redricks Lane
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest declared) 21/009 a much smaller scale, Harlow facing proposal. Most of it is not in a flood zone. Largely brownfield (previously landfill). There will be potential environmental benefits to clearing up contaminated land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When was landfill completed? Remediation costs may be prohibitive.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure when landfill completed. 4 landowners, looking for a developer/promoter. The land was used for landfill of putrescible waste in the early post-war period and more recently for inert waste. The site has remediation requirements which could alleviate the local community of the liability of future contamination risks. Viability depends on a number of other factors such as land values, CIL and Section 106 etc but has been achieved on numerous schemes including the Ransome Road site in Northampton.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you envisage connectivity? - Potential for a new pedestrian/vehicular bridge.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would you work with HNJV? - Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redricks Lane is a nightmare, so it needs connectivity with Harlow. Is it economically viable (because of remediation costs)?
21/003 – Terlings Park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The client is pursuing a residential application. Has been marketed for employment use but nothing has been forthcoming. Independent of the wider north of Harlow proposals.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many houses? - Indicative number of 270 – although current application deals with floor space.
21/006 - South of Gilston park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bit like 'Goldings'. Currently remote although wouldn't be if north of Harlow comes forward.
04/005 – Thomas Rivers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to look at the historic character of Sawbridgeworth –'squares'. Need to take a strategic view. If you really want to do it, then plan properly rather than incrementally.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referred to the Orchards Group alternative proposal for the Thomas Rivers site.
04/004 and 04/009 – South, Sites 04/001 and 04/011 – Further South
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at planning history, sites have a long audit trail.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 04/001 is deliverable. Site surrounded by residential. Access agreed with highways. Ready to go.
27/002 – Sayes Park Farm
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large site (170ha). Proposed for residential. Any thoughts?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same comments as those relating to 21/004.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment.
29/004 – Briggens Estate East
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large tract of land. Again, similar issues to those already discussed. Any further thoughts?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site being promoted independently, however, has had various

conversations with HNJV.
29/001 - Hunsdon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large extension to village (29ha). Any thoughts?
47/002 – Adams Farm Widford
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we deal with land in the villages? Any thoughts? - Depends on village strategy. Hunsdon has services, Widford doesn't
29/006 – Land adjacent to Tanners Way, Hunsdon
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for a small extension to the village. A sustainable option. • If you have large-scale development to north of Harlow, should we be restricting development in neighbouring villages? • Comes back to your approach. A couple of houses in a village won't have any significant impact.

East Herts SLAA Partnership Meeting 29/09/2011
Ware and Central South

Attendees

Invitees

Ross Blumire – Taylor Wimpey (North Thames)
Richard Coutts – Baca Architects
Michelle Crees – HCA
David Digby – Hill Residential
Tony Gallagher – Quod Planning
Peter Haynes – Paul Wallace Land
Jim Hatch – Leach Homes
Duncan Murdoch – Moulton-Walker
Rachel Padfield – Sworders
Simon Poole – Cresthaven
John Oldham – Countryside Properties
Jane Orsborn – Jane Orsborn Associates
Neil Osborn – DLP Planning
Tim Waller – JB Planning Consultants
Spencer Warren – Heaton Planning
Mike West – The Ware Society

East Herts Council

Simon Drinkwater – Director Neighbourhood Services (Chair)
John Careford – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Jenny Pierce – Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy

Introduction and Discussion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introduction from the Chair
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Powerpoint presentation setting strategic context and overview, raising matters such as the composition of the towns and villages in the district and issues faced in the area, including external pressures (new towns in neighbouring districts); levels of commuting; affordable housing provision, housing markets etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the context of Wednesday's meeting, the comments raised had been taken on board and that today's meeting would focus on larger proposed development sites, rather than smaller suggested areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Confirmed that EHDC was seeking to tap into expert knowledge of the Partnership – particularly experience of marketing and delivering sites. What issues are the most important? What would make a developer wish to progress – highways issues etc?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Outlined that all the sites under consideration at the meeting derived either from the Call for Sites or Urban Capacity work. It was stressed that no decisions are being made at this stage – the Council is currently looking for guidance.

05/003 Nun's Triangle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stated that the proposal is for residential development and an employment business park.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an issue with the setting? Are there mature trees on the site? If so the historic environment should be the context for future development. Otherwise the site could be delivered and is marketable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about the relationship of this site to the town? Is this a good location for employment land?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a rounding-off exercise this is a good site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the employment market strong in Ware? - It is over-supplied in Ware according to the Employment Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any information on school provision available? - There is a shortage across the district. - Anecdotally, there is a growing problem with a shortage of spaces.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the thresholds set in the Issues and Options consultation for 2 form entry schools this would require 2-5 ha of land. This site could provide that and could be part of a planning gain package for the release of this land.
05/004, 05/009, 44/001B and 44/005 Land East of Trinity Centre
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is very open and to develop it would cause coalescence with Thundridge.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declare an interest in Site 44/005. Delivery in conjunction with the Leach Homes site (05/020). Parts of the eastern element could be bought forward in isolation as a small-scale expansion to the east of Ware.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the relationship of these sites to the town centre and the south?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a similar debate to that of Hertford. Issues over accessibility, topography and the quantum proposed. There would need to be improved access. As it is an historic town this needs to be dealt with as part of a strategic vision rather than as piecemeal developments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ware Society view is that sites closer to the A10 would be better than sites further to the east.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites would be accepted better if they were part of a Masterplan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 05/003 could have a northern by-pass and then all the sites within the enclosed landscape could be brought forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be strategic landscape issues with this.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could integrate green infrastructure in to the plans, including the management of the space as public open space. It would cause viability issues as the costs would increase. Strategic landscaping could be created around the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to get over the idea that landscaping can hide development. Development itself can provide the boundary if done well.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A northern by-pass could not be delivered. It would prevent affordable housing provision and stop other planning gains being sought as the road would be too expensive. Grantham cited as an example.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development to the north and east would result in a rounding off of the town with a new road as a barrier. But to the south there is already a barrier so this is a better suggestion.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are issues over land values and the resultant viability of development. Where would the northern by-pass go-to-and-from?

Improving accessibility is not the same as building a by-pass.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statistics show there is already leakage of expenditure to neighbouring settlements and a by-pass would make it easier to travel out of Ware to elsewhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of retail are the supermarkets and retail still viable in Ware? - The size of the town and the retail offer is good and there is capacity for other stores to locate here.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The town centre location is better than peripheral development. All applications should have a retail impact assessment.
05/020 and 44/005 East of Ware
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There would be impacts on Star Street.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local perspective is that development here would be closer to high quality landscape. There is only one road into the centre of town which already suffers from congestion. The Widbury Hill development site will only exacerbate existing problems. Any further development in this direction will cause major traffic impacts.
05/008, 05/013, 05/016, 05/017 and 05/019 Hertford Rugby Club, Rush Green, Chadwell Springs Golf Club, Land at Little Acres and Hale Club
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the relationship of this cluster of sites to the town centre?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Presdales Pit site is very enclosed as a result of old landscaping interventions. The land levels inside the site are lower so it is ripe for development. One option the land-owners considered was as a Resource Recovery Park as they were approached by the County Council as part of their Waste Strategy but this has gone quiet. It could be brought forward quickly.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Interest declared) The landowners preference is for circa 350 houses. Improvements at the junction of Hoe Lane and the Stanstead Abbots Road have already been agreed with Herts Highways and include a right turn lane into Hoe Lane. We acknowledge that the existing junction needs improving. A new bus service would be provided, with roundabout improvements, a walking scheme. There is a lot going for the site, which is well contained by the local road network.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All these options could be delivered independently or in partnership with the Presdales Pit site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well is the site connected to the town centre? - It is about a mile to the high street.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cluster of sites are as easy to get to the station in Ware as well as in Stanstead St Margaret's.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would it encourage car use? - The existing parking constraints in the town centre would prohibit parking and put of car use from this site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 05/013 has a golf course to the side of it. There is already development activity there.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These sites could cause coalescence with Amwell. Air quality is an issue. Hertford and Ware need their own identities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 05/013 is open so there would be more visual impact.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The south is preferable in order to keep the Kings Mead area free from development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hertford and Ware function as one large centre in some aspects so is it still appropriate to continue to treat them as two towns or deal with them

as one?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be practical links between the two towns but should be thought of as a pair, each offering something to the other, but they are emotionally detached.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are bigger issues. Thousands of homes are required. We just need to decide whether to put them north or south of the town. The north seems to make more sense due to the access opportunities but not necessarily all of the sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sutton BedZed cited as an example. Need to consider the centres of gravity if development is located in one location over another.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wherever development goes we would need to deal with the household waste. Gassification is one option. It needs new pipe networks. How we deal with resource supply and waste is a vital consideration we need to take.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper recycling is a requirement. What is the plan in EH?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County is pushing for more sites in the district, including the Biffa site to the north-west.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County plan is not site-specific yet.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of piecing together sites to the south we should look at gradual releases of land to the east.
05/014, 05/015 and 05/022 Crane Mead
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites are functioning floodplain so no housing is allowed so commercial development would be preferable. This could be raised on stilts but this pushes up costs. A sequential test should be applied as per PPS25.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access is awkward on this site as it sits between the railway line and the river.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a scheme for 100 dwellings on site 05/014 which sits outside the Lee Valley Park. It is a Fairview scheme. With some screening put in place between the site and the LV Park it is deliverable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency would certainly have views.
25/001 and 25/002 - Hertford Heath
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not the whole of site 25/001 would be developed. It is a decent location due to the proximity to services,
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the 25/002 is contained between two roads so could be redeveloped.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significant numbers proposed would require appropriate levels of infrastructure provision, otherwise pressure would increase on existing services/facilities. How would CIL charges be worked out?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where figures are provided these would be used but there may be some multipliers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be a doubling in the size of the village. Smaller scale development could expand sensitively on some parts of the proposed sites but not all of them.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would 25/001 open up all the land to the west of the site to development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The golf course under construction to the north would prevent development spreading further.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would be the landscape impact?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a new planting belt to the back of the site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a connection between this site and the golf course? - Yes it is owned by the same landowner.
<p>37/001 and 37/002 - St Margarets</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest declared) Both sites are owned by the same landowner. There is a local sports centre to the east of the sites which the development is prepared to fund the doubling of. 30ha of the site to the north of the A414 would be released as private woodland open to the public if the whole of the site is delivered. The sports facility support the scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The function of the Green Belt in this location is paramount to prevent coalescence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is very open and to develop it would cause coalescence. There is no sense to it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be considered as part of a green infrastructure plan to create a new woodland from arable land with the Woodland Trust. It would provide a new footbridge connection to the station. There is a strong intention to preserve the buffers to neighbouring developed areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt boundaries would need to be looked at.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site would provide around 250 homes on the southern site with a large playground. Four new football pitches, one cricket pitch, indoor tennis courts and other improvements would be made to the sports facility. There would be a total of 300 homes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there is a shortage in sports facilities in this area? - The Council undertook a Playing Pitch Strategy which indicated that there is a shortage of pitches, particularly for football which is the sport with the most growth in participation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CIL charge impacts on viability. Where is the County Council at in terms of CIL charging schedules? - The scale of costs would be sorted out in the Core Strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we suggest the costs add up to between £9,000 and £11,000 affordable housing would be a key issue. - Is affordable housing part of CIL? - No but the two are related. There would be a balance between contributions in the same way that Section 106 contributions are balanced against the cost of affordable housing.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It depends upon the type of infrastructure you wish to deliver.
<p>36/001, 36/002 and 36/007 - Stanstead Abbots</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest declared) The sites are owned by French & Jupps who have been on site for 400 years. It has been a major employer for 100 years employing some 600 people on site. The site has potential for business use as an expansion of the business park.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roydon Homes own the adjacent site and want to provide housing. It is in a good location and is deliverable. It is within walking distance to facilities. It is in the floodplain but the Environment Agency have been carrying out works over the last few years. It has not flooded since the 1970s. Site 36/002 in Flood zone 2 but there is no reason why it should not be developed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a recent scheme in this location all the houses were sold, some even prior to completion so there is an excellent market here.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Local Plan has this location listed as a main settlement but

<p>the intention in the Core Strategy could be to downgrade this to a larger service settlement.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area shouldn't be downgraded.
<p>36/006 Websters, Netherfield Lane</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site should be allocated for employment use. It employs circa 80 people. There is scope for some housing too.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site is in the Lee Valley Park so there is scope for a marina and leisure uses. There have been no recent discussions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Council had any discussions with the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as yet, although as part of ongoing work we need to liaise with all neighbouring planning authorities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting a site in Hoddesdon which is also within the park boundary, but progress was difficult.
<p>42/013 - Cold Christmas</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a rural locations somewhat isolated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very isolated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a dreadful exposed site and would expose the whole plateau to development pressure, acting as a precedent.
<p>42/002, 42/003 and 42/005 - Thundridge and Wadesmill</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 1 status makes more sense in this location. There is an interest in a small site for possibly 10 houses, but access would be difficult.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sworders proposed the other site for small scale development. There are other small sites in other villages that are available but they didn't submit. Should pair both villages as a Category 1 village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does this function as a satellite to Ware with some services?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to allow development in such locations in order to maintain viability of the settlements.
<p>42/010 and 42/011 - Oakley Coach Builders</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very serious developer interest in this site with an application pending. The client would like to build a new factory in order to keep the business viable. The old coachworks buildings would be redeveloped into new employment units. Small scale units would work in this location.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What proportion of the employees are local? - Most are from nearby settlements.
<p>42/004, 42/006 and 42/008 - R/O School, Sutes Farm, R/O Cambridge Cottages</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth of these small scale village sites would help prevent the loss of local services including shops. There is a possibility of employment on Site 42/006 as it is currently a farm.
<p>Bayford and Brickendon</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the principle of Bayford and Brickendon as locations for development?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Interest declared) - Brickendon Grange. There could be some rounding-off of the Category 2 village. Bayford could also take a small amount of development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are decent rail links for commuting.
<p>Concluding Remarks</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report going to next LDF Executive Panel setting out next steps and

Partnership members thanked for their time and involvement.