

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

**Meeting Notes (Morning Session)**

**Attendees – am session (10.30-12:15)**

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

**Apologies**

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

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

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

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

### **Development Strategy and phasing**

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

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

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

### **Delivery Study and illustrative masterplanning**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Cross Boundary Issues**

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

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

## Education

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

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

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

### **Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)**

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

### **Minerals**

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

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

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

### **Wildlife Sites**

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

### **G&T and Travelling Showpeople**

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

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

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

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

#### **Attendees**

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

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

### **National Policy Issues**

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

### **Transport Modelling**

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

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

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

#### **South of Bishop's Stortford**

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

#### **Gilston Area/North of Harlow**

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

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

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

### **Cross-Boundary Mitigation measures**

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

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

### **Air Quality**

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

### **Rail and Bus Provision**

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

### **The meeting closed at 3pm**

#### **List of Actions – morning session**

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

#### **List of Actions – afternoon session**

<b>Task Owner</b>	<b>Para</b>	<b>Action</b>
PC	10	To supply MY with details of relevant mitigation schemes

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

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