



Gilston Steering Group

Tuesday 11 July 2017 @ 7:00pm
Wallfields- Room 1.11

MINUTES

Present:

Councillor Linda Haysey	–	EHC
Liz Watts	–	EHC
Councillor Robert Brunton	–	EHC
Kevin Steptoe	–	EHC
James Mead	–	EHC (Minute taker)
Mary Parsons	–	Places for People
David Sprunt	–	Essex County Council
Paul Jarvis	–	ARUP (Consultant- Garden Town)
Mark Orson	–	Neighbourhood Plan Group
Bob Toll	–	Neighbourhood Plan Group
Jill Buck	–	Widford Parish Council

Apologies: Chris Butcher – East Herts Council
Claire Sime – East Herts Council
Jamie Cardwell – Essex County Council
Jan Hayes-Griffin – Hertfordshire County Council
Anthony Bickmore – Neighbourhood Plan Group

Introductions

- LH began the meeting and set out the agenda.
- Members of the meeting introduced themselves.

1. Presentation by ARUP consultant on garden town programme and project management

- 1.1 PJ explained that ARUP have been appointed by the Garden Town Authorities as the consultants to lead on Project Planning and Programme Management for the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town.
- 1.2 PJ began the presentation and explained the reasons behind the authorities decision to move forward with the Garden Town approach. He cited extreme housing pressure and high population growth as key issues that the Garden Town project would have to tackle.
- 1.3 PJ outlined some of the recent history behind the Garden Town, referring to the Garden Town Expression of Interest that was submitted in 2016 and the announcement of Garden Town status in early 2017.
- 1.4 LW highlighted that the project is the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town, not just Gilston. It is important to remember that the Garden Town includes all of the sites around Harlow (Gilston, Harlow East, Land West of Sumners/Katherines and Latton Priory).



- 1.5 LH highlighted that the funding received for the Garden Town will cover the whole of the Garden Town not just the Gilston site.
- 1.6 PJ agreed with this.
- 1.7 MP added that the Garden Town is a long term vision for strategic growth around Harlow that will extend beyond the plan period and therefore would include the full 10k at Gilston and total number of homes from other sites.
- 1.8 PJ explained that ARUP have been appointed to lead on work relating to: Interim Governance Arrangements, Project Programme and the Sustainable Transport Corridor.
- 1.9 JB questioned whether work on sustainable transport would lead to any improvements with the rail network in Harlow.
- 1.10 PJ explained that the work on the Sustainable Transport Corridor would not explicitly deal with improvements to the rail network. The main focus of this work is on other sustainable modes of transport (cycling and walking) and how these can help to reduce the reliance on cars in the area.
- 1.11 MO questioned how the rail would fit in.
- 1.12 PJ explained that the work ARUP will be doing will look to improve the role of the train station as an important hub by making it more accessible.
- 1.13 MO stated that there are currently capacity issues at Harlow station.
- 1.14 DS explained that Essex County Council and Hertfordshire County Council are always pressing for improvements to rail network.
- 1.15 JB highlighted that most of the people moving into Gilston will be commuters who use the rail service for travel to work into London.
- 1.16 DS explained that part of the vision of the Garden Town is to encourage residents to commute into Harlow for work and not have to travel long distances into London.
- 1.17 MO stated that this is unrealistic and there needs to be commitment to improve the rail network.
- 1.18 PJ highlighted that the Local Plans coming forward are aiming to increase employment space, to try and encourage residents to work in the local area.
- 1.19 DS added that Network Rail is looking at the possibility of increasing the length of the trains to try and improve capacity.
- 1.20 LH asked PJ if he could do a short paper for the next meeting on Network Rail and what can be done.
- 1.21 MP commented that the Garden Town status will help prioritise the area for Government investment and give DCLG more reason to engage with the Department of Transport on these strategic infrastructure issues.
- 1.22 LH highlighted that the Garden Town status will mean we are in a good position to bid for infrastructure funding. We will continue to analyse the situation to see if we need to look at further funding.
- 1.23 MO commented that there needs to be a commitment to funding.
- 1.24 PJ explained that the developers will provide funding contributions. The funding gap that exists after developer funding will then be analysed and other funding sources assessed.



- 1.25** MP explained that Places for People would be bound to deliver infrastructure funding through a Section 106 agreement. Places for People are confident of delivering the infrastructure required for the Gilston development.
- 1.26** MP commented that the outline application is being prepared for October 2017 to demonstrate the deliverability of the proposals and the funding and other commitments at the Examination in Public.
- 1.27** MO commented that the main concern is the strategic infrastructure.
- 1.28** PJ explained that we are working to understand the overall infrastructure need across the Garden Town and the triggers/phasing of infrastructure.
- 1.29** MO commented that much of the infrastructure is already at capacity.
- 1.30** PJ explained that the planning applications that come forward will have to provide information on the mitigation required to deliver the site, without worsening the infrastructure situation.
- 1.31** MP highlighted that the next Gilston Workshop will tackle the existing infrastructure deficits as well as looking at what infrastructure is required to support new development. The Parishes have already flagged up a number of areas where capacity is already an issue ahead of any development in the area taking place.
- 1.32** MP commented that Places for People have done a lot of work on infrastructure. The Garden Town project will be looking at the possibility of forward funding from the Government for infrastructure.
- 1.33** PJ agreed that this is a good route to go down.
- 1.34** MP commented that funding could also come from the Homes and Communities Agency and they could discuss this with the Garden Town team.
- 1.35** PJ continued with the presentation setting out that ARUP would be looking to build a Design and Review Panel. A proposal for this Panel would be taken to the Co-operation for Sustainable Development Board shortly. ARUP will also be working on an Infrastructure Delivery Overview.
- 1.36** PJ highlighted that Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners have been appointed by the Garden Town authorities to deliver a Spatial Vision and Design Charter for the project.
- 1.37** MP asked for confirmation that the starting point for this would be, in Gilston's case, what EHDC has included within the proposed Site Allocation within the Draft Plan. For example, green belt release and village structure. PJ confirmed this would be the case
- 1.38** PJ set out the Interim Governance Arrangements proposed and explained that there would be two newly established groups: The Garden Town Member Board and the Garden Town Officer Steering Group. These two Groups could be considered sub groups of the Co-op boards, and will solely focus on the Garden Town.
- 1.39** PJ explained that Places for People will be invited to sit on the existing Epping Developer Forum that looks to facilitate a co-ordinated approach to development across the area.



- 1.40** MP responded that this may not be as effective as having a Group where the main landowners/developers were working with the Local Authorities
- 1.41** PJ highlighted that there will also be a newly established Garden Town Project Team.
- 1.42** MP stressed that the Governance proposals for Gilston were advancing in terms of community ownership of open space and assets for the Gilston area and wanted reassurance that these would not be subsumed directly into a Harlow-wide structure.
- 1.43** PJ confirmed that ARUP will look at how community ownership is addressed across the Garden Town but noted the progress at Gilston.
- 1.44** PJ highlighted the programme of works that has been set out on the next slides.
- 1.45** LH asked LW if she was able to give an update on the situation with the Princess Alexandra Hospital.
- 1.46** LW explained that work is still ongoing on the potential relocation of the Princess Alexandra Hospital. The Strategic Outline Case has been brought forward and looks at four different options: a new hospital on a new site, a health campus on a new site, rebuilding on the existing site or to do nothing. The option to do nothing has to be considered as standard practice in developing such cases.
- 1.47** LW explained that the next stage is for the Strategic Outline Case to be approved by the Secretary of State, and assuming that happens, to proceed to the Outline Business Case. At the moment the options of a new site or a health campus are the two preferred routes for the trust, but all four options are being considered as part of the process.
- 1.48** BT questioned politically whether the Gilston allocation will have an impact on the District boundaries.
- 1.49** LW stated that there is no boundary change being considered. The Gilston site is part of East Herts.
- 1.50** DS confirmed that the sites around Harlow that fall within the Epping Forest District will also stay part of the Epping Forest District.
- 1.51** LW confirmed that the Garden Town project is one that is being pushed forward by the three authorities (East Herts, Epping Forest and Harlow). The Garden Town is bigger than just the Gilston site.
- 1.52** MP commented that the housing numbers provided at Gilston will go towards East Herts housing numbers. Harlow will benefit from the Gilston allocation without the site being part of Harlow. The aspiration has always been for development at Gilston to contribute to improving Harlow.
- 1.53** LH commented that East Herts sit on the Harlow Enterprise Zone Board so are involved in the discussions regarding regeneration of Harlow. East Herts also remain in contact with Public Health England, who are keen to see high quality homes brought forward at Gilston.
- 1.54** PJ finished his presentation by explaining his previous relevant experience and the kind of work he has been involved in. He then closed the presentation.
- 1.55** LH thanked PJ for the presentation.



ACTION: PJ to produce a short report on Network Rail. PJ invited to present at another Steering Group meeting in the future.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

2.1 LH asked the group to agree the minutes from the previous meeting.

2.2 Group agreed the minutes.

3. Terms of Reference Sign off

9.1 LH introduced the terms of reference which were presented in draft form to the last Steering Group meeting.

9.2 LW highlighted that there have been two minor amendments to the terms of reference since the previous meeting. There has been deletion of wording in section 2 and amendment to the table under 5.1. (sent out as tracked changes in the papers for this meeting)

9.3 LH asked for the group to agree the terms of reference.

9.4 Group agreed the final version of the terms of reference.

ACTION: LW to send the final version of the terms of reference around with the minutes. *Post-meeting note: the terms of reference will also be posted on the Gilston page of East Herts website.*

4. Action log from Saturday workshops (PfP)

4.1 LH introduced the Action Log which highlights progress with any actions.

4.2 MP noted that the actions in this table will be highlighted in either: green, amber or red depending on the level of progress. Green would denote an action that has been completed, amber would represent an action that is in progress and red would highlight any actions that have been put on hold or that have not seen any progress.

4.3 MP proposed that Chris Butcher continues to pick up suggestions as he takes minutes, he can then send these to Places for People who can insert into the Action Log. Chris may also pick up some actions that need to be taken forward by East Herts or by the community.

4.4 LH stated that this is a good basis to ensure everything is captured.

4.5 MO stated that the Neighbourhood Plan Group will review this log and feedback to Places for People to make sure everything has been captured.

4.6 MP suggested that an extra column be added to the log which shows where the action has come from e.g. Workshop or Steering Group meeting.

4.7 Group agreed that this extra column would be useful.

ACTION: MP to add extra column to the log to show where the action has come from. Neighbourhood Plan Group to review the log and feedback. CB to add new actions as they arise.

Post meeting note: Given that there is different membership of the two groups, to avoid confusion a separate sheet logging the steering group actions will be



produced but the workshop action list shall continue to be reviewed at this meeting

5. Critical path timelines for process and delivery (PfP)

- 9.1** MP explained that the East Herts District Plan will go to examination in autumn, at the moment we are anticipating an October start.
- 9.2** MP highlighted that work and consultation will continue to be ongoing with regards to the Gilston Concept Framework.
- 9.3** MP explained that there have been structured workshops that have been focused on the Gilston Concept Framework. East Herts have committed to undertaking further community consultation on this document and Places for People will align their engagement programme with this.
- 9.4** MP explained that the next stage will be the Outline Application which Places for People intend to prepare for October 2017. This application will spatially put the vision for the site onto a map. Key components such as: the boundaries, parameters for development, the points of access and the proposed movement through the site will be set out on the outline application.
- 9.5** RB questioned the purposed of the Scoping Opinion.
- 9.6** KS explained that the Scoping Opinion is part of the regulatory process that the allocation has to go through.
- 9.7** JB asked whether there has been a good response.
- 9.8** MP explained that East Herts will collate the responses and then send to Places for People. The consultation has not yet finished so the responses have not yet be analysed.
- 9.9** BT questioned which statutory consultees were consulted.
- 9.10** KS explained that the same statutory consultees were consulted that would be consulted on a planning application.
- 9.11** BT raised concerns that the local community have been unable to respond as they lack the technical expertise to contribute. BT questioned what kind of input a Parish Council can have into the scoping opinion.
- 9.12** KS explained that it can be difficult for local communities to comment on this type of document.
- 9.13** MP suggested that that rather than trying to produce a technical response, which the other statutory consultees would be doing, the Parish Councils can best contribute by raising issues they are aware of because of their local knowledge. For example, in addition to the Environment Agency view on flood risk, to highlight areas where localised flooding persistently occurs, as they had been doing through the workshops
- 9.14** MP explained that following the Outline Application, Places for People will be working on the phase one proposals and the individual village masterplans.
- 9.15** LH highlighted that Places for People are unlikely to build out all seven villages, therefore it is vital that the quality of build is maintained by other housebuilders that come in.



- 9.16** MP explained that six village masterplans will be produced by Places for People, the other masterplan will be produced by City and Provincial Properties. These masterplans will control where fundamental infrastructure such as roads and schools will go and will also set the high design standards and principles that any development must follow.
- 9.17** MP explained that Places for People are unlikely to sell a whole village, it may be the case that part of a village is sold to separate housebuilders/developers and even self build plots. These housebuilders will have to abide by the form of development set out in the masterplan for the village.
- 9.18** RB stated that submitting an outline application prior to the examination of the District Plan would lead to the community thinking the development is a done deal.
- 9.19** MP explained that whilst the outline application will be ready for the Examination, it is not the intention of Places for People to formally submit the outline application until after the examination.
- 9.20** KS questioned whether Places for People intend to provide the outline application to the Inspector of the District Plan.
- 9.21** MP confirmed that Places for People will provide the outline application to the inspector as it is the best way to demonstrate the depth of work done to show deliverability, the commitments as to how infrastructure would be funded and delivered and to draw in the responses of the statutory consultees, as discussed above.

6. Engagement materials for wider consultation (PfP)

- 6.1** MP highlighted again that work and engagement will be ongoing on the Concept Framework until early September. MP wished to emphasise that at this stage comments should not be questioning the suitability of the Gilston site as an allocation in the District Plan, instead comments should be made on the content of the Framework.
- 6.2** LH queried whether it will be useful for the East Herts communications team to contribute to publicising the Framework.
- 6.3** MP agreed that this would be a good idea and that Places for People communications could work with the Council.
- 6.4** MP explained the Public Awareness Campaign and set out a number of the steps that Places for People would take to publicise the framework and the outline application. These include: meetings with the parishes, publication in parish newsletters, publication on village noticeboards, flyer distribution and exhibition events.
- 6.5** MP highlighted that Places for People would be updating their website. They will be looking to engage young people through venturing into schools and colleges. Social media, print, radio and digital advertising will be used to raise awareness. Places for People also intend to be present at local community facing events.
- 6.6** MP then set out the timeline for public awareness events up to the end of September.

7. Community Advisor post update



- 9.1 MP explained that the brief for the Community Advisor was sent out to seven different companies and there have been two submitted proposals (both of which were combined proposals from two of the seven initially contacted, in each case). One from Hester Architects and the second from Urban Silence. The Community Advisor would be appointed by Places for People but would work as a technical design advisor for the community.
- 9.2 MP explained that before a decision is made on the appointment Places for People are waiting for some additional clarification from Hester Architects to ensure their bid was compliant with the brief.
- 9.3 JB asked what kind of experience and qualifications these two companies have.
- 9.4 MP stated that both of the companies have worked on large scale development and are experienced planners/urban designers. If the Parishes wish to meet the advisors before they make a final decision, this can be arranged.
- 9.5 MO queried when the additional information from Hester Architects would be received.
- 9.6 MP stated that this should be received by the end of next week.
- 9.7 MO queried when the Parishes can expect the advisor to be appointed.
- 9.8 MP stated that the advisor should hopefully be appointed by the end of the month to give chance for them to work with the Parishes ahead of the next workshop at the end of August.

8. Study tours update and suggestions

- 8.1 LH stated that there would be a visit this Friday to Cambourne and Trumpington Meadows in South Cambridgeshire, where we will look to understand how these new settlements have been developed.
- 8.2 LH then explained that there would be a visit to Chilmington Green, Ashford in September. This visit will be particularly beneficial in understanding the governance of the site. We are also looking to organise a visit to Alconbury in Cambridgeshire, the invitations for this have not been sent out yet.
- 8.3 LW highlighted that for the trip to Alconbury there will be limited spaces and it is anticipated one or two people per community could attend. MP confirmed that another future trip to Alconbury may be useful as part of the education workstream as the same Architect, AHMM, will be working on the Gilston schools
- 8.4 LH explained that we are looking at a trip to Poundbury in Dorset. This visit would be helpful to understand how traffic concerns were dealt with. In addition, it will be interesting to see the site as a Places for People subsidiary company has developed a significant proportion of the site on behalf of the Duchy of Cornwall.
- 8.5 JB queried whether it would be more worthwhile to visit towns such as: Crawley, Stevenage or Milton Keynes to see how the first phases of these settlements were developed. MP confirmed she would be happy to arrange another trip to Brooklands in Milton Keynes as part of



this to show PFP's approach to infrastructure and also to meet the schools teams.

- 8.6 LH agreed that this could be beneficial and queried with KS about an offer from Uttlesford District Council to visit towns in their District.
- 8.7 KS confirmed that there could be the potential to visit Saffron Walden.
- 8.8 LH asked the group whether a November visit to Poundbury would be suitable.
- 8.9 The Group agreed that this could be a suitable time.
- 8.10 DS suggested a visit to Newhall in Essex, this could be an interesting visit as a number of different architects have had an input into this neighbourhood.
- 8.11 MP suggested a visit to the Olympic Park this could be relevant to the village masterplans as this site was brought forward through zonal masterplans. It also has interesting arrangements for estate charging for the park and, again, the Chobham Academy school, which is a through school, was designed by AHMM
- 8.12 LH stated that we can look at the different options for future visits.

ACTION: LW to follow up in arranging future visits.

9. A.O.B

- 9.1 LH asked the group if they had any other business.
- 9.2 The group raised no other business.
- 9.3 Meeting closed at 21:00.

Date of next meeting: 10th August @ 19:00, Wallfields

Date of next workshop: 31st August @ 18:30- TBC