



# Matter 2: Employment provision for the proposed garden communities

North Essex Joint Strategic (Section 1) Plan

for Williams Group

Emery Planning project number: 14-007 / 17-334

Project : 14-007  
Participant : Williams Group  
Client : Williams Group

Date : 02 December 2019  
Author : Ben Pycroft

Approved by : Rawdon Gascoigne

This report has been prepared for the client by Emery Planning with all reasonable skill, care and diligence.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Emery Planning.

Emery Planning Partnership Limited  
trading as Emery Planning.

# Contents:

1. Introduction	1
2. Matter 2	1

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This brief hearing statement is submitted on behalf of the Williams Group in relation to Matter 2: Employment provision for the proposed garden communities. The hearing session for this matter is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2020.
- 1.2 The Inspector will be aware from our original representations to the publication draft section 1 plan dated 28<sup>th</sup> July 2017, our hearing statement for matter 4 (providing for employment) dated 4<sup>th</sup> December 2017 and more recently our representations to the suggested amendments to the publication draft dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019 that we consider there is a gross over-reliance on the garden communities in delivering retail and employment.

## 2. Matter 2

### Questions for all participants, including the NEAs

#### **6 – Is there clear justification for selecting the comparator locations identified on p55 of EXD/052, rather than other comparator locations?**

- 2.1 No. It is unclear why the 8 comparator locations (West Essex, Cambridgeshire, Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, West Surrey and East Surrey) have been selected rather than other comparator locations. The “*Economic Vision and Strategy for the North Essex Sub-Region*” (Cebr, August 2018, ref: EXD/052) explains that the 8 comparator locations selected are within the Greater South East outside London and have a higher GVA per capita than North Essex. The report continues to explain that the comparator locations have a level of economic success to which the North Essex sub-region can reasonable aspire to given its location and potential linkages. However, on that basis, it is unclear why other comparator locations have not also been selected.
- 2.2 Once the NEAs have responded to question 1 (what criteria was used to select the comparator locations), we may wish to comment further in a response statement.

**7 – is it reasonable to assume that, in the inward investment-led scenario, North Essex increases its employment-to-population ratio to that of the comparator regions by 2036 (para 2.4 of EB/081, p116 of EXD/052)?**

- 2.3 No. Firstly, it is unclear what the current employment-to-population in North Essex is. Footnotes 14 and 87 of the “*Economic Vision and Strategy for the North Essex Sub-Region*” report (Cebr, August 2018, ref: EXD/052) explain that employment in the comparator locations is 43.5% of population compared to 35.9% in North Essex in the traditional construction case and 36.1% in the innovative construction case. However, paragraph 2.4 of the “*Employment provision for the North Essex Garden Communities*” report (Cebr, July 2019, ref: EB/081) explains that in 2016 the North Essex’s employment-to-population ratio was 38.5%.
- 2.4 Secondly, notwithstanding the above, the Cebr reports (EXD/052 and EB/081) assume that under the inward investment led scenario by 2036 intervention will have taken place to attract major employers and create jobs, thereby increasing participation and decreasing out-commuting. However, the scenario is high-risk. It assumes that large scale employment in the garden communities is provided and that the garden communities are then successful in attracting large scale inward investment in modernising sectors by major employers within the short term.
- 2.5 The Cebr report EB/081 explains that the investment-led scenario assumes the delivery of employment land effectively matches the delivery of dwellings on a 1 job per house ratio, based upon little more than conjecture. Importantly, the housing trajectories set for the garden communities as set out in table 1 of EB/081 show completely unrealistic start dates (i.e. both the Tendring Colchester Borders and West of Braintree garden communities are expected to start delivering in 2023/24) and at unrealistic build out rates (please refer to our matter 4 statement).

**8 – Is the percentage mix of employment sectors shown in Table 2 of EB/081 justified, having regard to the sectoral GVA shares identified in EXD/052, pp125-127?**

- 2.6 No. The percentage mix of employment by sector as set out in table 2 of EB/081 does not reflect the sectoral GVA shares identified in EXD/052 for either North Essex or the comparators. It assumes that even more employment would be in the information and communication and business services sectors than the comparator locations.