

**Tuesday 14 January
2020**

**Early afternoon
session**

1.30pm – 3.15pm

Matter 2

Employment provision for the proposed garden communities

AGENDA

The numbered questions in italics below are the original questions from the Inspector's matters, issues and questions document [IED/020]. For any original question that is not shown below, the Inspector has sufficient information from the hearing statements and responses, and is not inviting further discussion on it.

The commentary in normal typeface is from the Inspector.

*The lettered questions in **bold typeface** are the further questions on which the Inspector will be inviting discussion at the hearing session. He is not inviting written responses to these questions.*

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

The submitted Section 1 Plan makes no specific requirement for the quantity of employment land to be provided at each proposed GC. The Inspector indicated, in IED/011, that the Plan should set indicative requirements for the overall amount of employment land or floorspace at each GC.

In their *Suggested Amendments* [EB/091A] the NEAs propose amendments to policy SP7 (Ref 70) to set indicative employment land requirements based on the figures in Table 4 of EB/081.

According to Cebr's *Employment Provision for the North Essex Garden Communities* (August 2019) [EB/081], those figures are derived from two alternative scenarios, which produce almost identical results: (a) an assumption that one job per dwelling will be provided at each GC; (b) an assumption that the employment-to-population ratio in North Essex (including in the GCs) will rise to 43.5% by 2036, as a result of converging on the ratio forecast by Cebr for a set of comparator areas.

A. Is assumption (b) justified, taking into account the evidence provided by Understanding Data in paras 7.1-7.18 of their hearing statement for Shalford PC?

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?*

B. Exactly how did Cebr arrive at the percentage breakdown of jobs at the proposed GCs by industrial sector, as shown in Table 2 of EB/081?

C. How does Table 2 relate to Table 37 in Cebr's *Economic Vision and Strategy for the North Essex Sub-Region* [EXD/052]?

D. Over what period of time does the percentage breakdown in Table 2 of EB/081 apply; and is it static or does it change over time?

4. *How do the employment figures for the GCs shown in Table 4 of EB/081 relate to the annual jobs forecasts for the three NEAs set out in policy SP4, having regard to any differences in the methods by which they were arrived at?*
5. *Are the employment land requirements of policies SP7, SP8, SP9 & SP10 part of, or additional to, the employment land requirements of policy SP4?*

In their response CAUSE point out that the number of jobs assumed to be created at West of Braintree GC represents a substantial proportion of the total forecast job numbers for BDC set out in policy SP4. They say this will leave insufficient jobs for new residents occupying the dwellings proposed in the Section 2 plans, and thereby increase out-commuting.

In paragraph 2.4.4 of their further hearing statement the NEAs say that the number of jobs assumed to be created at the three GCs represents 47% of the total forecast job numbers for North Essex set out in policy SP4. The latter total was based on extrapolating past trends but additional job growth is likely to occur as a result of future economic strategy. In their response ANSC & Countryside point to the 50,000sqm of employment floorspace built over 12 to 14 years at Skyline 120 as an example of what could be provided at West of Braintree GC.

Based on EB/081, the NEAs propose to amend policy SP7 so that it sets out specific requirements for employment land provision at each of the proposed GCs [EB/091A, ref 70]. In section 2.3 of their further hearing statement the NEAs make it clear that the West of Braintree figures of 9ha/44ha are based on a cross-boundary GC extending into the Uttlesford DC area.

E. If the NEAs' proposed indicative employment land requirement figures for the GCs are not justified, what should be the basis for setting alternative figures?

F. In the interests of effectiveness, should indicative requirements for employment land also appear in policies SP8, 9 & 10?

G. Should the employment land requirement figures for West of Braintree GC be based on the area of the GC within Braintree only?

H. Are there any other points, not already covered, which need to be discussed at this hearing session?