

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL: Examination of the District Local Plan, 2011 – 2033.

Inspector: Louise Phillips MA (Cantab) MSc MRTPI

Programme Officer: Louise St John Howe, louise@poservices.co.uk

HEARING AGENDA – WEEK 6, THURSDAY 23 MAY 2019:

Matters 14, Infrastructure & Delivery; and 13, Transport.

The hearing sessions for the above matters will take place on Thursday 23 May commencing at **9.30am**.

Participants should be aware of my Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) (Document **ED5**) as they will provide the framework for discussion at the hearings. They should also be aware of the statements submitted in response to my MIQs by the Council and others. These are available on the website.

Some of my questions have been adequately answered in the statements so that limited discussion should be needed at the hearing. Consequently, further discussion will focus upon the issues on the following agenda.

I intend to provide an opportunity to discuss the recently published Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Viability Study for the Garden Town (Documents ED34 and ED35) during the Matter 14 session. In light of when these documents were published, I am mindful of the potential need for further consultation upon them. This will also be considered at the hearing.

I look forward to seeing you on 23 May.

Louise Phillips

INSPECTOR

13 May 2019.

MATTER 14: Infrastructure and Delivery

General Issues, inc. the role and status of the IDP & viability documentation.

- Role and status of the IDP and viability studies as living documents:
 - Can developers be committed to the precise items listed or to the apportionment currently proposed (where this is available)? If not, is the role of the IDP/the need for flexibility appropriately conveyed in the plan?
 - ***Dealing with amendments/updates to the IDP, such as the recent work for the Garden Towns. Initial comments on Garden Town work. Is further consultation/opportunity for comment required?***
 - Should the IDP be referenced in the policy wording?
 - Does/should the Plan itself identify the essential infrastructure associated with specific developments?

- Does the various IDP and viability evidence provide sufficient confidence for plan-making purposes that the necessary infrastructure can be delivered in time to support proposed growth?
 - Detailed representations continue re. uncertainty surrounding the funding of infrastructure and about the detail of the requirements themselves, particularly in relation to modal shift.
 - Specific concerns raised by Savills (LAD0109) in relation to Ongar. As an example, how is it anticipated that the infrastructure set out in the IDP will be delivered, and what are the consequences if it is not?

Issue 1: Will Policy D1 be effective in securing the infrastructure necessary to support development before it takes place?

- MM proposed to para. 6.12 to explain that the IDP comprises of documents relating to the District as a whole and to the Garden Town.

- In the context of requiring the provision of infrastructure, should Policy D1 specifically reflect the tests in the CIL Regulations?

- Part C - MM proposed to Part C to clarify that all the sub-clauses must apply before any exception is made on viability grounds and to re-order the sub-clauses.
 - Justification for Part C(iv) – see in particular Statement by Peer Group (LAD0120).

Issue 2: Are the requirements of Policy D2 concerning Health Impact Assessments (HIA) justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- Explanation of the purpose of HIAs, how they are undertaken, what type of information they should contain and what the expected benefits/outputs of completing them are.
- MM proposed to para. 6.30 and Policy D2 Part D to more clearly explain the role of HIA and to fully reference the relevant guidance.
- What is the rationale for the 50-dwelling threshold for requiring HIA? Are such developments expected to have a “significant impact” (PPG) from a health perspective? Should the policy clarify that the HIA should be proportionate to the type and scale of development proposed?
- Is an “Additional Modification” to para. 6.26 needed to update the situation concerning the relocation of Princess Alexandra Hospital?

Issue 3: Is Policy D3 justified in requiring developers to fund improvements to utilities infrastructure where capacity issues exist?

- Explanation of developers’ responsibilities for utilities infrastructure funding vs providers’ responsibilities.
- Does Part A require that sufficient capacity must be available upon the grant of planning permission (see Miller Homes LAD0139)? Is this justified or should it rather require sufficient capacity to meet the needs of development as it is built?

Issue 4: Is Policy D4 effective?

- MM proposed to Part C concerning the requirements for developments of different scales. However, should the existing text be deleted?
- MM to delete part H and to include the requirement for marketing in Part G.

Issue 5: Are Policies D5-D7 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- Policy D6 – Neighbourhood Planning. Is it necessary to include this policy in the Plan?
- Policy D7 – Monitoring and Enforcement.
 - Is it necessary to include a specific “Review Policy” within the Plan? Housing need, allocations and Green Belt boundaries are raised.
 - Do the indicators provided in Appendix 3 provide a robust framework for monitoring the effectiveness of the Plan?

MATTER 13: Transport

General issues, in particular the Plan's reliance upon modal shift.

- Following the infrastructure session (and HRA session), explanation of how the Plan will secure the level of modal shift relied upon.
- Discussion of the vehicle trip reduction rates expected in some developments. (15-20% generally and up to 88% in some developments).
- Impact of proposals for reduced car-parking standards in certain developments.
- Implication of junctions in Epping being over-capacity. Is the plan sound if we know that junctions will be over-capacity even with mitigation proposed?

Issue 1: Has regard been had to the Mayor of London's draft Transport Strategy and London Plan in proposing Policy T1; and are its provisions clear and effective?

- In response to my Question 4, amendments are proposed to policy T1 to improve clarity, reduce duplication and correct drafting errors.
- MM to para. 6.23 in the infrastructure section concerning safe routes to schools.
- MM to para. 3.88 to signpost that it is the Council's Validation Requirements which determine the scale/type of development which must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment/Statement.

Issue 2: Will Policy T2 be effective in protecting the land required for future transport schemes from development?

- Is it necessary to list the particular schemes for which land is required to be safeguarded? Is the relevant land shown on the Policies Map?
 - To what type of land will this policy apply?
 - How will such land be protected from other development as set out in Part A? Will the identification of land in strategies outside the plan be sufficient to secure its protection?

End.