

Epping Forest District Council

**Epping Forest District Council Infrastructure
Delivery Plan**

Non-Strategic Sites Developers' Forum

Issue | 22 August 2017

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number

13 Fitzroy Street
London
W1T 4BQ
United Kingdom

ARUP

Contents

	Page	
1	Background and Purpose	2
2	Structure of the Event	4
2.1	Infrastructure themed presentations	4
2.2	Road and sustainable transport	4
2.3	Education	5
2.4	Health	5
2.5	Utilities	6
2.6	Area-themed discussions	6
3	Conclusions/ next steps	10
	Group 1 questions	1
	Group 2 questions	2
	Group 3 questions	3

Appendices

Appendix A

Agenda

Appendix B

Invites and Attendees

Appendix C

Discussion questions

1 Background and Purpose

Epping Forest District Council is progressing a new Local Plan that will guide future growth in the District to 2033.

The Draft Local Plan was published for a six-week consultation between 31st October and 12th December 2016 under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations (2012). Subsequent to the consultation and the consideration of the responses, the Submission Plan will be prepared. Following the Pre-Submission Regulation 19 Publication stage, the Plan, evidence and representations will then be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination by an independent Inspector.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) require Plans to positively plan for development and the infrastructure required in the area to meet the needs associated with growth. Local planning authorities must progress a proportionate evidence base for infrastructure which assesses the quality and capacity of various forms of infrastructure.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is therefore an important part of the evidence base. Its purpose is to demonstrate that the infrastructure requirements necessary to support the level of housing and employment growth in Epping Forest District to 2033 can be delivered. A Draft IDP was prepared to support and inform the draft Local Plan. Following the recent Regulation 18 consultation, the IDP is now being updated to provide a more detailed evidence base to support the submission version of the Local Plan.

The Developer Forum for non-strategic sites was held on the 16th June 2017. Its purpose was to consider the specific infrastructure requirements in relation to the proposed site allocations in the Draft Local Plan, and provide site promoters and developers with the opportunity to provide input to the IDP.

As part of the preparation of the Draft IDP, a baseline of the District's existing social and physical infrastructure has been completed, and an initial round of consultation undertaken with the relevant infrastructure providers. Part of this work included a consultation event in December 2016, with key infrastructure providers and stakeholders. Its purpose was to provide a briefing on the Draft Local Plan and Draft IDP, as well as providing an opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions and provide feedback in advance of any formal representation the providers may have chosen to make on behalf of their organisations.

In addition, a consultation event was held in early June 2017, with officers from neighbouring authorities. Its purpose was to consider the infrastructure requirements relation to the proposed site allocations in the Draft Local Plan, and agree an approach going forward across relevant authorities. The need for joint working in relation to the strategic sites and relationship with the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town work was a particular focus of the session. These consultation workshops helped to raise key issues surrounding infrastructure, which have been used to inform discussions at the Developer Forum. Further infrastructure discussions will be undertaken as part of a Member's workshop in July 2017.

An initial assessment of the requirements associated with the housing distribution and trajectory in the Draft Local Plan was also undertaken. As well as seeking feedback on work done so far, the purpose of the non-strategic sites Forum was to progress the study into next stages and identify in more detail the infrastructure required to support and enable delivery of the allocated sites. It enabled discussions on:

- Existing infrastructure issues, constraints, shortfalls and deficits;

- The implications of planned growth for infrastructure provision, including discussions on possible future needs and locations of required facilities.
- Finance and delivery of infrastructure
- Potential approaches to sharing costs equitably between developers
- Work undertaken by landowners and developers to date, in relation to infrastructure

Pro-formas were issued in advance of the workshop, to obtain information from land owners and promoters in relation to infrastructure surrounding their site. The scope of the pro-forma included the current status and phasing of development proposals, along with identifying the extent to which promoters had considered infrastructure requirements. This included questions on engagement with infrastructure providers, any modelling work undertaken, or known infrastructure interventions or contributions that will be delivered as part of the development. The pro-forma covered a range of infrastructure types, including transport, utilities, education, health, community facilities, open space and green infrastructure. The purpose of the pro-forma was to help guide discussions at the non-strategic sites Developer Forum workshop, and contribute to the overall understanding of infrastructure needs across the District. A copy of the issued pro-forma can be found in Appendix **Error! Reference source not found.**

The pro-forma responses provided useful information on anticipated infrastructure requirements, known gaps in information and further work needed to be undertaken through the masterplanning process.

From the responses received, it was noted that the sites are at different phases of masterplanning, and therefore had varying levels of certainty surrounding infrastructure needs. The identified infrastructure requirements and contributions also varied significantly according to the size of the proposed development, particularly in relation to education and healthcare provision. Across the responses, there was generally greater certainty in relation to transport requirements, compared to health, education and utilities, which will require further consultation with relevant providers to better understand the necessary provision needed to support growth.

The attendees of the workshop included officers from Epping Forest District Council, officers from Essex County Council (ECC), land owners, developers, promoters and their agents.

2 Structure of the Event

A copy of the agenda is provided at Appendix A and a broad overview of the structure of the event is set out below.

In order to provide context and to introduce the workshop, officers from EFDC and consultants from Arup gave an introductory presentation. The presentation provided a summary of the process of preparing the Local Plan as well as its overall strategy and content. This outlined:

- Local Plan programme
- Key workstreams being progressed to support the Local Plan
- An overview of the Garden Town project, including governance and funding arrangements
- Proposed strategic masterplans

The presentation also introduced the IDP, outlining its principle aims in assessing the infrastructure needs associated with the planned level and distribution of housing and employment growth in EFDC. It was outlined that the principle output of the IDP will be a schedule of infrastructure required to support growth. This will need to identify at the appropriate spatial scale (including at site level where appropriate): the infrastructure required; its cost; how it will be funded and delivered.

This introduction was followed by an update on the progress and programme of the IDP, to help outline work undertaken to date, and key areas that need to be advanced over the coming workshops and ongoing consultation with providers.

2.1 Infrastructure themed presentations

The introduction was followed by infrastructure specific presentations, to provide an overview of key work undertaken, overview of findings, the current understanding of infrastructure needs and requirements and outstanding areas of work. Each infrastructure presentation concluded with a series of questions which were intended to set a framework for wider discussions amongst the Forum. An overview of each presentation and discussion questions are set out below:

2.2 Road and sustainable transport

Officers from ECC gave a presentation on highways infrastructure and sustainable transport options. This included an overview of their ongoing modelling work being undertaken, and key assumptions made around sustainable modal share targets. A summary of preliminary findings to date was provided, showing key ‘hot spots’ in the District. It was outlined how the modelling work will be used to assess the likely impacts of growth over the Plan period, and present possible mitigation measures, where required.

Given the constraints on the highways network, it was emphasised in the presentation that sustainable transport measures will be vital to making development acceptable in planning terms. Developers will need to demonstrate that they have maximised opportunities to reduce car trips by promoting non-car journeys by:

- Contributing to sustainable transport routes eg diversion of existing bus routes/provision of new services to serve sites, potential to extend or improve existing walking and cycling routes;

- Planning for public transport, cycle and walking in the development of site layouts and proposals; and
- Maximising opportunities to connect into the existing network of walking and cycling routes to key destinations.

An overview of TfL's analysis of Central line capacity to 2041 was also included. The presentation concluded by outlining the next stages of modelling work, including further testing of sustainable transport options and identifying further options where feasible.

2.3 Education

Officers from ECC and consultants from Arup provided a presentation on education. This outlined the total primary and secondary FE requirements expected to arise over the Plan period.

An overview of the modelling work undertaken by ECC was provided, which included details on the child yield and other modelling assumptions in the absence of a detailed housing mix at this stage in the process. The County Council approach to schools planning through Forecast Planning Groups, which cover groups of schools across the District was outlined. The total primary and secondary school FE needs were identified for each Forecast Planning Group.

The presentation outlined possible options for school expansions to help meet this need, and the preference for delivery, including possible co-location with early years' providers.

The presentation concluded with a number of key points to advance the IDP work going forward:

- Ensure schools provision is sufficient to meet the needs associated with growth;
- Determine best/ suitable/ most sustainable location for any new schools;
- Avoid inefficient scenarios, such as a small primary school on every location and
- Reach an equitable position whereby each pays their share (including land value).

2.4 Health

Consultants from Arup provided a presentation on health infrastructure. This included an overview of existing healthcare infrastructure, and the newly arising GP requirements identified as part of the forecast modelling up until 2033. An overview of changing models of healthcare delivery was provided, including the 'scaling up' of primary and community services in order to provide more care outside of hospitals.

The presentation also provided update on the Princess Alexandra Hospital (PAH), and the ongoing discussions surrounding the scenarios being considered. This included progress on the Outline Business Case, and likely timescales for consideration.

The presentation concluded by providing the next steps needed within this work stream. This includes the need for further engagement with the CCG to identify suitable locations for future health facilities. Ongoing discussions with PAH will also be required as further details emerge on the redevelopment and relocation options.

2.5 Utilities

Consultants from Arup provided a presentation on utilities infrastructure, focusing on water and waste water. This focus was chosen as it has been the most significant issue raised through the consultation process. This included an overview of consultation undertaken with Thames Water to date, and a summary of their initial assessment for each settlement within the District. A brief up-date was provided on Thames Water's modelling of the cumulative impact of proposed growth on Rye Meads (which serves part of the District). Thames Water has stated that there is capacity up to 2026 but modelling is required to determine whether upgrades are required to serve growth beyond this period. This was followed by an overview of the work undertaken by Affinity Water to date, along with the consultation response from the Environment Agency (EA).

In relation to funding, it was stated that waste water process upgrades (ie sewage treatment works and associated infrastructure) are the full responsibility of the provider. Local network reinforcements necessary to deliver a particular site will be the responsibility of developers. Network reinforcements will be funded in line with Thames Waters' emerging charging framework.. For water supply, developers will be expected to contribute to the cost of the network infrastructure reinforcements and connections necessary to support the development of their site.

The presentation concluded by providing the next steps needed within this work stream. These were identified as receiving clarity from Thames Water and the EA on network capacity issues, and the timing of future modelling outputs. Going forward, Thames Water will carry out further work in relation to growth assumptions in neighbouring authorities, and encourage early engagement with developers.

2.6 Area-themed discussions

Following the infrastructure presentations, the non-strategic sites Developer Forum was split into three groups, reflecting key settlement growth areas across the District:

- Group 1 (sites in the South of the District): *Chigwell, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton*
- Group 2 (sites in the West of the District): *Waltham Abbey, Roydon and Nazeing*
- Group 3 (sites in the East of the District): *North Weald Bassett, Theydon Bois, Epping, Ongar, Sheering*

These area-based sessions were used to focus discussions around health, education and transport infrastructure. It was hoped that the sessions would provide site-specific detail on the infrastructure requirements for key settlements within these areas, and consider how these facilities could be delivered. It was also intended to understand the outputs of any work undertaken to date by land owners, promoters and developers in relation to infrastructure provision.

A number of discussion points were used to help capture settlement specific information in relation to infrastructure. These are set out in full in Appendix B.

Further detail on the key points of discussion for each area group are set out below:

Table 1: Group 1: Chigwell, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Actions
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Given the size of the sites represented in the discussion and the level of additional schools capacity required within the	

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Actions
Transport	<p>Forecast Planning Area, it was discussed that developer contributions would be the most appropriate method to meet the impact of development on education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sites represented are well-served by public transport, with a pedestrian link to Chigwell Station (although no segregated cycle route exists). • The possibility of enhancing cycle parking at the station was discussed. • There was support for provision of a hop-on bus service between sites serving the Chigwell area including site SR-0478B (given developer aspirations to deliver an element of adult social care on the site); however, a specific route was not discussed. 	
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions around opportunities for partnership between existing Chigwell Medical Centre and adult social care-related development promoted on site SR-0478B – e.g. opening up on-site pharmacy and treatment room(s) for wider use. 	

Table 2: Group 2: Waltham Abbey, Roydon and Nazeing

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Action
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a general discussion surrounding how land owners and promoters could consider infrastructure requirements, both in terms of ongoing engagement, emerging masterplanning and financial contributions. • It was also noted that minor footpath enhancements may be required to Roydon Primary School 	
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions surrounding Nazeing, and how connecting growth into the existing network is more challenging. There may be a need for improved crossing facilities and greater visibility at key junctions, to support growth. • Walking could be encouraged by improvements to the existing footpath network, to improve connectivity. • It was stressed that access to the network and sufficient access to local services should be prioritised as part of developments in these locations. • The Crooked Mile was identified as having significant local transport problems, including accidents. Broader discussions were held as to how contributions from a number of local sites could fund improvements on this stretch of road. • There were broader questions surrounding whether it is possible to pool developer contributions on a junction by junction basis. • There was a general consensus that in the more rural parts of the District, including Nazeing and Roydon, bus services were unlikely to provide a realistic alternative to private car use. 	
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that Roydon and Nazeing have more limited access to health services, and are often reliant on cross- 	

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Action
	<p>boundary provision. This includes travelling to Broxbourne. Capacity of GP services is an issue in this part of the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One landowner within this group presented plans for a new GP surgery in Roydon. The proposed facility included dental provision, and a range of other healthcare facilities co-located within the surgery. It was agreed that further consultation will be required with the CCG to see whether there is merit in this proposal. • It was agreed that the Roydon and Nazeing area could also benefit from local dental provision. • There is a need for further clarity on charging mechanisms associated with healthcare infrastructure. 	<p>Arup to follow up through further consultation with the CCG and health providers.</p>

Table 3: Group 3: North Weald Bassett, Theydon Bois, Epping, Ongar and Sheering

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Action
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was discussion about the process for determining appropriate locations for new schools. There was concern from the group that this should be led by EFDC and ECC. It was suggested that a site selection exercise should be undertaken. • It was confirmed that EFDC and ECC would lead this process taking into account existing school catchments, accessibility, availability and suitability of land and a range of other factors. This event is the start of the process and the opportunity for promoters to express their views. Part of this process would also involve an assessment of potential sites against ECC criteria. • There was some discussion about when and how potential sites would be assessed against ECC land compliance requirements. It was agreed that EFDC would approach relevant landowners/promoters once work was further progressed. • The group expressed concern that schools planning should be undertaken holistically and that movements across the District and cross boundary should be taken into account. • Several attendees requested clarification that existing capacity both in Epping and in neighbouring Districts had been properly accounted for. • There was some discussions surrounding potential locations for schools infrastructure across Epping and North Weald Bassett. • The discussion also included gauging if developers, land owners and promoters had begun engagement with providers or other sites in relation to infrastructure provision. • It was noted that St Andrews in North Weald Bassett had been expanded and that it currently took a significant number of pupils from Epping. ECC confirmed that these patterns of travel are accounted for within future projections and therefore this will not distort the requirements arising through the Local Plan. 	<p>ECC to provide greater clarity on the broad locations of search for primary school provision</p>

Infrastructure Type	Key Points of Discussion	Action
<p>Transport</p> <p>Health Utilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum members noted the potential issues regarding land take for a school and the commercial implications that this would give rise to. The principle of equalisation agreements was discussed, however the details of these would need to be determined at a later stage once a better understanding of the exact school requirements is understood. Some members of the forum expressed scepticism about the potential to ensure equitable equalisation across a large number of small sites. • There were discussions surrounding possible sustainable transport interventions that could help support growth in this area. This included the location of bus stops, and the potential for route diversions to serve key sites. There was also reference to enhancing the cycling and walking network, in line with ECC's Cycle Action Plan (2016). • It was confirmed that a number of site promoters have begun to undertake their own Transport Assessments for sites. • The group did not provide feedback on either of these two areas. 	

3 Conclusions/ next steps

The session ended with an overview of the next steps for the Local Plan, including:

- Further work identifying possible sites for facilities, especially schools and potential sustainable transport projects/improvements.
- Additional evidence base work (transport modelling, open space strategy input, sports and playing fields assessment)
- Working with site promoters through the non-strategic Developer Forum to identify priorities and undertake further work on viability.

Going forward, the importance of collaborative working was emphasised. Developing the IDP will be an iterative process and will require further engagement with the infrastructure providers at a number of further stages.

Further discussions will take place through the non-strategic sites Developer Forum and strategic masterplanning process where appropriate. Members of the Forum were encouraged to respond to the infrastructure pro forma issued by Arup, if they have not done so already.

The IDP will be up-dated on an iterative basis to reflect any changes to the housing allocations and trajectory as well as employment sites to be allocated as the Local Plan is progressed towards submission.

Appendix A

Agenda

Agenda

Figure A1: Non-strategic sites Developer Forum Agenda

Time	Session	Presenter
14.00 – 14:15	Introduction and Background	EFDC
14:15 – 15:00	Up-date on IDP and known infrastructure requirements	Arup
15.00 – 16:15	Discussion Groups: Group 1 (Sites in the South of the District): <i>Chigwell, Buckhurst Hill and Loughton.</i> Group 2 (Sites in the West of the District): <i>Waltham Abbey, Roydon and Nazeing.</i> Group 3 (Sites in the East of the District): <i>North Weald Bassett, Theydon Bois, Epping, Ongar, Sheering.</i>	Arup/EFDC
16:15 – 16:30	Summary Close	EFDC/Arup

Appendix B

Invites and Attendees

Appendix B: Invites and Attendees

Table B1: Hosts- Epping Forest District Council and Arup

Organisation/Department	Contact Name	Email
Epping Forest District Council	David Coleman	dcoleman@eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Epping Forest District Council	Alison Blom-Cooper	ablomcooper@eppingforestdc.gov.uk
Arup	Anna Richards	Anna.richards@arup.com
Arup	Dan Evans	Dan.Evans@arup.com
Arup	Emily Jones	Emily.jones@arup.com

Table B2: Invites and attendees

Contact name	Company/ organisation	Site [if applicable]	Attendance
Nigel Agg	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	SR-0003	
P Milazzo	UK Salads	SR-0011	
Kevin Ellerbeck	ELA Design	SR-0011	
Danny Simmonds	RPS	SR-0026b	
Rachel Bryan	Sworders	SR-0032, SR-0102	Yes
Clare Hutchinson	Sworders	SR-0033, SR-0035, SR-0036, SR-0311	Yes
Mrs E Webster	Whirledge & Nott	SR-0049	
Camilla Smyllie	Sworders	SR-0067	
Angus Hudson	Sworders	SR-0069	
Rachel Bryan	Sworders	SR-0070	
Michael and Janice Annetts		SR-0069/33	
Liz Fitzgerald	Vincent + Gorbing	SR-0071	Yes
Martin Friend			
Laura-Dudley-Smith	Strutt and Parker LLP	SR-0072	
Kevin Coleman	Phase 2 Planning	SR-0099	No
N D Chapman & Chris White	N D & E W Chapman	SR-0104	
Philip Copsy	David Lock Associates	SR-0113/b	
C. Brown	C/O Fairfield Partnership		Yes
Tim Waller	JB Planning Associates Ltd	SR-0120	
Olivier Spencer	AM Planning	SR0132/b/ci	Yes
Emma Walker			
Elaine Marsh		SR-0149	
Jane R Orsborn	Prospect Planning	SR-0150	

Contact name	Company/ organisation	Site [if applicable]	Attendance
Richard Seamark	Carter Jonas LLP	SR-0153	
Graham Bloomfield	Pigeon Investment	SR-0153	Yes
S Butler-Finbow			
Peter Banks	Peter Banks Associates	SR-0158A	
Andy Butcher	Strutt & Parker LLP	SR-0158A	Yes
Andrew Taylor	Countryside Properties	SR-0158A	
Stuart Anderson		SR-0169	
T M Nicholls	Leaside Leisure Ltd	SR-0169	Yes
Keith Harley	Keith Harley Associates	SR-0176	
David Moseley	Persimmon homes	SR-0184	
Stuart McAdam		SR-0185, SR-0186, SR-0208	
Mary Foster		SR-0195b	
Andrew Hodgson	Savills	SR-0197	
C Williams			Yes
	Transport for London	SR-0225, SR-0226, SR-0227, SR-0228i, SR-0228ii, SR-0229	
Alan Hall	EFDC	SR-0289	Yes
Mr John FJ Wilkinson & Mrs Linda CV Wilkinson		SR-0300	
Bruce Keeling		SR-0300a, SR-0300b	
Jenny Thompson		SR-0300a	Yes
		SR-0300b	
Adam Dias		SR-0333Bi	
Karim Pabani	EFDC	SR-0347, SR-0348, SR-0349, SR-0356, SR-0358, SR-0361, SR-0381, SR-0385, SR-0405, SR-0541, SR-	

Contact name	Company/ organisation	Site [if applicable]	Attendance
		0548, SR-0555, SR-0556, SR-0557, SR-0565, SR-0848, SR-0903	
Peter Heaney		SR-0390	
Mario Ttakoushis	Lindhill Developments		
Garry Fitzpatrick	Lindhill Developments		
WHC Hoare		SR-0404	
Martin Eldred	Eldred Group	SR-0417	Yes
Mr G A Smith	Lambert Smith Hampton	SR-0433	
Mrs Annetts		SR-0445	
Sally Newton		SR-0473	
Paul Wisbey			
M. Scott Properties Ltd	Strutt & Parker LLP	SR-0478B	
John Scott		SR-0512	
	NLP on behalf of Higgins Homes Plc	SR-0527	
Mr Reginald Mark Lemon	Epping Sanitary Steam Laundry Co. Ltd	SR-0587	
Mr Martin Moss		SR-0588	
Jessica McSweeney	Carter Jonas LLP	SR-0601	
Mary Simons	Simons & Sons Launderettes Limited	SR-0813	
Rory Anderson	Anderson Group	SR-0878	
Nicholas North		SR-0878	
Ben Thomas	Savills	SR-0890	
Thomas McCaughan	BB Partnership Ltd	SR-0894	
Catriona Fraser	GL Hearn	SR-0895	
Matthew McFarran	BB Partnership Ltd	SR-0896	
Adam Barnett	BB Partnership Ltd	SR-0898	

Contact name	Company/ organisation	Site [if applicable]	Attendance
Sam Hollingworth	Strutt & Parker LLP	SR-0890	
Peter Cook	Essex CC		
Rich Cooke	Essex CC		
Matthew Jericho	Essex CC		
David Sprunt	Essex CC		Yes
Mary Young	Essex CC		
Simon Hughes	Essex CC		
Gwyn Owen	Essex CC		
James Wood	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of ECC		
Nicky McHugh	Thames Water	Water and Wastewater	
Graeme Kasselmann	Thames Water	Water and Wastewater	Yes
Michael Collin	Affinity Water	Water	
Filipe Estacio	Affinity Water	Water	
Blaise Gammie	ECC	Education	Yes
Zunaid Vawda	TfL	Transport	
Gareth Fairweather	TfL	Transport	
Geoff Roberts	West Essex CCG	Health	
Mark Norman	Highways England	Transport	
Susie Cobos-Hartle	Affinity Water	Water	Yes
Hernandez Cubero, Nuria	Affinity Water	Water	Yes
Simon Jones	Jacobs (for ECC)	Transport	Yes

Appendix C

Discussion questions

C1 Area-specific infrastructure questions

Group 1 questions

Education:

- Have you considered the likely demand for primary and secondary school places as a result of your development, either in isolation or in combination with other developments in the vicinity?
- What are your current thoughts about how you will mitigate the impacts of their development in relation to education?
- How does this link in with plans of other promoters in the vicinity of their site? How can we ensure a joined up approach to future provision? (Which site or sites should accommodate new school requirements? If applicable)
- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to education?
- How should sites help to ensure safe access to new schools?

Transport:

- Re-affirm the importance of sustainable transport measures in the acceptability of the sites from a transport perspective.
- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to transport (road, rail, public transport, cycling and walking)? Particularly bus providers.
- What is your understanding of the transport interventions that are likely to be required to deliver your site?
- Where is there potential for increased bus service frequencies, diversion of routes, or new services to serve planned development?
- Have you considered which bus routes serve you development and how to integrate bus routes and bus stops into your development where appropriate?
- There is potential to improve cycle and walking links to town centres, stations and other key destinations. Have you considered how your site could contribute to this by providing safe routes within the development and links to existing routes where appropriate?
- How can we ensure a joined up approach to provision? Have you considered measures jointly with other sites in the vicinity?
- Are there opportunities for peak demand management in relation to Central Line and its car parks through the sites?

Health:

- Have you given any consideration to the demand for health facilities as a result of your development? How will this demand be met?
- What engagement has been undertaken with West Essex CCG, GP surgeries or other stakeholders in relation to health?

- How can sites work together to ensure adequate health facilities to meet future needs?
- Analysis suggests surgeries at Chigwell (Chigwell Medical Centre), Loughton (Loughton Health Centre) and Buckhurst Hill (River Surgery) are currently operating over capacity and the cumulative impact of growth is likely to require expansions.

Utilities:

- Have you considered the capacity of waste water and water supply infrastructure to serve your development and have you had any consultation with the relevant providers?
- What is your understanding of any utilities upgrades that are likely to be required to deliver your site?

Group 2 questions

Education:

- Have you considered the likely demand for primary and secondary school places as a result of your development, either in isolation or in combination with other developments in the vicinity?
- What are your current thoughts about how you will mitigate the impacts of their development in relation to education?
- How does this link in with plans of other promoters in the vicinity of their site? How can we ensure a joined up approach to future provision? (Which site or sites should accommodate new school requirements? If applicable)
- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to education?
- How should sites help to ensure safe access to new schools?

Transport:

- Re-affirm the importance of sustainable transport measures in the acceptability of the sites from a transport perspective.
- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to transport (road, rail, public transport, cycling and walking)? Particularly bus providers.
- What is your understanding of the transport interventions that are likely to be required to deliver your site?
- Where is there potential for increased bus service frequencies, diversion of routes, or new services to serve planned development?
- Have you considered which bus routes serve you development and how to integrate bus routes and bus stops into your development where appropriate?
- There is potential to improve cycle and walking links to town centres, stations and other key destinations. Have you considered how your site could contribute to this by providing safe routes within the development and links to existing routes where appropriate?

- How can we ensure a joined up approach to provision? Have you considered measures jointly which other sites in the vicinity?

Health:

- Have you given any consideration to the demand for health facilities as a result of your development? How will this demand be met?
- What engagement has been undertaken with West Essex CCG, GP surgeries or other stakeholders in relation to health?
- How can sites work together to ensure adequate health facilities to meet future needs?
- Analysis suggests surgeries at Waltham Abbey (Market Square Surgery, The Medical Practice), are currently operating over capacity and the cumulative impact of growth is likely to require expansions.

Utilities:

- Have you considered the capacity of waste water and water supply infrastructure to serve your development and have you had any consultation with the relevant providers?
- What is your understanding of any utilities upgrades that are likely to be required to deliver your site?

Group 3 questions

Education:

- Have you considered the likely demand for primary and secondary school places as a result of your development, either in isolation or in combination with other developments in the vicinity?
- What are your current thoughts about how you will mitigate the impacts of their development in relation to education?
- How does this link in with plans of other promoters in the vicinity of their site? How can we ensure a joined up approach to future provision? (Which site or sites should accommodate new school requirements? If applicable)
- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to education?
- Analysis by ECC highlights the need for a new primary school (2.1ha site) in Epping, and one in North Weald Bassett (2.1ha site).
- The analysis also suggest there will be significant pressure on secondary schools in the Epping area which might it might not be possible to meet through expansions to existing schools.
- What are your views on where these new schools might be located?
- Does any equalisation need to occur?
- How should other sites be linked to ensure safe access to new schools?

Transport:

- Re-affirm the importance of sustainable transport measures in the acceptability of the sites from a transport perspective.

- What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to transport (road, rail, public transport, cycling and walking)? Particular with bus operators.
- What is your understanding of the transport interventions that are likely to be required to deliver your site?
- Where is there potential for increased bus service frequencies, diversion of routes, or new services to serve planned development?
- Have you considered which bus routes serve you development and how to integrate bus routes and bus stops into your development where appropriate?
- There is potential to improve cycle and walking links to town centres, stations and other key destinations. Have you considered how your site could contribute to this by providing safe routes within the development and links to existing routes where appropriate?
- How can the sites be linked to and integrated into existing walking and cycling routes to town centres and train stations / Central Line stations?
- How can we ensure a joined up approach to provision? Have you considered measures jointly with other sites in the vicinity?
- What are the opportunities to increase bus services to Epping and Harlow from North Weald Bassett?
- Are there opportunities for peak demand management in relation to Central Line and its car parks through the sites?

Health:

- Have you given any consideration to the demand for health facilities as a result of your development? How will this demand be met?
- What engagement has been undertaken with West Essex CCG, GP surgeries or other stakeholders in relation to health?
- How can sites work together to ensure adequate health facilities to meet future needs?
- Analysis suggests some surgeries are operating over capacity in Epping and the cumulative impact of growth is likely to require expansions or even new facilities.
- The Limes Medical Centre, Epping, are looking to expand to a double extension building.
- Is there potential/need for a new health centre in North Weald Bassett?
- What is the impact of the potential relocation of PAH? (E.g. knock-on impacts on St Margaret's).

Utilities:

- Have you considered the capacity of waste water and water supply infrastructure to serve your development and have you had any consultation with the relevant providers?
- What is your understanding of any utilities upgrades that are likely to be required to deliver your site?

D1 Developers' Forum Survey Pro-forma

ARUP



Epping Forest District Council Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan: Developers' Forum Survey

Epping Forest District Council is preparing a new Local Plan, which will set out the policies that will guide development in the District up to 2033. Arup are currently producing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will support the emerging Local Plan. The purpose of the IDP is to assess the suitability of existing infrastructure provision and identify the infrastructure investment required to support growth.

The Draft IDP was published to support the draft Local Plan consultation in Autumn 2016, and can be found at: <http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/>. Following the consultation, work is now being undertaken to finalise the IDP and inform the Local Plan. This includes further engagement with infrastructure providers, developers and other key stakeholders.

You have been invited to attend a dedicated Developers' Forum to discuss infrastructure in relation to your site(s). In order to guide discussion at the Forum, this survey asks a series of questions relating to the provision of different types of infrastructure. Please complete the survey to the best of your knowledge and in as much detail as possible. You may wish to provide additional documents to support your response.

Please return this survey by **23 May 2017** to Dan Evans at Arup via dan.evans@arup.com or 13 Fitzroy Street, London, W1T 4BQ.

Date:	
Name:	
Contact Details:	
Organisation:	
Site name(s):	

Status of proposals

- 1 The draft Local Plan proposes a number of dwellings for your site(s) (available here: <http://eppingforest.consultationonline.co.uk/>). Do you think the draft Local Plan accurately reflects what your site(s) might deliver?
[Enter response here]
- 2 The draft Local Plan included assumptions relating to the phasing for your site(s). Does this reflect your current position?
How many dwellings are expected to be delivered in the first five years?

[Enter response here]

Transport

3a What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to transport (road, rail, public transport, cycling and walking)?

[Enter response here]

3b Have you undertaken/commissioned any preliminary transport modelling in relation to your site? If so, please provide details.

[Enter response here]

3c What is your understanding of the transport interventions that are likely to be required to deliver your site?

[Enter response here]

3d What will be delivered as part of your scheme in relation to transport?

[Enter response here]

Utilities

4a What engagement has been undertaken with providers or other stakeholders to date in relation to utilities (water, wastewater, electricity, gas and broadband)?

[Enter response here]

4b What is your understanding of any utilities upgrades that are likely to be required to deliver your site?

[Enter response here]

4c What will be delivered as part of your scheme in relation to utilities?

[Enter response here]

Education

5a What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council or other stakeholders to date in relation to education (early years, primary education and secondary education)?

[Enter response here]

5b Will any education facilities be provided as part of your scheme? If not, how will the demand generated from your scheme be met?

[Enter response here]

Health

6a What engagement has been undertaken with West Essex Clinical Commissioning Group or other stakeholders to date in relation to healthcare facilities?

[Enter response here]

6b What will be delivered as part of your scheme in relation to healthcare facilities? Does this meet the full demand generated from your scheme? If not, how will the demand be met?

[Enter response here]

Community facilities

7a What engagement has been undertaken with Essex County Council, parish and town councils, or other stakeholders to date in relation to community facilities (adult social care, community centres/halls, libraries, sports facilities)?

[Enter response here]

7b What will be delivered as part of your scheme in relation to community facilities? Does this meet the full demand generated from your scheme? If not, how will the demand be met?

[Enter response here]

Open space and green infrastructure

8a What engagement has been undertaken with Epping Forest District Council other stakeholders to date in relation to open space and green infrastructure?

[Enter response here]

8b What will be delivered as part of your scheme in relation to open space and green infrastructure? Does this meet the full demand generated from your scheme? If not, how will the demand be met?

[Enter response here]

Other comments

9 Has any other work relating to your site(s) been undertaken? Is there anything else we should know ahead of the Developers' Forum?
[Enter response here]

