

Epping Forest District Council Representations to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	3426	Name	Rich Cooke	Essex County Council
----------------	------	------	------------	----------------------

Method	Email
--------	-------

Date	20/1/2017
------	-----------

This document has been created using information from the Council's database of responses to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016. Some elements of the full response such as formatting and images may not appear accurately. Should you wish to review the original response, please contact the Planning Policy team: ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Letter or Email Response:

1. INTRODUCTION Essex County Council (ECC) supports the preparation of a new Local Plan for Epping Forest District Council (Epping Forest DC) and welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Epping Forest District Local Plan (Regulation 18 consultation, October to December 2016) (the Draft Plan). A Local Plan, by setting out a vision and policies for the long-term planning and development of the district, should provide a platform from which to secure a sustainable economic, social and environmental future to the benefit of its residents, businesses and visitors. A robust long-term strategy will provide a reliable basis on which ECC and its partners may plan future service provision and required community infrastructure for which they are responsible. ECC will continue to use its best endeavours to assist Epping Forest DC on strategic and cross-boundary matters under the duty to cooperate, including engagement and co-operation with other organisations for which those issues may have relevance. The following is the response from ECC to the Draft Plan covering matters relevant to ECC's statutory service provision and its function as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The response does not cover ECC as a landowner and/or prospective developer. A separate response will be made on these matters (if relevant) and that response should be treated in the same way as a response from other developers and/or landholders. For ease the ECC response will work through each of the chapters set out in the Draft Plan, and indicate where acknowledgements, recommendations and alterations are sought. This is preceded by commentary on the duty to cooperate.

2. DUTY TO CO-OPERATE ECC acknowledges the production of the Draft Plan consultation by Epping Forest DC. ECC supports the key strategic issues that Chapter 3 seeks to address, namely implementing the vision for the London Stansted Cambridge Corridor Core Area; providing for homes and jobs within the district and linked to the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market and Functional Economic Market Area; supporting the Lee Valley Regional Park vision; the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment and need for high quality design; provision and improvement of infrastructure for transport and broadband; provision of education, health, community and cultural infrastructure; plus responding effectively to climate change and flood risk. The PPG makes it clear that the duty to cooperate requires cooperation in two tier local planning authority areas and states 'Close cooperation between district local planning authorities and county councils in two tier local planning authority areas will be critical to ensure that both tiers are effective when planning for strategic matters such as minerals, waste, transport and education.' (Paragraph: 014, Reference ID: 9-014-20140306). Governance for the collaborative Local Plan work and meeting the Duty to Cooperate is provided by the Cooperation for Sustainable Development Board (covering West Essex local authorities and East Hertfordshire DC), including Member representatives from each local authority, including ECC and Hertfordshire County Council and supported by officers. The meetings are convened on a monthly basis and Councillor Page attends for ECC. The Board

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Stakeholder ID	3426	Name	Rich Cooke
----------------	------	------	------------

has been instrumental in managing collective decisions over key issues for the Housing Market Area. Examples of these are the agreement of the overall objectively assessed development needs (particularly on housing numbers), the spatial distribution of these between districts and the overall growth strategy, which focuses development in and around Harlow, as the most sustainable location. That growth (of over 16,000 homes) is to be located not only within Harlow itself, but also within Epping Forest and East Herts districts. The Harlow growth is being supported by a wealth of collectively prepared evidence (such as the Harlow Strategic Sites study) and is being planned to provide a series of high quality new communities designed on Garden City principles. This has been coordinated by the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town bid to central government for funding to help plan and deliver the growth outlined in local plans. This growth necessitates some key transport interventions such as the M11 junction 7 improvements, new junction 7A and the River Stort crossing improvements. ECC has and will continue to play a key role in developing and promoting the evidence base, particularly for transport measures. In preparing its Draft Local Plan ECC has assisted Epping Forest DC in the following:

- Commissioning joint evidence base documents as required.
 - o Joint evidence base: The Epping Local Plan Highway Impact Assessment (Technical Notes 1-8) (2013- onwards) and detailed junction modelling.
 - o Highway evidence for Harlow strategic sites and Epping Forest DC growth strategy - including: Local Bus Service Assessment and Priority Policy 2015 to 2020, Essex County Council (2016); Essex Transport Strategy: the Local Transport Plan for Essex (2011); also The Epping Local Plan Highway Impact Assessment (Technical Notes 1-8)(2013- onwards).
 - o Submission of SELEP (Round 3) Single Local Growth Fund Bids for highway improvement schemes, focused on Harlow and M11 J8.
 - o Evidence base by ECC: Minerals Safeguarding Assessment (2016).
 - o Statutory Plans: Essex Minerals Local Plan (July 2014) and Essex and Southend-on-Sea Replacement Waste Local Plan (examination hearings concluded in October 2016).
- Joint meetings with relevant authorities as and when required.
 - o Joint meetings have been held with Highways England (HE); the West Essex Transport Board; ECC Community Infrastructure Group; and as part of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town proposals, in addition to regular Local Plan / Duty to Cooperate meetings.
 - o Joint work to inform the Department for Transport (DfT) and Highways England's Road Investment Strategy (RIS): 2015 to 2020.
- Three Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) have been drafted between the local authorities where significant strategic issues need to be resolved and ECC has played an active role within their preparation. ECC will be a signatory, along with the West Essex local authorities (Epping Forest, Harlow, Uttlesford), East Herts DC, and Hertfordshire County Council, to the 'Memorandum of Understanding: Strategic Highways and Transportation Infrastructure' (MOU). This covers agreed priorities and approach to the key transport interventions across the area. ECC will be a signatory along with Epping Forest DC, and the above partners (plus the City of London Corporation and Natural England) to the MOU, which aims to monitor and manage the impacts of growth on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). ECC as Highway Authority has outlined its support (but as a non-signatory) to a further over-arching MOU, dealing with the overall approach to meeting objectively assessed growth needs for the West Essex/East Hertfordshire Housing Market (and Functional Economic Market) Area and its overall spatial distribution. The three MOU's form part of the supporting material for the current consultation, as publicised by Epping Forest DC. One of the key ways in which the range of potential Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) spatial distribution options was analysed and decisions on this made was through strategic transport modelling undertaken by ECC.
- Pre-consultation during the production of the new Local Plan and other relevant local plan documents. ECC, as Highway Authority, Education Authority, Lead Local Flood Authority, and Minerals and Waste Planning Authority (MWPA) provides pre-application advice and responses to planning applications, and potential new Local Plan allocations. Interim advice on the capacity of education facilities, highway impacts and mineral issues has been provided to inform the Draft Plan. As regards highway matters ECC has assisted the preparation of the Draft Plan by undertaking the transport modelling for the strategic sites in and around Harlow. This has informed plan preparation for Epping Forest DC, Harlow Council, and East Herts DC. ECC has also undertaken transport modelling for 'non-strategic' sites to assess local-level issues. ECC will continue to assess the impact of growth on the highway network serving Epping Forest district and its neighbours, and identify where mitigation is required and how it can be funded and delivered. ECC will continue to provide information to inform the evolving Epping Forest DC Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP will need to support the Pre-Submission Plan, and identify infrastructure required arising from growth proposals. ECC will continue to assist Epping Forest DC in identifying requirements arising from the growth proposals as the Draft Plan is reviewed following this round of public consultation. This relates to our role as a provider of key services and subject to statutory responsibilities, for example minerals and waste; highways, education (primary, secondary, and early years and childcare), flood and water management, and adult social care.

3. DRAFT EPPING FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION Paragraph 1.4 General - Minerals & Waste

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Planning Epping Forest DC is required to aid ECC in the implementation of the Essex Minerals Local Plan (MLP) 2014, Policy 8 - Safeguarding mineral resources and mineral reserves and the emerging Essex and Southend-on-Sea Waste Local Plan (WLP), Policy 2 - Safeguarding Waste Management Sites and Infrastructure. Both policies request that the MWPA is consulted on applications relating to non-mineral and waste developments within 250m of an existing mineral or waste use, and (as relevant to Epping Forest DC) on development proposals over 5ha that are located, at least partially, on the sand and gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area. As the recipient of such applications, ECC are reliant on Epping Forest DC for such notification. The emerging Epping Forest Local Plan should make mention of Policy S8 of the MLP 2014 and the emerging WLP Policy 2, the latter of which is expected to form an adopted policy in mid-2017. ECC requests that this requirement is inserted within an appropriate section of the Draft Plan in order that promoters of non-mineral and waste development are aware of the requirements of the wider Development Plan, which includes the MLP and WLP. The above process has been communicated to Epping Forest DC as part of liaison meetings at both the Essex Planning Officers' Association and as part of the ongoing Duty to Co-operate. There is no expectation that the above policies would be reproduced in the Epping Forest District Local Plan. However, it is considered useful that the Local Plan refers specifically to the above policies. It is also requested that the emerging Local Plan make reference to the fact that ECC in its role as MWPA would be a consultee on applications relating to non-mineral and waste developments within 250m of an existing mineral or waste use, and (as relevant to Epping Forest DC) on development proposals over 5ha that are located, at least partially, on the sand and gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area. The above is particularly important when windfall or other such sites are promoted which are not already allocated in the emerging Local Plan. As agreed (at previous Duty to Cooperate meetings), GIS information relating to the spatial extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Area and the location of mineral and waste developments will be periodically issued to Epping Forest DC. These layers would then form part of the constraint mapping applied to standard Development Management procedures. An amendment is also required to provide a factual update in relation to the preparation of the Replacement WLP. There is a need to amend the part of the paragraph relating to roles and responsibilities. The Essex MLP 2014 and Essex and Southend WLP 2001 (and its forthcoming replacement) are part of the Development Plan in Epping Forest and therefore Epping Forest DC has a responsibility for ensuring that the policies in these plans are adhered to. The above is particularly relevant with regard to the implementation of mineral and waste safeguarding (Please see the above explanatory text under 'General - Minerals & Waste Planning section'). ECC suggests a change - amend to read: "Minerals and Waste policy is produced by Essex County Council although Epping Forest District Council shares a responsibility in its implementation as it is part of the wider Development Plan. The current Minerals Plan was adopted in July 2014 whilst a replacement Waste Plan is expected to be adopted in mid-2017. More information can be found on the Essex County Council website." CHAPTER 2: SETTING THE SCENE Paragraph 2.3 and paragraph 2.7 Paragraph 2.3 states 2011 census: 124,660 population and close to 54,400 dwellings; paragraph 2.7 says roughly 52,000 households in 2011. Change needed: Correct discrepancy or explain the reason for the differences. Paragraph 2.31 It is noted there are high numbers of commuters travelling out of Epping Forest DC (approximately 50%). ECC Public Health would recommend Epping Forest DC work with West Essex Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to ensure that the health needs of this group are met through commuter clinics etc., as they may not be able to access services during normal working hours. This could be reflected in the IDP. In response, the ECC suggestion is to consider working with the CCG / National Health Service / Public Health commissioned providers to ensure provision for the health needs of those working outside the area and outside of normal working hours. Paragraph 2.33 / Figure 2.17 Comment - high levels of education, health, public administration workers are employed within the area. Accordingly, provision for key worker homes should be considered within local plan housing policies. Additional information: Key worker homes may be applicable under housing affordability policy (with a specific mention to this). Paragraph 2.51 ECC agrees and supports the key issues as identified at paragraph 2.51, including the second bullet point in stating that the planned growth for the district will need to be supported by necessary infrastructure. This is expanded on by the later point stating that addressing the transport needs of current and future populations is a key issue, together with other infrastructure needs such as health, education, community spaces, etc. These also highlight the recognised need for significant regeneration of Harlow and the Draft Plan helps to promote this objective through its growth strategy and planned allocation of nearly 4,000 new homes near the Harlow border. As a mainly rural district, ECC recognises Epping Forest DC's ongoing support for the work of the Essex Rural Partnership. ECC commends the 'Essex Rural Strategy 2016-2020', (RCCE 2016) and its successor documents published by the Essex Rural Partnership to Epping Forest DC to help inform the emerging Local Plan. This will help promote vibrant, mixed and sustainable rural communities. Elements of the Epping Forest DC planned growth for rural areas and policies such as H 2 and H 3 (for

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

affordable homes and rural exceptions sites) could be anticipated to support these objectives. It is positive that the Draft Plan recognises that climate change is an important key issue that will need to be addressed through the draft policies and plan proposals. This meets the requirements set out by the NPPF for Local Plans to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the framework and to set out the strategic priorities and policies for the area, this included strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the Climate Change Act 2008.

CHAPTER 3: STRATEGIC POLICIES OF THE LOCAL PLAN Paragraph 3.11 ECC is supportive of the vision set out for the London Stansted Cambridge Corridor (LSCC) Core Area. ECC supports the specific inclusion of the LSCC as a driver for economic growth and job creation. This vision places the district within its broader context and identifies a range of key objectives that have been developed to promote the LSCC area. The vision emphasises the need to support the corridor's economic performance and housing delivery, as well as the need to safeguard its special character. The key major infrastructure investments identified are also considered appropriate, including rail capacity improvements, the opportunities of Crossrail 2, improvements to the M11 and other key routes (such as the A414, A120 and M25, plus superfast broadband. The vision also cites the importance of Harlow's regeneration and its future sustainable growth. ECC is supportive in regard to 'working with partners to protect and enhance the high quality environment, its unique landscapes and places of special wildlife value' (fourth bullet point). ECC agrees with the vision that there should be measures to conserve high biodiversity and to provide greater opportunities for more sustainable access to nature.

There is also the need to avoid creating fragmented and isolated pockets of habitats to prevent the degradation of the natural environment and biodiversity. Therefore it is important to provide appropriate mitigation where areas of green spaces and natural environment are going to be lost due to unavoidable development. This could be that the development proposal includes the creation of wildlife corridor networks to prevent fragmentation and that appropriate design features are incorporated to provide new habitat or contribute to existing local habitats, as well as measures to identify to protect species rich and local habitats of importance. This approach should be considered and encouraged in all new developments and reflected in master plans for the large sites near the Harlow border.

Paragraph 3.26 Draft Plan Objectives ECC supports the stated Plan objectives, including those to meet in full the objectively assessed growth needs (including those for new homes, jobs and the needs of businesses). Related to these growth requirements, ECC supports those objectives covering infrastructure and movement, plus sustainable transport and telecommunications such as superfast broadband. The link between sustainable transport with healthy / active lifestyles is supported. It is also positive that the need to address climate change and flood risk has been included in the Plan objectives. It is important to ensure a clear and explicit link between the Plan's overall vision, objectives and the key policies / strategies that will aim to deliver these. Accordingly, the objectives most relevant to each policy could be identified within their preamble. To strengthen the vision regarding Epping Forest DC's commitment to address the impacts from climate change and meet the requirements of NPPF, the Local Plan should consider adding under Part E of the Draft Plan Objective:

- 'Development will be planned to minimise the vulnerability to climate change impacts and that such development will not exacerbate vulnerability in other areas.
- Green infrastructure to be used as a way of adapting and mitigating for climate change through the management and enhancement of existing habitats and the creation of new habitats to assist with species migration, to provide shade during higher temperatures and for flood mitigation.'

Health and wellbeing The Draft Plan does not include an explicit policy on health and wellbeing within the main body of the plan. Although, as mentioned, health is generally good within Epping Forest district, maintaining and improving health is a part of the NPPF. This would include addressing physical activity and obesity issues in the population. For example, no mention has been made regarding fast food outlets etc. (A5 use). It is recommended that Epping Forest DC consider incorporating a wider health and wellbeing policy or Supplementary Planning Document that supports the draft local plan. It is also recommended that reference is made to the most up-to-date health profiles from Essex Insights and Public Health England (see web links at the end of this response).

Paragraphs 3.31 – 3.32 ECC supports the proposed approach: It is encouraging that the Strategic Policies set out the approach to the natural environment and green infrastructure, as well as addressing sustainable development and climate change. The policies also state that these are viewed as important within the context of the development in the district and that it is stated that this section should be read in conjunction with Chapters 5 and 6. Making this link helps ensure that these considerations are less likely to be overlooked and should be considered as part of all development proposals. Paragraph 3.48 The last sentence needs the following word to be inserted: "... (NPPF, paragraph 47) whilst taking account of infrastructure and environmental constraints." Paragraph 3.50 The text refers to transport modelling having been undertaken to demonstrate that between 14,000 – 17,000 new homes could be accommodated over the Plan period, provided that the required package of mitigation measures are provided

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

(including those referred to in the Highways and Transport Infrastructure MOU). This is an important point in the consideration of the growth strategy and strategic sites at Harlow and supports the currently identified proposed approach. This reference is supported and should be retained to support the Plan's stated growth strategy. Paragraph 3.53 The paragraph text should refer to Princess Alexandra Hospital site. ECC raise a concern that the relocation of PAH is treated as a given, which has implications for the level of homes that could be delivered around Harlow if the move did not happen (for approximately 675 homes). Paragraph 3.55 / Figure 3.5 The last line of the table text states: "Remaining requirement to be provided 4,550 plus reserve sites". The issue that ECC raises on this is that the Draft Plan lacks clarity on these reserve sites, their role, status and location. This is not mentioned or explained anywhere in the Draft Plan text. The Pre-Submission Plan will need to be clear on the purpose of the reserve sites (justified) and whether the sites have been included in the supporting evidence i.e. sustainability appraisal, transport modelling and the Draft IDP. Paragraph 3.62 & 3.63 The cross reference in paragraph 3.63 to paragraph 3.49 is wrong, this should instead be to paragraph 3.48. Paragraph 3.48 refers to the OAHN and CLG housing levels being lower than that Epping Forest DC is proposing - this may potentially be what is meant by having reserve sites/exceedance but it is not clear. This would not apply and be justified if paragraph 3.48 also refers to the latest ORS projections as being higher than the proposed housing provision. Paragraph 3.67 The text states: "The analysis suggests that there is potential for growth to the south, although the ridge line is an important boundary that should not be breached. Sites to the west of Harlow offer greater suitability for growth ... and local transport concerns can be mitigated." ECC advise that local transport issues have not been flagged up in this section in relation to the southern strategic site, only the western sites. ECC further advises that these issues have been considered carefully through the evidence base preparation and in particular, the transport modelling carried out to date. This work has confirmed that the planned growth levels and proposed strategic sites can be accommodated provided an identified and agreed package of transport measures is delivered. Policy SP 3 Strategic Allocations around Harlow Please note that these comments will need to be considered for the Local Plan, the associated IDP and supporting strategic masterplans. For future educational provision, it is recommended that further advice is sought from ECC as the Plan and its proposals progress and refine further. Primary Education: The planned provision of 3,900 homes would require approximately 6 forms of entry of primary school capacity. New schools should be no smaller than two forms of entry. This extra provision could either be achieved by two 3 form entry primary schools, or three 2 form entry primary schools, and as such school sites should be safeguarded in the plans for new development for this purpose. Access to school sites will likely be required in the early phases of development, as there is little or no spare capacity forecast at primary level in Harlow. See more detailed comments contained under Chapter 9 of this response. Secondary Education: This level of development would require between five and six forms of entry of secondary school provision, which would potentially necessitate a new secondary school, as existing schools would not have the capacity to expand to accommodate this. A school site should be safeguarded in plans for new development for this purpose, with a site area that may need to be oversized to accommodate a larger school than the five or six forms indicated, in order to accommodate growth arising from other developments in and around Harlow (please note it is not viable to open multiple small schools). See more detailed comments contained under Chapter 9 of this response. Policy SP 3 (B) Clarification is sought by ECC on the intended / stated meaning and scope of this: This currently states: "Sites must also provide the necessary infrastructure including highways and transport infrastructure (as identified in the relevant Memorandum of Understanding), schools, health, open space and green infrastructure provision." It is not clear from this statement whether the intention is that this wording restricts the highways and transport infrastructure to that already identified in the highways and transport infrastructure MOU. Alternatively, it may be intended to mean that additional required infrastructure beyond that (as stated above) may subsequently be identified. Clarity is sought on this issue. Paragraph 3.70 / Figure 3.6 (Harlow) The map illustration does not have a key indicating what the coloured patches within the strategic sites on the map allude. The map should be amended accordingly to provide an explanation of these. Paragraph 3.74 / Key Evidence It is recommended that this section makes reference to the Historic Environment Character Assessment prepared and provided by ECC Place Services. This has application to the place shaping aims and requirements of Policy SP 4 that will apply across all new development for which that the Local Plan provides. Policy SP 4 Place Shaping In principle ECC is supportive of this draft policy and agrees with the reasoning presented on why the alternative option of not to include a Place Shaping Policy should not be considered. This policy will help to ensure developments meet a certain design quality standard. With the removal of Code for Sustainable Homes, this gives the District Council the opportunity to set its own locally determined housing (sustainability) standards, provided suitable justification is shown. It is positive that this policy includes a set of principles that a development should adhere to in order to be considered acceptable,

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

with regards to high quality design and access to green spaces. However, there is the potential to include a requirement and ensure that the development addresses climate change, therefore meeting the Local Plan's objectives. The terms of this policy should apply to consideration of future climate risks when Epping Forest DC is allocating development sites to ensure risks are understood over the development's lifetime. Some elements of this may be captured under bullet point v: 'provide high quality and imaginatively designed homes with gardens or access to usable and accessible amenity space, combining the very best of town and country living to create healthy homes in vibrant communities;' In order to provide an explicit and specific reference, the following suggested additional wording is suggested at the end of Part A of the policy: xv. Developments are designed to high sustainable standard that considers adaptation and mitigation approaches to address climate change. ECC advise that positive place shaping principles also support many public health approaches, including access to green space, connection of communities and sustainable travel. This also applies to other draft Local Plan policies that include place shaping provisions (H 2, DM 9 and DM 10). Policy SP 5: Green Belt and District Open Land As mentioned elsewhere, ECC notes that a Green Belt review has been carried out for the preparation of the Local Plan. ECC recommends that within this review context and that of a Local Plan proposing Green Belt review and boundary revisions (within the terms of the NPPF, paragraphs 83-85) it would be beneficial to consider either the Green Belt boundary revisions (to ensure rational, defensible boundaries for the future) and / or making Local Plan policy to provide positive support for the improvement and expansion of existing schools. Schools evolve over time to reflect changes in educational practice and operational requirements that better meet, and improve, future educational quality and standards. This results in proposals for remodelling and reconfiguration of school sites that are likely to require extension of buildings beyond the existing built footprint on school sites. It may not be possible to obtain the required educational outcomes without using parts of school playing fields which may be designated also as lying within the Green Belt. In addition, it is clear from ECC's wider representations regarding additional, future educational provision needs, that school expansion will be necessary. In many cases, this will represent the most sustainable and more deliverable solution, potentially in preference to the provision of entirely new schools (also within the context of a constrained Green Belt district). Policy SP 6: The Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Green Infrastructure It is positive that the Draft Plan recognises the key role the natural environment has to assist the Council's response to both mitigate and adapt to a changing climate. It is agreed that the two alternative options (on page 102) would not provide a preferred approach. The policy approach is also supported as positive, since access to green and blue infrastructure has positive impacts on health, including mental health, physical activity opportunities across the life-course and social interaction amongst communities. CHAPTER 4: DISTRICT WIDE POLICIES Policy H 1 Housing Mix ECC supports the provision of lifetime homes. Mention is made of Active Design in supporting documents but it is not mentioned within the policy itself. Other principles that could be applied would include 'HAPPI' (Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation). See weblink below; http://www.housinglin.org.uk/Topics/browse/Design_building/HAPPI/ ECC suggest additional content for this section: This could include a mention of Active Design principles and design to support physical activity and addressing the obesogenic environment that is becoming increasingly common. It would be beneficial to consider including reference(s) to other housing design principles that support health, such as 'HAPPI' or alternative design for homes, including wheelchair adaptable and flexi-care where applicable. Independent Living and Accessibility: Whilst the Draft Plan makes reference (at paragraph 4.2 to 'specialist housing requirements'), it does not make any specific reference to evidence or requirements in relation to the Independent Living needs of adults with disabilities (AWD). The Independent Living programme led by ECC seeks to address this and is making available a series of documents to enable effective delivery in this area, including: Evidence base document; Planning position statement; and Market position statement. Both the supporting text (paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6) and this policy (H 1) would benefit from specific reference to Independent Living requirements, the Independent Living programme and the need to make provision within this identified housing accommodation area. In order to allow for capturing opportunities new development proposals may offer for making Independent Living provision, this could be facilitated by consulting the ECC Independent Living service area when dealing with pre-application enquiries and planning applications for schemes with a residential element.

This form of accommodation also forms part of identified requirements for affordable homes, addressed in the Draft Plan by Policy H 2.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Policy H 2 Affordable Housing

The comments provided above in respect of Independent Living apply equally in respect of affordable homes provision and accordingly, Policy H 2, as these Independent Living considerations and requirements need to be reflected through Policy H 2, so that accommodation to be provided to meet the Independent Living agenda also needs to be affordable to its occupiers.

Policy H 3 Rural Exception Sites

Comment: ECC supports this policy approach with regard to Public Health considerations, as it is acknowledged that these smaller, rural settlements should not be affected adversely through increased social isolation. The rural exceptions sites approach can be valuable in providing for affordable homes in rural areas.

Policy H 4 Traveller Site Development

Insofar as Transit site requirements / provision is concerned, ECC notes that the policy and supporting section make no reference to the issue of Transit site provision for gypsies and travellers. This could usefully be revised to make reference to the relevant evidence base in the form of the 2014 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and 2016 interim update note and its findings in respect of Transit site provision. Each emerging Local Plan for the Essex Local Planning Authorities (including the Epping Forest DC Draft Plan) needs to acknowledge these requirements and consider transit site provision accordingly (whether meeting this form of needs is to be provided directly by the Local Plan and / or by other mechanisms). This is suggested in the interests of increasing the prospects of success in meeting these identified needs (notwithstanding the project being led by ECC in this area) against a backdrop of known barriers to doing so.

The absence of any transit site provision within Essex creates issues and problems in the event of unauthorised encampments occurring across Essex, since it means that there are not suitable sites where unauthorised caravans can be directed to when they are removed from other sites. ECC is aware of the Green Belt constraints applying within Epping Forest district but notes that a Green Belt review has been carried out in respect of the need to accommodate other forms of development and this exercise could be used to ascertain whether any suitable sites are identifiable for this purpose.

Paragraph 4.37

ECC welcomes the inclusion and recognition of Harlow Enterprise Zone as a major driver for economic growth and job creation for its wider area. This project represents one of the key areas of focus for inward investment across Essex, and aligns with 2 of the key inward investment sectors already identified - Life Sciences and Advanced Technology.

Paragraph 4.39

ECC welcomes the recognition by Epping Forest DC that there is a need for further 'grow on space' to accommodate the needs of existing businesses and to help ensure their future retention in the district. The experience of dealing with inward investment enquiries across Essex suggests that such grow on space is in comparatively short supply for both manufacturing and office sectors. ECC has evidence research to help in this area, in relation to identified issues and requirements. However, in terms of the current economic evidence base, concerns arise for ECC given that the Employment Land Review was last undertaken in 2010, which may now be considered out of date. It would be beneficial for this to be reviewed and updated to provide a more up to date view. This would be required to support the Plan's economic strategy and its preferred approach to reply mainly on existing employment sites (allowing for their expansion or redevelopment / regeneration where necessary).

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Policy E 1 – Employment Sites

Policy E 1 part B: ECC welcomes the intention of every effort being made to retain existing employment space in principle (subject to compliance with NPPF) in the interests of promoting the local economy and sustainability. ECC welcomes the degree of flexibility allowed for ranges of employment related use classes at these sites and it is noted that these could provide for waste uses where necessary or appropriate.

ECC would like to suggest the inclusion of an additional sentence within the policy as follows, to ensure that inward investment opportunities might be accommodated when any employment sites are vacated or become available for development / redevelopment:

“Details of vacated sites to be shared at the earliest possible opportunity with the Local Planning Authority’s nominated inward investment team or agencies, alongside the core marketing strategy, in order to maximise exposure of the employment / business opportunity the site affords, to as wide a potential business audience as possible.”

Policy E 1 part F: ECC notes that Epping Forest DC will be looking to undertake work to identify specific employment land requirements and allocations and as such, there are substantial gaps currently on the site specific and quantitative information related to this.

In response, whilst ECC cannot comment on this at present without the necessary information referred to, ECC encourages close cooperation between Epping Forest DC and ECC in the preparation of specific employment land requirements between this Draft Plan stage and the Pre-Submission stage of the Local Plan preparation, to ensure economic growth prospects are maximised.

Policy E 1 part G: Whilst ECC welcomes Epping Forest DC’s recognition of the need to support and encourage the development of flexible local employment space, we would recommend strengthening of this policy wording to include (but not limit to) the example of flexible tenure, which was concluded to be an important factor for businesses in looking for Grow On Space (as identified in a recent study completed by ECC on Grow On Space across the County).

Suggested revised wording: The Council will support and encourage the development of flexible local employment space (such as flexible tenure) to meet the employment and economic needs of the District. All new employment space should seek to meet the needs of local businesses and attract inward investment.

Policy E 2 Centre Hierarchy / Retail Policy

ECC supports the proposed policy approach as it provides for planning and management of suitable diverse uses for the town centres and takes an approach that recognises the realistic scope for their ability to compete with larger centres nearby.

Policy E 3 Food Production and Glasshouses

This revised policy approach is supported and is considered to provide greater flexibility of location for this industry. However, given the importance of this industry within the district it is suggested that the policy approach should be monitored carefully, in order to ensure effective policy implementation. In addition, it may be beneficial for Epping Forest DC and ECC to collaborate on a review of the evidence base within this specialist subject area, given the quickly

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

changing circumstances involved. ECC would also welcome active involvement in any further policy changes within this policy area.

Paragraph 4.77

It is not clear whether the reference to 'CO2' refers to the Epping Forest district as a whole or to the Epping Forest itself. The paragraph wording needs clarifying in response.

Paragraph 4.81

The final bullet point of this paragraph states: "securing the provision of, or financial support for, bus services ..." This objective is supported in principle but there is a need to ensure that bus services are financially viable, particularly in the longer term, as ECC is unable to support unviable services. ECC advises that this comment is advisory in nature. It is therefore a decision for Epping Forest DC as to whether this actually requires any amendment to the Local Plan text but the point needs to be noted in either scenario.

Policy T 1 Sustainable Travel

The policy references to sustainable transport choices are supported, including requirements for developers to provide transport assessments and travel plans. Transport Modelling undertaken to date suggests that improvements to key junctions and strategic highway interventions will need to be supplemented by sustainable transport measures and a change in travel behaviour. To further encourage modal shift developers should be actively encouraged to discuss opportunities to expand or provide new services. In order to ensure provision of a suitable Local Plan-led basis for sustainable transport, ECC would wish to see the retention of a comprehensive Local Plan policy in broad accord with current Policy T 1 within the Pre-Submission version of this Plan.

Policy T 1 should make specific reference to:

" - the provision of safe, direct, walking and cycling routes between new developments and community infrastructure such as schools.

- new community infrastructure to include sufficient public realm around key access points to allow users to congregate safely and thereby encourage walking to access it."

ECC notes (through references in the IDP) that EFDC draws on a range of evidence from, and has liaised with, TfL in respect of planning for the future of the Central Line passenger services serving the district. ECC considers that such collaboration is very important in order to plan a future service (and especially capacity) aligned with future growth across the area. ECC confirms its interest in working with EFDC through TfL towards ensuring that the Central Line serves the area in the most effective way for the future.

ECC also recognises that walking and cycling routes and modal shift to less car use has positive wider benefits to the environment.

Additional information: ECC would recommend ensuring that new developments link to existing cycling and walking infrastructure to ensure that journeys are easier and can be completed safely (as mentioned in Policy DM5) and in the interests of delivering public health benefits.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Policy T 2: Safeguarding of routes and facilities

ECC advises that given:

- the findings of the evidence base for the HMA / FEMA;
- the draft Highways and Transport Infrastructure MOU; and
- to accommodate the overall growth strategy (in particular that to be focused at Harlow);

ECC considers that specific Local Plan policy provision is required for key transport interventions located within the Epping Forest DC Local Plan area. These include the M11 improvement schemes for junction 7 and new junction 7A. These will have land use requirements and implications. The draft Strategic Highways and Transportation Infrastructure MOU also makes this agreed requirement clear at figure 5 (future actions) in the MOU. Appropriate new (Local Plan) policy provision could be set within and added to the existing subject matter of draft Policy T 2 (safeguarding of routes and facilities) by extending the scope of this policy.

Whilst existing Policy T 2 as drafted goes some way towards providing for these key infrastructure measures, it could make planned provision more usefully for Green Belt land release (possibly by way of indicative, planned Green Belt boundary revisions) at the relevant locations. Reference is made elsewhere in the draft Plan (e.g. Key Issues for the Plan to address - Chapter 2, plus supporting text for Policy SP 5) to a District-wide Green Belt review having been carried out to identify potential for future development. It is not evident that the scope of this review included development for key transport interventions and if not, this is suggested as part of the necessary scope of such a Green Belt review.

This new policy provision also flows, as a rational Local Plan addition, from the stated LSCC Core Area vision included in the Draft Plan (at chapter 3, see para. 3.11). ECC wishes to keep its joint work with Epping Forest DC as collaborative as possible. Accordingly, ECC will offer to work with the District Council and other partners to develop and ensure appropriate wording for the Pre-Submission Local Plan. The absence of a suitable policy provision in this area, however, (should Epping Forest DC not be agreeable) would indicate the need for an objection on this point, given the importance of these transport interventions to delivering the agreed growth strategy for the Housing Market Area (HMA).

Paragraph 4.94

ECC is supportive of the four broad categories that the Development Management Policies include to be judged against all development applications.

- natural environment and green infrastructure;
- historic environment;
- design; and
- climate change and environmental policies.

It is also positive that the Draft Plan recognises that these four categories are interlinked and that good quality design, the natural environment and green infrastructure is inseparable from achieving sustainable development and to minimise the impacts from climate change.

Paragraph 4.101 and Policy DM 1: Habitat protection and improving biodiversity

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

There is no objection to this type of draft policy being the preferred option. However, it is recommended that a full ecological assessment should be required where a development proposal may have an adverse impact on protected species.

Policy DM 1 - Habitat protection and improving biodiversity

Whilst the policy is supported in principle, it is considered the themes should be split for clarity, and ordered hierarchically in accordance with national policy and environmental legislation. The proposed policy approach below reflects the criteria-based and hierarchical approach that should be taken to protected sites, as required under paragraph 113 of the NPPF. They reflect the need to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure required under paragraph 114. They meet the requirements for planning policies set out in paragraph 117 and those for determination in paragraph 118. The policy would benefit from being split / ordered as follows:

- a) Legally protected sites and irreplaceable habitats
- b) Legally protected species
- c) Priority habitats and hedgerows
- d) Priority species
- e) Local sites
- f) Biodiversity offsetting
- g) Living landscapes.

The following policies are provided for the consideration of Epping Forest DC and have been produced as part of the 'Essex Biodiversity Toolkit for Planners' funded by Natural England to ensure compliance with the NPPF.

- a) Legally protected sites and irreplaceable habitats

Proposals likely to have a significant effect on Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar sites as shown on [Map X] will require a full assessment in line with European legislation. Development proposals affecting Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and National Nature Reserves (NNR) as shown on [Map X] and irreplaceable habitats should be controlled through avoidance, on-site management and on-site mitigation. Where this cannot be achieved development proposals will not be permitted.

The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about avoidance, management and mitigation measures. The Council will secure management, mitigation and enhancement through planning conditions/obligations where necessary.

- b) Legally protected species

Where there is a confirmed presence, or reasonable likelihood, of a legally protected species on an application site, the developer will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts upon the species have been avoided, and where they cannot be avoided adequately mitigated. Mitigation must conform to the requirements of relevant legislation and Government Standing Advice. Where impacts cannot be adequately mitigated, the proposal will not be permitted.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about avoidance and mitigation measures. The Council will secure mitigation through planning conditions/obligations where necessary.

c) Priority habitats and hedgerows

Development proposals that result in a net gain in Priority Habitat will in principle be supported, subject to other policies in this plan. Where Priority Habitats are likely to be adversely impacted by the proposal, the developer must demonstrate that adverse impacts will be avoided, and impacts that cannot be avoided are mitigated on-site. Where residual impacts remain, off-site compensation will be required so that there is no net loss in quantity and quality of Priority habitat in Epping Forest.

Hedgerows must be subjected to an assessment against the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. If a Hedgerow is deemed to be Important under the Hedgerow Regulations, the developer must demonstrate that adverse impacts upon the Important hedgerow will be avoided, and impacts that cannot be avoided are mitigated on-site.

The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures. The Council will secure mitigation and compensation through planning conditions/obligations where necessary.

d) Priority species

Where there is a confirmed presence or reasonable likelihood of Priority species being present on a development site, the developer will be required to demonstrate that an adequate mitigation plan is in place to ensure there is no net loss of Priority species.

The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about mitigation measures. The Council will secure mitigation through planning conditions/obligations where necessary.

e) Local sites

Proposals likely to have an adverse effect on a Local Wildlife Site (LoWS), Local Nature Reserve (LNR), Special Roadside Verge or a site that satisfies the relevant designation criteria will not be permitted unless the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm to the nature conservation value of the site. If such benefits exist, the developer will be required to demonstrate that impacts will be avoided, and impacts that cannot be avoided will be mitigated on-site. Where residual impacts remain, off-site compensation will be required to achieve no net loss of biodiversity in Epping Forest.

The Council will assess sites proposed for development to ascertain whether they fulfil the criteria for designation and may request information from applicants to assist in that process. If a site satisfies the criteria it will, for planning purposes, be treated as if it were a LoWS/LNR.

The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about avoidance, management, mitigation and compensation measures. The Council will secure management, mitigation and compensation measures through planning conditions/obligations where necessary.

f) Biodiversity offsetting

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

In order to achieve (the objective of) no net loss of biodiversity the Council expects that the Defra Biodiversity Offsetting metric will be used to quantify the impacts of all development proposals upon habitats in 'credits'.

Where residual impacts are calculated to remain after the application of on-site mitigation, Biodiversity Offsetting should be used to deliver the required compensation. The use of Biodiversity Offsetting will be secured through planning obligations where necessary.

g) Living landscapes

The extents of the Living Landscapes in Epping Forest are identified on [Map X], these are:

- ...
- ...
- ...

Within each Living Landscape, opportunities for the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and populations of priority species will be supported in order to protect and enhance strategic wildlife corridors and habitats in Essex. Development proposals that would deliver these opportunities will in principle be supported, subject to other policies within this plan. Development resulting in a significant adverse impact on the ecological function of these Living Landscapes will be refused.

Policy DM 5: Green Infrastructure: Design of Development

ECC agree with the draft policy in principle (and recommend it as the preferred option over the two alternative options), especially since the existing Local Plan policy only covered street trees.

The supporting text to this policy could not only highlight the multifunctional role of green spaces for biodiversity, recreation, amenities connection, but also for surface water management and climate change adaptation.

ECC agrees that any proposals should look to enhance green open spaces and corridors, where possible, to contribute positively to the landscape and visual amenity value (i.e. health and wellbeing benefits, sustainable travel and potential tourism) of the green space.

There may be the need to increase the resilience of ecosystems to the impacts of climate change, which will help the widest range of biodiversity to survive and adapt. Through assessing the vulnerability of biodiversity and associated ecosystems this will help to identify priorities and develop appropriate actions, such as:

- Conserving range and ecological variability of habitats and species will increase the chances that species whose current habitat becomes inhospitable will be able to spread locally into newly favourable habitat.
- Maintaining existing ecological networks -further habitat fragmentation and isolation should be avoided.

Supporting information: The specific measures associated with enhancing biodiversity adaptation to climate change will generate social, economic and cultural co-benefits, as well as reduce the negative effects of climate change (i.e. absorb CO₂, reduce flooding), which can be advocated through a Green Infrastructure approach to development

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

planning and conservation. These may include green/brown roofs, SUDs and the creation of green corridors for wildlife. Therefore new development proposals should incorporate climate change adaptation measures through the use of green infrastructure (i.e. incorporate biodiversity or geological features into the design as far as possible).

Additional suggestion: To strengthen the policy and meet the requirements of the NPPF, the Local Plan should consider adding under Part A:

1.

Use green infrastructure as a way of adapting and mitigating for climate change through the management and enhancement of existing habitats and the creation of new habitats to assist with species migration, to provide shade during higher temperatures, reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and for flood mitigation, i.e.

1. Providing a permeable surface and allowing places to store water for reuse; and
2. Providing water storage and retention areas to alleviate flooding.

Policy DM 6 Designated and undesignated open spaces

Comment: where a development results in a loss of open space, ECC would suggest carrying out a formal impact assessment to assess the potential level and nature of impacts on public wellbeing and health.

Additional Information: Please note that examples of Health Impact Assessments and Impact of Green Space are available from ECC if required.

Policy DM 9: High quality design

Under paragraph 4.154 it states that 'The Council seeks development that follows the principles of sustainable construction and encourages developers to deliver schemes that meet the performance set by appropriate standards e.g. the Code for Sustainable Homes'

It is worth noting that In March 2015, Government withdrew the Code for Sustainable Homes (in England) so Local Authorities should no longer require it as a planning condition for new homes approvals. The removal of the Code came in response to the Housing Standards Review consultation (forming part of the Government's wider objectives to review housing regulation). However, all energy/sustainable development requirements will now be contained within the Building Regulations instead, which are set to be raised to a minimum equivalent standard to former (CSH) Code Level 4. This includes all new homes to be 'zero carbon' in terms of their 'regulated' emissions (space and water heating, fixed internal lighting).

It is also worth remembering that the NPPF requires Local Plans to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the framework and to set out the strategic priorities and policies for their area. This includes strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the Climate Change Act 2008. Therefore there is scope to include in the policy the role that design has to mitigate and adapt to climate change. It is recommended that the following should be added under Part A:

1.

Developments to meet the standards within the new building regulations or local standards.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

2. Developments are designed to high sustainable standard that considers adaptation and mitigation approaches to address climate change.
3. Development will be planned to minimise the vulnerability to climate change impacts and that such development will not exacerbate vulnerability in other areas.

Policy DM 10 Housing Design and Quality

There is scope to include in the policy the role that design has to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Epping Forest DC may also wish to take the opportunity to include measures that could be considered for residential extensions with regards to improvements to existing builds/developments to encourage low carbon/ resilience measures when improvement works are being undertaken.

Paragraph 4.186

In terms of climate change and environmental policies, it is encouraging that there are policies to cover both the environment and climate change. However, the policies under this section focus predominantly on flooding. These policies include DM 15 to DM 21.

Epping Forest DC may wish to consider a specific policy for climate change adaptation. It can be argued the flooding policy is a form of adaptation, but there are other risks from climate change that need to be considered in the design of a development, such as higher temperatures and risk of subsidence etc. A suggested new policy is provided below, together with suggested wording,

Incorporate climate change adaptation measures into development by:

- a. Using best practice energy efficiency and sustainable construction methods, including waste management, should be incorporated in all aspects of development, with use of locally sourced and recycled materials where possible, and designed to high energy and water efficiency standards.
- b. Considering:
 - i. future climate risks when allocating development sites to ensure risks are understood over the development's lifetime
 - ii. the impact of and promoting design responses to flood risk for the lifetime of the development
 - iii. availability of water and water infrastructure for the lifetime of the development and design responses to promote water efficiency and protect water quality
- c. Directing development to locations with the least impact on flood risk or water resources. Where development is proposed in flood risk areas, mitigation measures must be put in place to reduce the effects of flood water.
- d. Aiming to limit surface water run-off by attenuation within the site as a means to reduce overall flood risk and protect the quality of the receiving watercourse by giving priority to the use of sustainable urban drainage in developments.
- e. Promote adaptation (and mitigation) approaches in design policies for developments and the public realm
- f. Green infrastructure to be used as a way of adapting and mitigating for climate change through the management and enhancement of existing habitats and the creation of new habitats to assist with species migration, to provide shade during higher temperatures and for flood mitigation.

Paragraph 4.187

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

This section of the document could be further improved and to help with this, ECC suggests additional explanatory content for this paragraph:

“Additional key factors in reducing the risk of flood damage include identifying the Critical Drainage Areas and delivering the appropriate flood mitigation schemes to alleviate the risk of flooding and to improve the drainage infrastructure.”

Paragraph 4.188

Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010 has not been fully implemented and ECC as the LLFA is not a SuDs approving body (SAB) (for all development), so there is a need to correct the currently worded statement as follows:

“ECC is the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and a Statutory Consultee on Major* Developments with surface water drainage implications since 15 April 2015.

*10 or more dwellings/ sites over 0.5 hectares where number of dwellings not known OR a building greater than 1000sq.m/ site over 1 hectare.”

The Environment Agency Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps (RoFSW) can be added to the evidence base. This contains up-to-date District wide information on surface water flood risk. This has been updated to include flood extents and depths.

Paragraph 4.194

The preferred approach, as currently worded, could be improved. Suggested wording revisions and additions could reflect the following considerations:

“Developments should be viewed as opportunities to encourage and promote mixed use of land in urban and rural areas in order to provide for such functions as the reduction of flood risk (in accordance with the Core Planning principles set out in the NPPF).”

Policy DM 15 Managing and reducing flood risk

There are no objections to the draft policy and it is supported as the preferred approach over the alternative options. The draft policy for managing and reducing flood risk could be further amended to include the following wording.

“Proposals for developments within ECC identified Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) could, based on the outcome of a site-specific flood risk assessment, be subject to a Section 106 contribution, or Community Infrastructure Levy funding, for the delivery of appropriate flood alleviation schemes (facilitated by ECC). ”

Policy DM 16 Sustainable Drainage Systems

There are no objections to the draft policy and it is supported as the preferred approach over the alternative options. A helpful addition could be made to section D point (iv), as follows:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

“Consideration should also be given to the runoff volume leaving the site. The runoff volume post-development should not be greater than the pre-development runoff volume for the 6hr 1 in 100 year event, in which case long-term storage should be considered within the development site.”

Paragraph 4.199

The following key evidence base elements for Draft Policy DM 16 Sustainable Drainage Systems should be included:

- ECC SuDS Design Guide
- CIRIA C753 The SuDS Manual.

Paragraph 4.206

The following additions should be made to the key evidence, as follows:

- The Environment Agency Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps (RoFSW)
- The Essex CC Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Theydon Bois Surface Water Management Plan.

Paragraph 4.208

The preferred approach could be improved with regard to the following considerations; please note that this information is advisory in nature and it is therefore for Epping Forest DC to consider whether a revision to the Draft Plan text is appropriate. ECC suggest that new developments within Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) should be viewed as opportunities for developers to work in conjunction with (flood) risk management authorities such as Thames Water, the EA and ECC in order to provide mechanisms to address the existing flood risk within the CDA and to accommodate the drainage infrastructure requirements of new developments.

Policy DM 17 Protecting and enhancing watercourses and flood defences

There are no objections to the draft policy and it is supported as the preferred approach over the two alternative options. This policy approach could be further improved by outlining a pro-active mechanism for improving flood defences and infrastructure. Where appropriate (in areas where other Flood Risk Management Authorities can deliver feasible schemes) Epping Forest DC could utilise Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure levy funds from developers in order to facilitate the drainage infrastructure requirements of new developments. This would be a useful addition to the policy's explanatory text.

Policy DM 19 Sustainable Water Use

As mentioned previously, following the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes, Local Authorities should no longer require it as a planning condition for new approvals. Energy/sustainable development requirements will now be contained within the Building Regulations (set to be ramped up to a minimum equivalent to Code Level 4). This includes all new homes to be 'zero carbon' in terms of their 'regulated' emissions (space and water heating, fixed internal lighting). However there is a real opportunity to set locally determined standards (where justifiable) for:

- Low carbon - in excess of the Building Regulations; and
- Resilience - in low flood risk areas/flood attenuation, water efficient, insulated against overheating.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Therefore, ECC is supportive of the inclusion of the draft policy to address the potential issues of water stress that a changing climate presents now and in the future (ECC also agrees that proposing no policy is not a recommended or preferred alternative option).

Policy DM 20 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy

It is positive that there is a proposed Low Carbon and Renewable energy policy. It is encouraging that the District Council will consider all types and scales of renewable technologies such as district heating schemes and not just small-scale renewables and low carbon solutions. These policy provisions appear relevant to the proposed Harlow strategic sites in particular, in view of the scale of these developments. Reference to these developments within Policy DM 20 would accordingly seem beneficial. A footnote for Policy SP 3 (Strategic Allocations around Harlow) with a cross-reference to Policy DM 20 would also be helpful.

By way of additional explanation, it is not considered that this policy alone will address all the issues and challenges presented by climate change and as stated above (regarding the previous comment for Page 179; paragraph 4.186), there may be a need to include a policy on climate change adaptation to ensure the Local Plan meets the requirements for the NPPF to set out the strategic priorities and policies for the area. This includes strategies to not only mitigate, but also to adapt to climate change in line with the Climate Change Act 2008. This policy could also be cross-referenced within the housing design policies DM 9 and DM 10 (as a footnote). This will help ensure the measures within Policy DM 20 are not overlooked.

Policy DM 21 Local environmental impacts, pollution and land contamination

The suggestion under the alternative option on page 201, regarding retaining existing policies and the opportunity to combine relevant elements of the existing policies, may have merit if it will strengthen Policy DM 21 and make it user friendly. The policy could include under Part B, requirements of the following form:

1.

"Require developments to be planned to minimise the vulnerability to the impacts of climate change and that such development will not exacerbate vulnerability in other areas."

CHAPTER 5: THE PLACES

Assessment of Primary and Secondary Education Requirements

These comments are provided on the basis of proposed housing numbers within Policy SP 2 Spatial Development Strategy and The Places policies P 1 - P 12 inclusive. Please note that where school site expansion or requirements for new schools are cited, reference to ECC's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions 2016 will provide the information required. ECC considers the provision of adequate and high quality education facilities and services at the right time when they are needed is a critical point.

Primary Education

Epping: 1,770 homes (including 130 at Thornwood) would require a maximum of 531 primary school places. There is no further scope to expand existing schools in Epping or its environs, so a site for a new 2-3 form of entry (420-630 - place) primary school would need to be identified.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Loughton: 1,190 homes would require a maximum of 357 primary school places. Local school could not accommodate this level of expansion, and therefore a site for a new 2 form entry primary school will need to be identified.

Waltham Abbey: 800 homes would require a maximum of 240 primary school places. It may be possible to expand schools in the town to accommodate this level of growth, or alternatively, a school site for a two form entry primary school should be identified, to allow a new school to be built to accommodate growth from new housing, and the already forecast demand for primary school places.

Chipping Ongar: 690 homes (including 90 at Fyfield) would produce a requirement for a maximum of 207 primary school places. This level of growth could be accommodated by expanding existing schools in Ongar.

Buckhurst Hill: 90 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum 27 primary school places. This number of pupils would need to be accommodated at existing schools.

North Weald: 1,580 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 474 primary school places. Forecasts already indicate other growth in the area and accordingly a demand for more primary school provision. A site for a new 2-3 form entry primary school (420-630 places) will need to be identified, to enable provision of a new school to accommodate this level of growth.

Chigwell: 430 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 129 primary school places. There is limited scope to expand existing schools. Chigwell Row Infant School is a stand-alone infant school, with children transferring to Chigwell Primary School and a number of other junior schools when reaching the end of their infant education. ECC would want consideration to be given to the relocation and expansion of Chigwell Infant School to a new site, in order to provide the additional primary school places that would be required to serve the new housing developments in the area.

Theydon Bois: 360 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 108 primary school places. This level of growth could be accommodated by expanding a local school.

Coopersale: 50 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 15 primary school places. This level of growth could be accommodated at a local school.

Roydon: 40 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 12 primary school places. This number of pupils would need to be accommodated at Roydon Primary School.

Nazeing: 220 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 66 primary school places. Pupils from new housing in Nazeing would need to be accommodated at Nazeing Primary, which would need to expand by half a form of entry, to two forms of entry. The school site is currently undersized for two forms of entry, so consideration should be given to identifying additional land adjacent to the existing school, which would enable the required school expansion.

Sheering/Lower Sheering: 150 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 45 primary school places. This additional demand could not be accommodated at the local school (Sheering Primary), which has a small planned

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

admission number (PAN) of 15, and operates on a small and constrained site. Other local Essex schools, namely in Harlow, or in Uttlesford district, are already forecast to be full, and therefore this demand could not be accommodated locally. The number of homes also does not generate sufficient pupil yield to sustain a half form entry expansion of Sheering Primary, even if additional land could be identified to expand the school.

ECC also advises that many children from Lower Sheering/ Sheering area access schools in Sawbridgeworth, and therefore this may have an impact on school place planning in Hertfordshire.

Secondary Education

Secondary school places in Epping Forest District are organised into three planning groups for the purpose of forecasting demand. They are as follows (housing allocations included):

- Loughton (4 schools)
Loughton, Buckhurst Hill, Chigwell - totalling 1,710 homes;
- Epping / Waltham Abbey (2 schools)
Waltham Abbey, Epping, North Weald, Theydon Bois, Coopersale, Thornwood - totalling 4,560 homes;
- Ongar (1 school)
Chipping Ongar, Fyfield - totalling 690 homes.

For the Loughton Planning Group, there is limited scope to expand local secondary schools. The impact of the potential growth in secondary school demand would be primarily seen at schools in London Borough of Redbridge, from where a large number of pupils migrate into Essex and (over a period of time) would need to be “pushed back” (via revised admission policy arrangements for the Essex schools designed to prioritise provision of spaces for local pupils).

For the Epping/Waltham Abbey Planning Group, 4,560 homes would produce a requirement for a maximum of 912 secondary school places, or 6-7 forms of entry, in an area already forecast to require additional secondary capacity in the next 5 to 10 years. This level of growth could not be accommodated at the local schools, and therefore a new school site, able to accommodate 6-7 forms of entry (900-1050 pupils) will need to be identified to mitigate the impact of the new housing. The timing of the school site coming forward will need to be carefully considered to ensure children are not displaced and required to travel unreasonable distances to access a school.

For the Ongar Planning Group, the potential growth in secondary school demand could be accommodated by expansion of the local school (The Ongar Academy).

Infrastructure provision for site allocations (all)

References to site allocations that include identified needs for on-site community infrastructure must include specific wording that allocates the appropriate area of land for D1 use. This will ensure its availability / deliverability for that purpose.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

ECC advises that for all proposed and potential site allocations, it is of fundamental importance that these developments are of sufficient scale and form to ensure that sufficient viability and deliverability of the required supporting infrastructure is generated and a piecemeal approach is avoided.

Paragraph 5.22 onwards – all place specific policies and standard / repeated paragraphs

In the standardised text sections (for each place) on “Infrastructure requirements” the same wording is used for all settlements – “The infrastructure needs for ... will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.” It is not clear whether this allows for additional infrastructure being identified within the Plan period beyond that currently identified in the IDP. It is particularly pertinent in that there are only two specific highway schemes listed in the IDP. Similarly, the current policy wording for each settlement also refers to infrastructure “in accordance with the IDP.”

This confusion could be resolved by an additional sentence to state that other infrastructure requirements may be identified in future and would be reflected in an updated IDP document at the appropriate time (assuming that this is the intention for a living and evolving IDP, as ECC would anticipate). With this in mind, ECC also suggests that it would be useful for this section to address and outline the process for updating the IDP over time and working collaboratively with ECC to this end. This could form a useful element of the Epping Forest DC authority monitoring report process, for example, whereby an annual review is carried out and published.

Policy P 2 Loughton

Site reference SR-0226

Surface water management comments

This site is located within the Loughton Station Critical Drainage Area (CDA) as outlined in the Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Theydon Bois Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP). Other Loughton sites are also potentially at risk of surface water flooding, according to the Environment Agency Risk of Flooding from Surface Water maps (RoFSW). Please see attachment (for detailed table) detailing all the sites potentially at risk.

Sites within CDAs should make use of the sequential approach and avoid areas at risk of flooding. Flood risk mitigation measures and options as outlined in SWMP should be followed.

Policy P 8 Theydon Bois

Surface water management comments

Some sites in this policy are potentially at risk of surface water flooding, according to the EA updated Flood Map for Surface Water (RoFSW). Please see attachment detailing all the sites potentially at risk.

CHAPTER 6: INFRASTRUCTURE AND DELIVERY

Policy D 1: Delivery of Infrastructure

ECC supports the inclusion of policies covering strategic infrastructure, and developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

As a provider of key services and subject to statutory responsibilities, for example minerals and waste; highways, education (primary, secondary and EYC), and flood and water management, ECC will continue to assist Epping Forest DC in the preparation of its IDP. ECC also recommend specific reference is made to ECC's Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions 2016, which sets ECC's standards for the receipt of relevant infrastructure funding.

Paragraph 162 of the NPPF states that LPAs should work with other authorities and providers to assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk, and its ability to meet forecast demands. An IDP will identify infrastructure required. The Local Plan should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development. For the later stages of the plan period less detail may be provided as the position regarding the provision of infrastructure is likely to be less certain. If it is known that a development is unlikely to come forward until after the plan period due, for example, to uncertainty over deliverability of key infrastructure, then this should be clearly stated in the Local Plan.

ECC supports the reference in D 1 contained in part A, that new development must be served by appropriate on and off site infrastructure and services as identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Parts B - E are also supported.

Any relevant policy should ensure that sufficient primary and secondary school and EYC places are made available, at the appropriate time, within reasonable travelling distance for children moving onto new housing developments. Accordingly, the policy should make it clear that housing developers should contribute proportionately to the cost of providing the additional primary and secondary school places and EYC places that will be required to accommodate the additional pupils moving onto their new housing developments.

It is recommended that Epping Forest DC include a policy covering strategic infrastructure, and developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy. A new combined policy should consider covering the following:

- Specify when developers are required to either make direct provision or to contribute towards development for the provision of local and strategic infrastructure required by the development (including land for new schools);
- Requirements for all new development to be supported by, and have good access to all necessary infrastructure;
- Requirement to demonstrate that there is or will be sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the necessary requirements arising from the proposed implications of a scheme (i.e. not just those on the site or its immediate vicinity) and regardless of whether the proposal is a local plan allocation or a windfall site;
- When conditions or planning obligations will be appropriate - as part of a package or combination of infrastructure delivery measures - likely to be required to ensure new developments meets this principle; and
- Consideration of likely timing of infrastructure provision - phased spatially or to ensure provision of infrastructure in a timely manner.

Recommended wording for such an 'Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation' policy is provided within the ECC Exemplar Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation Policy as below:

"Policy X: Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the proposal. It must further be demonstrated that such capacity as is required will prove sustainable over time both in physical and financial terms.

Where a development proposal requires additional infrastructure capacity, to be deemed acceptable, mitigation measures must be agreed with the Council and the appropriate infrastructure provider. Such measures may include (not exclusively):

- financial contributions towards new or expanded facilities and the maintenance thereof;
- on-site construction of new provision;
- off-site capacity improvement works; and/or
- the provision of land.

Developers and land owners must work positively with the Council, neighbouring authorities and other infrastructure providers throughout the planning process to ensure that the cumulative impact of development is considered and then mitigated, at the appropriate time, in line with their published policies and guidance.

The Council will consider introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and will implement such for areas and/or development types where a viable charging schedule would best mitigate the impacts of growth. Section 106 will remain the appropriate mechanism for securing land and works along with financial contributions where a sum for the necessary infrastructure is not secured via CIL.

For the purposes of this policy the widest reasonable definition of infrastructure and infrastructure providers will be applied. Exemplar types of infrastructure are provided in the glossary appended to this plan.

Exceptions to this policy will only be considered whereby:

- it is proven that the benefit of the development proceeding without full mitigation outweighs the collective harm;
- a fully transparent open book viability assessment has proven that full mitigation cannot be afforded, allowing only for the minimum level of developer profit and land owner receipt necessary for the development to proceed;
- full and thorough investigation has been undertaken to find innovative solutions to issues and all possible steps have been taken to minimise the residual level of unmitigated impacts; and
- obligations are entered into by the developer that provide for appropriate additional mitigation in the event that viability improves prior to completion of the development."

Please note that the following glossary to support this policy could be included within the Draft Plan at Appendix 1 - Acronyms and Glossary.

"Glossary

Infrastructure means any structure, building, system facility and/or provision required by an area for its social and/or economic function and/or well-being including (but not exclusively):

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

- a. footways, cycleways and highways
- b. public transport
- c. drainage and flood protection
- d. waste recycling facilities
- e. education and childcare
- f. healthcare
- g. sports, leisure and recreation facilities
- h. community and social facilities
- i. cultural facilities, including public art
- j. emergency services
- k. green infrastructure
- l. open space
- m. affordable housing
- n. live/work units and lifetime homes
- o. broadband
- p. facilities for specific sections of the community such as youth or the elderly"

Policy D 2: Essential Facilities and Services

The Public Health function of ECC focuses on health improvement and supporting communities to remain healthy. Accordingly, ECC would encourage Epping Forest DC to consider health in all aspects of its Local Plan and local planning policy, as well as Health Impact Assessments (HIA) for new developments specifically. In addition, Policy D 2 should make it clear that expansion of any existing facilities considered under the terms of this policy will be supported in principle, including relaxation of green belt policies (of restraint) where necessary.

Paragraph 6.23

The reference to Princess Alexandra Hospital (PAH) does not include a potential need to retain PAH in the vicinity. This point on meeting the (hospital provided) health care needs of the Harlow area in future should possibly be considered as an additional point / intention to include (although it is noted that two potential sites have been identified nearby for relocation if required). In this context, ECC will work cooperatively with all parties to ensure future provision of adequate, high quality, healthcare facilities and services to serve the wider area that respond effectively to its planned and sustained growth. The replacement / relocation of PAH is considered to play an important role in this.

Policy D 4: Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities

In view of the Public Health and other benefits involved, ECC supports the inclusion of this policy as a positive measure to require provision in line with identified and emerging requirements. ECC also supports part C of this policy, as it encourages co-location of community, leisure and cultural facilities / services. This approach aligns with the ECC preferred approach to provide multi-purpose 'community hubs' offering several multi-local council/partner services, and providing space for communities to gather and share skills and experiences.

Policy D 5 Communications Infrastructure

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

ECC welcomes the reference to high speed broadband in this policy. ECC recommends that the wording for part 'A' of the policy is revised and strengthened to make this a clearer policy requirement for new development to ensure that all new developments (commercial and residential and not limited to 'major' development) is capable of being served by the standard of modern communications technologies required, including broadband.

Appendix 1 Acronyms and Glossary

The suggested new single infrastructure policy as outlined above could be supported usefully by including its glossary in this section.

Appendices 2 - 4

No comments necessary.

Appendix 5

ECC welcomes and supports the inclusion of an up-to-date housing trajectory with the Draft Plan. ECC also advises that when a Pre-Submission Plan is published, this will need to be supported by a further updated trajectory. It is recommended that this include the sites contributing to housing supply, site capacity and phasing. The housing trajectory and site specific requirements will also be necessary to further inform the IDP, along with informing the viability assessment of the Pre-Submission Plan.

4. MINOR WORDING CHANGES TO SUPPORTING TEXT

Refer to 'London Stansted Airport' rather than 'Stansted Airport' wherever this appears throughout the document. Similarly references to Stanstead need to have their spelling corrected to Stansted. There are also other typographic errors in the draft Plan document.

5. COMMENTS ON SA/SEA AND IDP

Several ECC service areas have made comments on the supporting documents to the Local Plan. Since these are not direct comments on the Local Plan itself, these will be sent separately and do not need to form part of this response.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A. Public Health Local Plan Evidence - Useful Links

The following links provide useful information/documents, which can be used to inform emerging policies regarding public health matters:

The following links provide useful information/documents, which can be used to inform emerging policies regarding public health matters:

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

1. Active Design principles; Planning for health and wellbeing through sport and physical activity"; by Sport England and Public Health England
2. Public Health England (2015) Health Profiles by authority area, published June 2015 Public Health England (2015) Health Profile Epping Forest (June 2015)
http://www.apho.org.uk/resource/view.aspx?QN=HP_RESULTS&GEOGRAPHY=22

Health Profiles provide summary health information to support local authority members, officers and community partners to lead for health improvement. Health Profiles is a programme to improve availability and accessibility for health and health-related information in England. The profiles give a snapshot overview of health for each local authority in England. Health Profiles are produced annually.

Designed to help local government and health services make decisions and plans to improve local people's health and reduce health inequalities, the profiles present a set of health indicators that show how the area compares to the national average. The indicators are carefully selected each year to reflect important public health topics. For more information about the 2015 profiles data (including changes compared to the 2014 profiles) please see the Datapage or read our FAQs.

3. Healthy Places- wellbeing in the Environment (2016) by The UK Health Forum
<http://www.healthyplaces.org.uk/themes/access-to-healthy-food/hot-food-takeaways/development-control/>

The UK Health Forum conducts and commissions research for the on-going development of Healthy Places. This work gives an outline of local structures and responsibilities in each area of focus at the time of research and provides the starting point for many of the themes and key issues found on Healthy Places.

- The regulatory environment and public health: Assessing the options for local authorities to use the regulatory environment to reduce obesity
- Planning
- Sustainability, health and local authorities
- Transport and public health
- Local alcohol control

4. Essex Insights (2015) Local Authority Portrait Published June 2015

5. Dementia friendly communities Guidance for Councils by LGA (second edition) (circa 2014/5)

The publication date is not stated but the Guidance builds on earlier guidelines produced by the LGA in 2012, and is informed by good practice over the last three years and emerging evidence about what works well in supporting people with dementia and those that support them. It is about what local government can do to help make this a reality. The purpose of the guide is to help councils play their part in developing communities where people can live well with dementia. It is about enabling people with dementia, their families, friends and carers to feel at home, supported, understood and that they matter.

6. Healthy New Towns by NHS England 2016

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

NHS England are working with ten housing developments to shape the health of communities, and to rethink how health and care services can be delivered. The Programme offers a golden opportunity to radically rethink how we live – and takes an ambitious look at improving health through the built environment. In March 2016, following a rigorous selection process, NHS England announced the ten demonstrator sites they will be working with.

In the NHS Five Year Forward View, a clear commitment was made to dramatically improve population health, and integrate health and care services, as new places are built and take shape. This commitment recognises the need to build over 200,000 more homes in England every year, and invited Expressions of Interest from developments across the country. Over time, NHS England look forward to connecting with this broad community of sites look to build health into the design of new and regenerated places. Now, the Healthy New Towns Programme will work alongside the ten housing developments across the country to offer challenge, inspiration and support as they develop their ambitious plans for building healthy communities. The programme is looking at how sites can redesign local health and care services, and how they can take a cutting edge approach to improving their community's health, wellbeing and independence.

7. Working Together to Promote Active Travel by Public Health England May 2016 A briefing for local authorities

The briefing has been written for transport planners, others concerned with the built environment, and public health practitioners. It looks at the impact of current transport systems and sets out the many benefits of increasing physical activity through active travel. It suggests that while motorised road transport has a role in supporting the economy, a rebalancing of our travel system is needed. Some key messages when developing a healthy local transport strategy include:

- physical inactivity directly contributes to 1 in 6 deaths in the UK and costs £7.4 billion a year to business and wider society
- the growth in road transport has been a major factor in reducing levels of physical activity and increasing obesity
- building walking or cycling into daily routines are the most effective ways to increase physical activity
- short car trips (under 5 miles) are a prime area for switching to active travel and to public transport
- health-promoting transport systems are pro-business and support economic prosperity. They enable optimal travel to work with less congestion, collisions, pollution, and they support a healthier workforce

This guide suggests a range of practical action for local authorities, from overall policy to practical implementation. It highlights the importance of community involvement and sets out key steps for transport and public health practitioners.

8. Tackling Obesity and Planning

Local Government Association (2016) Tipping the Scales; Case studies on the use of planning powers to limit the use of hot takeaways

(<http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/7632544/L15-427+Tipping+the+scales/6d16554e-072b-46cd-b6fd-8aaf31487c84>)

Public Health England, LGA and TCPA (2016) Building The Foundations; Tackling Obesity through Planning and Development

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

(http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/7632544/L16-6+building+the+foundations+-+tackling+obesity_v05.pdf/a5cc1a11-57b2-46e3-bb30-2b2a01635d1a)

9. Provision of open space, sport and recreation

There is a tool that provides a Health Impact Assessments are available for green space/open space

<http://greenspacescotland.org.uk/SharedFiles/Download.aspx?pageid=133&mid=129&fileid=41>

Public Health England (September 2014) Local Actions on Reducing Health Inequalities; Improving Access to Green Space to reduce health inequalities Health Briefing

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/355792/Briefing8_Green_spaces_health_inequalities.pdf)

10. Ageing population and development planning

Dementia Friendly Communities Guidance for Councils 2015. LGA and Innovations in Dementia

(<http://www.local.gov.uk/documents/10180/7058797/L15-238+Dementia+friendly+communities+guidance+for+councils/7acaa658-329e-4aa1-bdff-ef6a286dd373>)

Communities and Local Government (2008) Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods; A National Strategy for Housing an Ageing Population

(<http://www.cpa.org.uk/cpa/lifetimehomes.pdf>)

11. Wider guidance to be considered for better mental health and wellbeing related to planning

The King's Fund (2013) Improving the Public's Health; A guide For Local Authorities

(http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/files/kf/field/field_publication_file/improving-the-publics-health-kingsfund-dec13.pdf)

Mental Health Foundation (2016) Mental Health and Housing

(https://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/sites/default/files/Mental_Health_and_Housing_report_2016_1.pdf)

Public Health England and UCL Institute of Health Equity (2015) Reducing Social Isolation across the lifecourse.

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461120/3a_Social_isolation-Full-revised.pdf)

London Healthy Urban Development (no date)

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/461120/3a_Social_isolation-Full-revised.pdf)

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

Design Council Planning for Health (2009)

(<http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/future-health-full.pdf>)

B. Sites Identified to be in CDAs or at risk of Surface Water Flooding

Loughton

Location CDA uFMfSW

SR-0058 No No

SR-0134 No North western tip of the site

SR-0226 Yes (Loughton station)

SR-0227 No No

SR-0286 No No

SR-0323 No Eastern border of the site

SR-0326A No Flow paths on site

SR-0326 No Flow paths on site

SR-0326C No Flow paths in northern and eastern border of site

SR-0352 No Southern border of the site

SR-0353 No Flow paths on site

SR-0354 No No

SR-0356 No No

SR-0358 No No

SR-0359 No Rectory lane is a flow path

SR-0360 No Southern border of site is a flow path

SR-0361 No Flow path on Jessel Drive

SR-0362 No Site is on a flow path

SR-0446 No Flow path on Northern boundary

SR-0564i Same as SR-0326B

SR-0564il No Southern border of site

SR-0835 No No

SR-0837 No No

Theydon Bois

Location CDA uFMfSW

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

SR-0026A No No
SR-0026B No Flow path on site
SR-0026C No No
SR-0080 No No
SR-0327A No No
SR-0327B No Western border of site
SR-0328A No Flow path on site
SR-0328B No Western border of site
SR-0341 No Northern boundary
SR-0342 No No
SR-0477 No No
SR-0487 No No
SR-0497 No No
SR-0800 No Flow paths on site

Buckhurst Hill

Location CDA uFMfSW

SR-0176 No No
SR-0188 No No
SR-0319 No No
SR-0818 No No

ADDITIONAL ECC OFFICERS TECHNICAL COMMENTS (TO SUPPORT ECC RESPONSE TO EFDC) CABINET MEMBER ACTION
REPORT DATED 7 NOVEMBER 2016 (FP/604/09/16) REFERS

ECC RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION OF THE DRAFT EPPING FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 18
CONSULTATION), OCTOBER 2016

Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Epping Forest District Local Plan (AECOM September 2016)

p.6, Table 4.1

Under 'Historic Environment' the Objectives do not cover the non-designated assets that make up the majority of the historic environment assets in the District and form the basis of the Historic Environment Character of the District. The Objectives as put forward in the East Herts SA would be more appropriate here - and would enable parity / consistency in approach

Accordingly, ECC suggests re-wording these objectives to:-

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

- Protect the District's historic environmental assets (both designated and non-designated) from inappropriate development.
- Capitalise on the potential that historic assets have to contribute towards place-shaping (e.g. as the inspiration for design).
- Recognise the potential for unknown historic sites to act as a constraint on development.

p.54, paragraph 2

No mention is made of the role of non-designated assets within the district or of the Historic Environment Character Assessment prepared by ECC Place Services for Epping Forest District Council to support its decision-making for the Local Plan

Suggested re-wording:-

'Archaeological, built and natural heritage features (both designated and non-designated) are an important part of the character of the District. 25 conservation areas have been designated and there are over 1,300 listed buildings. In addition, there are over 30 scheduled monuments ranging from the earthworks of a Norman castle, to a Second World War fortification. There are currently a further 300 "locally listed" buildings as well as several registered parks and gardens. There are over 1700 undesignated assets, ranging from individual find-spots to pill-boxes. Epping, Chipping Ongar and Waltham Abbey are market towns of medieval origin. A Historic Environment Character Assessment has been prepared for Epping Forest District in order to inform the Local Plan and decision-making'.

p.65, paragraph 1

No mention is made of the role of non-designated assets within the district or of the Historic Environment Character Assessment prepared by ECC Place Services for Epping Forest District Council to support its decision-making for the Local Plan

Suggested re-wording:-

Archaeological, built and natural heritage features are an important part of the character of the District. There are a large number of designated heritage assets (Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks & Gardens) spread across the District. However the majority of the heritage assets are non-designated, and these play an equally important role in determining the significance and Historic Environment Character of the District. While all of the options propose the same overall level of housing growth, there are variations as to how this growth is distributed across the District.

p.65

It is not clear that the Historic Environment Characterisation Assessment that was undertaken by ECC Place Services for Epping Forest District Council was used to inform this assessment of the significant effects.

The 5 options should be re-assessed against the Historic Environment Characterisation in order to establish their possible impact on the non-designated and designated heritage assets and overall historic environment.

Overall comments and conclusions on SA/SEA (from ECC SA/SEA officer)

The SA is focused on the strategic elements of the Plan, and draws sensible conclusions over the wider HMA and within the District. The content forms an integral part of the SA process and the reasonable alternatives identified and assessed are appropriate.

The appraisal of the non-strategic elements of the Local Plan appears to be absent. It is acknowledged that the SA report is 'interim' at this stage, and it is recommended that the SA report is updated for consultation to include policy

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

appraisals (with reasonable alternatives) and also the assessments of non-strategic sites which are useful and thorough (appearing separately within the Council's evidence base on the website). This will be key in the broader assessment of cumulative impacts across the District, incorporating all elements of the Local Plan.

Epping Forest District Council Draft Local Plan
Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (Final 30 September 2016)

IDP document - public health comments - general

Caution would be advised on infrastructure needs with regards to the detail on health infrastructure requirements until the emerging (Essex County Council led) Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) report is finalised. Projected health needs have been identified through the GIF document process. This is in draft form, so we would advise caution on these projected needs until this document is in a more final form.

Page 8 Table 4.1

Reference to Early Years & Childcare needs to be added (as a category within the table).

Page 15

This appears to have an incorrect assumption - secondary schools have 5 year groups plus post 16 form usually accounts for a sixth = 180 per form of entry.

Page 20; Section 5.1.4, 4th paragraph

This section does not make clear that both new J7a and major improvements to J7 for the M11 are required.

ECC suggests amending final sentence of text to:

Discussions are ongoing with a view to prioritising the provision of Junction 7a in advance of further improvements to Junction 7, both of which will be required to be delivered within the Plan Period as this would provide greater gains in terms of additional capacity.

No specific mention is made within this section of highway infrastructure requirements outside the wider Harlow area.

Section 5.1.4, 5th paragraph

ECC disagrees with statement made in 5th paragraph, as (transport) growth is not likely to be wholly accommodated through improving alternative mode linkages and services.

ECC suggests how this text should be amended to reflect road traffic impact concerns, as follows:

"Growth located in Epping, Loughton, Chigwell, Chipping Ongar and Waltham Abbey is likely to be accommodated through improving links to public transport services, including extensions and improvements to the existing bus services and improved walking and cycling."

Page 41, section 6.1 Early years and childcare

Wording in first paragraph is not completely accurate. The following factual information is therefore provided to assist in improving this section.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

There is a set of statutory duties under the Childcare Act 2006 in relation to improving outcomes for all young children aged 0-5 and reducing inequalities between them, ensuring sufficiency of childcare for all children whose parents need it to support them to access work or training and providing information, advice and assistance to families. There is a local authority duty to secure information, advice, guidance and training for childcare providers to enable them to improve the quality of childcare provision.

All children are entitled to six terms of high quality nursery provision, as reflected in the Early Years Foundation Stage Framework, from the term after their third birthday, all three and four year olds are entitled to 15 hours of free childcare and education per week. This eligibility increases from April 2017 to 30 hours (subject to criteria). In addition, a proportion of two year olds are entitled to up to three terms of 15 hours per week free childcare and education, based on income and need. Whilst most children enter school before they are five, an average of four terms is currently accessed in the private, voluntary and independent (PVI) sector (including child-minders) where wider childcare needs can also be met for families.

The statutory duty in relation to childcare provision then continues for children over five years old, to address families' needs in the form of out of school care and provision for children and young people aged 0-14 (up to 18 for disabled children).

Page 39 / 40 Figure 15 at 6.1.4

ECC does not have a factor for childrens' clubs. The Early Years & Childcare factor quoted in the Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure is composite for all 0-5 years provision

Page 43 - 6.1.5

This paragraph confuses revenue funding for FEEE with the need for capital funding to build the infrastructure. This is somewhat replicated in the schools section and it would therefore be improved if the IDP focuses on consideration of capital funding that can be used to deliver infrastructure.

Page 44

Strike out the paragraph outlining the Childcare sufficiency county strategy group as this is now invalid.

Keep information relating to the Early Years childcare strategy 2015-18.

Page 44

The sentence that says that there is not an available childcare sufficiency data available is now out of date.

An interactive map outlining childcare sufficiency for Essex County Council is available via the web pages for the Early Years and Childcare care provider web page. ECC is providing a weblink for this on the edited version of the IDP (attached with these comments)

Page 47 figure 16

The figures here need some clarification.

The number of childcare places generated is listed in the ECC developers guide to infrastructure contributions.

There is no set formula for the size of childcare provision other than that stipulated by Ofsted. This is dependent on the floor space and the number of children. However it is common to have either a 26, 32 or 56 place nursery or pre-

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)

school facility. Out of school clubs are often held in school halls but it is rare that any one club would exceed 32 childcare places.

Page 50 paragraph 6.1.5

The department of Education does not fund capital investment for childcare or Free Entitlement places.

Page 50 paragraph 6.1.5

The sentence should read:

“Childcare in Essex is provided by private, voluntary and independent providers”

Page 50

Strike out the following sentence ‘However this would need to be considered against all competing demands for other services’.

Page 153, chapter 12 – Evidence Base and Strategic Issues

An addition to the evidence base list is needed: The Environment Agency Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Maps (RoFSW) can be added to the evidence base. The Essex CC Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Theydon Bois Surface Water Management Plan can also be added here as key evidence.

Page 156; paragraph 12.1.5

It is suggested to add an outline of all the infrastructure needs in the Critical Drainage Areas (CDA) highlighted in the Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Theydon Bois Surface Water Management Plan. High level assessments and appraisals were undertaken during the Loughton, Buckhurst Hill and Theydon Bois Surface Water Management Plan process. Each CDA has outlined some alleviation options, which (even though not currently costed) could be outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as drainage infrastructure to be delivered.

Appendix E Draft Infrastructure Schedule

This Appendix is not referenced in IDP main document text.

The listed highways scheme for new junction J7a of M11 cites RIS1 as the funding source – although this has yet to be determined.

Only two highway schemes are included in the Schedule (M11 J7 & J7a)

Also consider whether existing wording at start of the Draft InfrastructureSchedule is sufficient to indicate that additional highway schemes etc. may/will be required and rewording may assist in this respect accordingly.

Attachment - ‘CMA’ members report.

Response to the Draft Local Plan Consultation 2016 (Regulation 18)