



**BOROUGH OF
BROXBOURNE**

www.broxbourne.gov.uk

Local Plan Deliverability Report

June 2018

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 THE POLICY PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL PLAN	6
3. INFRASTRUCTURE	8
4 SITE ALLOCATIONS	10
5 CONCLUSIONS.....	12
APPENDIX 1: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES	15
Development Strategy	15
Places	15
Development Management Policies – Design and Sustainable Construction.....	21
Development Management Policies – Housing.....	21
Development Management Policies - Economic Development	23
Development Management Policies – Retail	23
Development Management Policies – Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities	24
Development Management Policies – Water.....	25
Development Management Policies – Green Belt	26
Development Management Policies – Natural Environment and Biodiversity.....	26
Development Management Policies – Environmental Quality	27
Development Management Policies – Historic Environment.....	27
Development Management Policies – Transport and Movement.....	29
APPENDIX 2: INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES	31
APPENDIX 3: LOCAL PLAN SITES	34
Strategic Allocations – Brookfield	34
Strategic Allocations – Cheshunt Lakeside.....	36
Strategic Allocations – Rosedale Park.....	38
Strategic Allocations – High Leigh Garden Village	39
Strategic Allocations – Park Plaza West	40
Strategic Allocations – Park Plaza North.....	42
Strategic Allocations – Waltham Cross Northern High Street.....	42

Local Plan Allocations – Broxbourne 43

Local Plan Allocations – Cheshunt..... 43

Local Plan Allocations – Goffs Oak 46

Local Plan Allocations – Hoddesdon..... 47

Local Plan Policies – Lee Valley Regional Park..... 47

Local Plan Allocations - Gypsy and Traveller Sites 48

Local Plan Allocations: Travelling Showpeople 49

Local Plan Allocations - SLAA and Brownfield Sites 49

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- a. This document addresses national policy requirements on Local Plan deliverability and viability assessment, including the cumulative costs of the policies, standards, and infrastructure provision. A review of all the Local Plan policies is provided in Appendices 1-3.
- b. Three policies have been identified with specific associated costs (Section 2). Cumulatively, these amount to no more than £1,500 per dwelling in total - less than 1% of the likely value on individual dwellings. They will therefore have minimal impact on overall viability.
- c. Affordable housing policy H1 can be delivered on both strategic sites, as demonstrated by the agreements for Rosedale Park and High Leigh, and on complex smaller sites, as demonstrated by Britannia Nurseries. Abnormal costs at Cheshunt Lakeside mean that only the detailed site-specific viability work can ascertain an appropriate level of contributions.
- d. Site-specific assessments of every Local Plan site are included in Appendix 3. This demonstrates the degree of variation in viability and deliverability considerations across large and small sites. The case for deliverability of the Local Plan sites is supported by a number of detailed site-specific viability appraisals prepared by applicants.
- e. Infrastructure costs are set out in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, a 'live' document to be updated on a regular basis during the lifetime of the Local Plan. The apportionment of costs of major pieces of infrastructure and pooling of contributions will be kept under review. The level of contributions sought will not undermine the deliverability of any of the Local Plan sites.
- f. The Council is working to attract additional funding to support the delivery of expensive infrastructure, e.g. the Brookfield link road and the A10 'hamburger' junction. The Council is supported by Hertfordshire LEP in such funding bids, which further the aspirations set out in the LEP Strategic Economic Plan.
- g. As can be seen from the comprehensive review contained within this report, the cumulative costs of infrastructure and policy requirements will not undermine the deliverability of the Local Plan sites. If developers are unable to meet the requirements due to site specific reasons, viability appraisal is the recognised route for challenge.

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The purpose of this document is to assist in demonstrating that the Local Plan is effective. i.e. that it is deliverable over its period¹. It includes a review of all the main delivery issues anticipated in implementation of the Local Plan to 2033. It addresses three main delivery issues: policies and standards; infrastructure provision; and the proposed Local Plan sites. A detailed review of each policy and site is contained in appendices 1-3 below.
- 1.2 The draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read alongside this document. The Deliverability Report also includes further cost details, for example in relation to a small number of development management policies, and considers the likely cumulative impacts of these costs in terms of the viability and deliverability of development. In doing so, the report aims to address the requirements of Paragraph 173 of the NPPF, which states that that:
- Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.*
- 1.3 Detailed financial viability assessments have been submitted by the developers of a number of sites in support of their planning applications for proposals at Local Plan sites. Plan-wide viability appraisal carries significant risk of introducing artificial simplifications which can undermine genuine understanding of local viability because it cannot by definition take account of variations across sites. This document draws attention to any abnormal costs or requirements where this will need to be factored into the decision-making process.
- 1.4 The Deliverability Report seeks to provide a basis for understanding of the cumulative scale of obligations whilst avoiding such simplifications. It is structured around a review of all the proposed Local Plan policies in order to ascertain the cost implications of such policies and then assesses the cumulative impacts.

¹ NPPF Paragraph 182.

2 THE POLICY PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL PLAN

2.1 All of the draft Local Plan policies have been screened for their impacts on viability and deliverability, as set out in Appendix 1. As a result of this exercise, four separate categories of policy have been identified as follows:

- a. Policies which are likely to have viability implications but for which these could only be satisfactorily addressed at a site-specific level;
- b. Policies where costs will be low or negligible cumulatively and where no supporting evidence is considered necessary;
- c. Policies for which viability and deliverability will be a matter for future work rather than the current Local Plan; and
- d. Policies with no specific viability implications.

2.2 Each of these four categories is addressed below

A. Policies which are likely to have viability implications but for which these could only be satisfactorily addressed at a site-specific level

2.3 These policies comprise:

- H1: Affordable Housing
- W4: SUDS
- GB2: Residential Development on Derelict Glass House Sites
- NEB1: General Strategy for Biodiversity
- TM1: Sustainable Transport
- TM2: Transport and New Development

2.4 For the strategic sites, the Council has either reached agreements with promoters or is working with them to confirm that the requirements of the policies will be provided for. Where agreement is being reached (as at Rosedale Park) and that can be demonstrated to the Examination, it is not considered that further evidence is necessary. Where this is not the case (as at Cheshunt Lakeside), the Council is negotiating with the promoters to provide the necessary evidence to support their position. For the non-strategic sites, it is anticipated these policies will be fully provided for and there is no evidence to suggest that they will not be. If through planning applications, promoters wish to challenge the requirements of the policies, that would be through viability assessments on a site by site basis.

B. Policies where even cumulatively the total costs will be low or negligible and where no additional supporting evidence is considered necessary

2.4 These policies comprise:

- TM4: Electric Vehicle Charging Points (£0-£500)
- H3: Housing Mix – Accessible and Adaptable dwellings (£520-£940 per dwelling)
- W3: Water Efficiency (£6-£9 per dwelling)

2.5 The source of these costs is taken from the document Housing Standards Review: Cost Impacts (DCLG, 2014). Further commentary is provided in Appendix 1. In total, the charges for these three policies amount to around £500-£1,500 per dwelling.

C. Policies for which viability and deliverability will be a matter for future work rather than the current Local Plan

2.5 These policies include the following:

- BX1: Broxbourne Village Improvement Plan;
- CH3: Old Cambridge Road Corridor;
- GO1: Goffs Oak Village Improvement Plan;
- HOD1: Hoddesdon Town Centre;
- WT2: Macers Estate;
- WC3: Waltham Cross Area Action Plan;
- PO2: CIL.

2.6 Viability assessments may not be necessary for all of the above plans and strategies but in cases where viability work is necessary it will need to be undertaken with reference to a clearly defined brief relating to a specific development project, for example for the Waltham Cross Area Action Plan, where significant development and infrastructure costs are anticipated.

D. Policies with no specific Local Plan viability implications or which can only be assessed on a case-by-case basis

2.7 Many of the policies have no specific viability implications or for which no further commentary is considered necessary for the purposes of this report. The full list is in Appendix 1. Examples are as follows:

- H2: Conversion of non-residential buildings to Residential use
- H4: Houses in Multiple Occupation
- H5: Housing for Specific Needs
- H6: Loss of Specialist Residential Accommodation
- H7: Residential Annexes
- H8: Permanent residential Moorings
- ED1: New Employment Uses
- ED2: Employment Areas

3. INFRASTRUCTURE

- 3.1 The infrastructure costs associated with the development proposed within the Local Plan are substantial. The Council has therefore published its draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to quantify the required infrastructure, to cost out that infrastructure and to establish the means by which the infrastructure will be financed.
- 3.2 This report does not set out to replicate the IDP but in summary the key areas covered are:
1. Education – cost of £91 million
 2. Transport – cost of £133 million
 3. Healthcare – cost of £23 million
 4. Social infrastructure - £10 million
 5. Other infrastructure - £6 million
- 3.3 The total cost is £263 million. The full breakdown of these costs is set out within an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule at the back of the IDP. Section 17 of the IDP sets out how the proposed infrastructure is to be funded and delivered and table 17.7 summarises the breakdown of that provision.
- 3.4 The total costs that are provisionally assigned to development and therefore of direct relevance to this Report are:
1. £127 million as infrastructure funding contributions from strategic sites; and
 2. £9 million as CIL contributions from non-strategic sites.
- 3.5 Section 5 of the IDP breaks down the strategic sites contributions to each of the strategic sites within the Local Plan (with the exception of High Leigh Garden Village which already has planning permission). These costs and their impacts on viability and deliverability are being actively discussed with the developers/promoters of four of the strategic sites: Cheshunt Lakeside; Brookfield Riverside and Brookfield Garden Village; Rosedale Park; and Park Plaza West. The viability issues arising from those discussions are covered within Appendix 3.
- 3.6 A review of the viability and deliverability implications of each of the Local Plan policies relating to infrastructure provision is contained with Appendix 2. Some of the key points contained within this review are as follows:
- *Crossrail 2 /four tracking (INF4)*: The Local Plan is not reliant on Crossrail 2/four-tracking and the inherent viability and deliverability issues associated with them;

- *Railway stations (INF5)*: whilst the Local Plan is not inherently reliant on these projects, there are issues associated with the development of the Park Plaza sites and the sustainable delivery of development on those sites. Should it be proven that there is a business case for the provision of a railway station at Park Plaza, significant contributions will be sought from the two Park Plaza sites;
- *Reserve Secondary School Site (INF10)*: Access and ecological mitigation are the main considerations relating to the deliverability of the site;
- *Health Care (INF13)*: despite a long-standing dialogue with the NHS and CCG, clear advice is still being sought.

3.7 In a number of cases, the delivery of infrastructure is site-specific and is considered further in relation to the site allocations in Appendix 3 below.

3.8. Infrastructure costs are set out in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, a 'live' document to be updated on a regular basis during the lifetime of the Local Plan. The apportionment of costs of major pieces of infrastructure and pooling of contributions will be kept under review. The level of contributions sought will not undermine the deliverability of any of the Local Plan sites.

4 SITE ALLOCATIONS

- 4.1 The primary test to determine whether a local plan is deliverable is that its site allocations are viable and deliverable against the policy requirements associated with the allocations and against the overall policy requirements of the Local Plan. The preceding sections have assessed all of the policies of the Local Plan and indicated which policies are likely to have viability impacts on site allocations. This Section considers those site allocations, summarises the main issues of viability and deliverability in relation to each of those, presents the evidence that exists to demonstrate that they are viable and deliverable, concludes on what further evidence is required and what additional evidence requires to be introduced into the Local Plan examination. For further details see Appendix 3.
- 4.2 *Brookfield (Policy BR1)*: the main infrastructure costs of £37.62 million include the Brookfield link road, car parks and the package of measures associated with the IDP. There are not known to be any other extraordinary costs required to deliver the development. Additional costs are associated with the areas of unstable ground (which will be retained as open space) and protection of the historic garden and landscape at Wormleybury (which is a design/masterplanning issue). The majority of the land is owned by Broxbourne County Council and Hertfordshire County Council, with the remainder under option. A procurement exercise is underway to appoint a development partner. Site-specific viability advice is being sought in respect of scheme viability. Funding is largely expected to come from the development itself but would be improved by the receipt of government funding, for which bids are being prepared.
- 4.3 *Cheshunt Lakeside (Policy CH1)*: A detailed viability appraisal has been prepared by the applicants Cheshunt Lakeside Ltd which suggests that policy requirements, in particular affordable housing, cannot be met. Significant costs are likely to arise from land purchase, site clearance and probable decontamination, as well as basement car parking.
- 4.4 *Rosedale Park (Policy CH2)*: the planning applications are fully policy compliant and therefore no further viability evidence has been sought or offered.
- 4.5 *High Leigh Garden Village (Policy HOD4)*: The current S106 agreement will act as the delivery vehicle and construction of the main road junction, utility and drainage infrastructure is well underway.
- 4.6 *Park Plaza West (Policy PP1)*: the Council will seek government funding to support the viability of this strategic allocation and reduce the contributions sought from the development, which will take time to attract occupiers and

therefore cannot be provided early in the development of the site. Development of a station at Park Plaza North is likely to be towards the end of the Local Plan period and any contributions to this would be likely to be triggered through on-going development of the Business Park.

- 4.7 *Park Plaza North (Policy PP2)*: the site has recently been bought by IKEA. An initial meeting with the company has indicated an ambition for a substantial distribution operation but that there would be space to accommodate other users on the site. Distribution is unlikely to be in accordance with the draft policy but more detailed plans from IKEA are awaited.
- 4.8 *Waltham Cross Northern High Street (Policy WC2)*: implementation of this policy, which seeks the regeneration of the Waltham Cross, rests on the relocation of Homebase and Wickes to Park Plaza North. This approach is strongly supported by Fishpools and was supported by Homebase, Wickes, and CWS in 2016 but the deliverability is currently uncertain pending discussions with IKEA, the new owners of Park Plaza North.
- 4.9 Appendix 3 sets out further details on the above sites together with information on the deliverability of the non-strategic site allocations.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 This document has set out to demonstrate that the policies and allocations contained within the Broxbourne Local Plan will be deliverable and viable. It has relied on a varied evidence base that includes obligations that have been and are being achieved in relation to planning permissions/allocations, detailed viability appraisals that have been and are being promoted in respect of those developments, discussions with and evidence from site owners and promoters that are supportive of the Local Plan policies and professional judgements in relation to the requirements of the Plan.
- 5.2 The majority of the Development Management policies within the Local Plan are standard local plan requirements of developments. Whilst, several of those, such as requirements for sustainable urban drainage systems, have major impacts on costs and hence viability, those are only properly understood and negotiated on a site by site basis. The only policies that have specific abnormal costs associated are those requiring electric car charging points, water efficiency targets and accessible and adaptable dwellings, for which the costs are negligible and further viability is therefore considered unnecessary. The costs for individual dwellings are £500-£1,500 per dwelling. This is less than 1% of the likely value on individual dwellings². If developers are unable to meet this requirement, viability appraisal is the recognised route for challenge and this is not therefore considered to be a Local Plan matter.
- 5.3 The one Development Management policy that is a challenge is Policy H1 that seeks 40% of units to be affordable with a housing split of 65/35 between social/affordable and intermediate products. Broxbourne Council has operated this policy for many years and has found it to be an essential benchmark for establishing a target that will be applied in the absence of a viability appraisal to demonstrate that it is not affordable. For strategic sites, the planning permissions for Rosedale Park will deliver in accordance with the Policy and that is the clear intent for Brookfield. The strategic brownfield sites of Cheshunt Lakeside and Waltham Cross Northern High Street, however, have extraneous costs associated with them that are a challenge to the Policy. The former is subject to a viability appraisal that purports to demonstrate that affordable housing is only affordable at 10%. This will be challenged by the Council subject to independent

² A similar conclusion was reached by the London Plan viability assessment: *“It should be noted that whilst it is important to make an allowance for any of these additional costs, some (e.g. affordable workspace, cycle parking [£758 per space]) have a minimal impact on overall build costs as they are a very small percentage, often less than 1% of GDV [Gross Development Value]. Therefore, any minor amendments of the policy through the plan process, or its application, will have very limited effect on overall viability”* (London Plan Viability Study (Greater London Authority, December 2017), paragraph 7.2.10 page 50.

assessment of that viability appraisal. This, however, is not seen to be reason to alter the Policy which remains entirely relevant. For Waltham Cross, it is impossible to assess viability until the full scope of the development and its costs and constraints are understood.

- 5.4 For smaller development sites, the planning permission for the Britannia Nurseries site has demonstrated that the policy can be secured on difficult, constrained sites within Broxbourne. That in itself is considered to be sufficient evidence in support of the Policy. It may well be that for individual sites, costs and circumstances will militate against the full achievement of the Policy but without understanding each site in detail, it is considered that any generic appraisal would be without foundation. Any application that proposes not to meet the terms of the Policy will be subject to viability appraisal and that is in accordance with national policy and guidance.
- 5.5 On infrastructure, this document largely defers to chapter 17 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in setting out how the cost of that infrastructure will be afforded. The emphasis of this document is on the costs assigned to strategic developments by the IDP. For Rosedale Park, those assigned costs are all being negotiated into the section 106 agreements to be attached to the planning permissions. For Brookfield, additional work is being undertaken to demonstrate that the IDP and other infrastructure costs associated with the development are viable. These will be submitted to the Inquiry in due course. For Park Plaza West, a statement of common ground is being prepared to accompany this document that will demonstrate the deliverability of the necessary infrastructure. Similarly, the Council is working with the new owner of Park Plaza North to establish common ground.
- 5.6 The site allocations section of this document has sought to demonstrate to the Inquiry that the Council has been and is being pro-active in ensuring that each of those allocations is deliverable and viable.
- 5.7 Of the strategic allocations, the Council, land owners and developers are entirely satisfied that Brookfield (Riverside and Garden Village), Rosedale Park, High Leigh Garden Village and Park Plaza West will be delivered entirely or largely in accordance with their respective Local Plan policies. There are outstanding issues with the closely related Park Plaza North and Waltham Cross Northern High Street allocations and substantial progress will be made now that discussions have commenced with IKEA, the new owner of Park Plaza North.

- 5.8 The document has set out position statements in respect of each of the smaller allocations that for the most part show them to be deliverable. Where that is not possible at this stage, the Council has set out what action will be undertaken.
- 5.9 Finally, the Local Plan sets out a number of action plans and improvement plans that will be pursued to help regenerate the borough through this Local Plan. Those will be implemented through costed and affordable action plans.
- 5.10 The Council will continue to add to and refine the evidence within this document up to the Local Plan hearings to ensure that it provides a supportive basis for the implementation of the Local Plan. However, considered in its totality, the Council is satisfied that it is pursuing a Local Plan that is deliverable and viable in accordance with national policy and guidance.

APPENDIX 1: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Development Strategy

Policy DS1: The Development Strategy

This policy sets out the quantum of development provided for within the Local Plan and its strategic spatial distribution. The policy is supported by all of the evidence that underpins the Local Plan and in disaggregated form by the remainder of this paper.

Places

The main site allocations within the Places section of the Local Plan are addressed within Appendix 3 of this Paper. This section considers viability and deliverability in relation to the non-site allocation policies within this Section.

Policy PM1: Sustainable Place Making

Whilst the deliverability of sustainable places lies at the heart of the Local Plan, the content of this policy does not require further viability evidence in its own right.

Policy BR1: Brookfield

See Appendix 3

Policy BX1: Broxbourne Village Improvement Plan

Costs will result from the production of an improvement plan and those will be encapsulated within an Action Plan that will set out known and potential future funding sources. It is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy BX2: Broxbourne Station and Environs

This policy signals a long-term development plan for this area that will consider issues of viability and deliverability at that time.

Policy BX3: Broxbourne School

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH1: Cheshunt Lakeside

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH2: Rosedale Park

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH3: Cheshunt Old Pond

The Council has recently published its draft Cheshunt Old Pond Strategy. That contains an Action Plan that is currently being costed and aligned with known and potential funding sources.

Policy CH4: Old Cambridge Road Corridor

Costs will result from the production of an improvement plan and those will be encapsulated within an Action Plan that will set out known and potential future funding sources. It is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy CH5: Cheshunt Park

Development Management policy that has no direct cost implications.

Policy CH6: Cedars Park

Development Management policy that has no direct cost implications.

Policy CH7: Cheshunt Football Club

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH8: Albury Farm Landscape Protection Zone

Whilst this is a protective development management policy, it does have implications for the land use of the affected area that may not lend itself to a viable farming unit. That is a matter that has and will continue to be discussed with the land owner. The land has not been promoted for development by the landowner in response to the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission Local Plan and it is considered appropriate for playing pitches or other open space usage.

Policy CH9: Theobalds Brook Field

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH10: East of Dark Lane

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH11: Former Eastern Playing Field

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH12: Land North of Bonney Grove

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH13: Council Offices, Churchgate

See Appendix 3.

Policy CH14: South of Hammondstreet Road

See Appendix 3.

Policy GO1: Goffs Oak Village Improvement Plan

Costs will result from the production of an improvement plan and those will be encapsulated within an Action Plan that will set out known and potential future funding sources. It is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy GO2: North of Goffs Lane

See Appendix 3.

Policy GO3: South of Goffs Lane

See Appendix 3.

Policy GO4: Newgatestreet Road

See Appendix 3.

Policy GO5: North of Cuffley Hill

See Appendix 3.

Policy HOD1: Hoddesdon Town Centre

Costs will result from the production of the Strategy and those will be encapsulated within an Action Plan that will set out known and potential future funding sources. It is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy HOD2: Turnford Surfacing Site

See Appendix 3.

Policy HOD3: Hoddesdon Business Park

The Hoddesdon Business Park Improvement Plan is an existing Council document that incorporates an un-costed action plan. The Improvement Plan has been used

as a bidding document to secure funds for e.g. the Essex Road improvements. Review of the Plan would provide more focus on funding but it is not necessary to identify costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy HOD 4: High Leigh Garden Village

See Appendix 3.

Policy HOD5: Barclay Park and Spitalbrook

The extension of Barclay Park and its long term management is provided for through the section 106 agreement for High Leigh Garden Village

Policy PP1: Park Plaza West

See Appendix 3.

Policy PP2: Park Plaza North

See Appendix 3.

Policy PP3: Park Plaza South

See Appendix 3.

Policy WC1: Waltham Cross Town Centre

There are significant costs associated with the Strategy and projects are being financed and implemented on a continuing basis. With the exception of the development allocations within this Local Plan (see Appendix 3), it is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources to meet the local planning requirements of national policy and guidance.

Policy WC2: Waltham Cross Northern High Street

See Appendix 3.

Policy WC3: Waltham Cross Renaissance Area Action Plan

The proposed Area Action Plan will have substantial costs associated with it. The appraisal of the viability of the development options within the Action Plan will be assessed through the process of producing that Plan.

Policy WT1: Wormley Conservation Area Improvement Plan

Costs will result from the production of an improvement plan and those will be encapsulated within an Action Plan that will set out known and potential future funding sources. It is not necessary to identify those costs and funding sources at this juncture.

Policy WT2: Macers Estate

Various options have been considered with the majority owning B3 Living housing association for the regeneration of the Macers Estate – from relatively small scale environmental improvements to wholesale redevelopment. The current proposal is for a hybrid arrangement of limited redevelopment within and around the neighbourhood centre allied to a range of community and environmental improvements. The Council has not engaged in detailed viability assessment of the proposals, a matter that is being addressed by B3. What is ultimately implemented is likely to be a complex cocktail of funding sources. This is not considered to be a matter for the Local Plan to conclude on. Rather, the Policy is written in a flexible manner to promote and to be supportive of this local regeneration priority.

Policy LV1: Lee Valley Regional Park

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy LV2: Lee Valley White Water Centre

Projects to support the policy are being progressed by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority.

Broxbourne Leisure Pool site

See Appendix 3.

Policy LV4: Spitalbrook

See Appendix 3.

Policy LV5: Lee Valley Park Gateways

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy LV6: Former Britannia Nurseries Site, Waltham Cross

See Appendix 3.

Policy CS1: Cheshunt Country Club

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy CS2: Countryside Protection and Enhancement

Enhancements to protected countryside will be pursued with land owners. No supporting evidence is necessary.

Policy NR1: New River Conservation Area

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy NR2: New River Path

This is a promotional policy and enhancements to the New River path are being implemented as a result. In accordance with the policy, planning contributions are being successfully sought from qualifying developments to help finance this work.

Policy GT1: Gypsy and Traveller Sites

See Appendix 3.

Policy GT2: Extended Travelling Showpeople Site

See Appendix 3

Infrastructure and Delivery

The policies within this section are assessed within section 3 of this Paper.

Planning Obligations and CIL

Policy PO1: Planning Obligations

This policy seeks planning obligations to deliver sustainable development where they are financially viable. This Paper as a whole provides the supporting evidence to the policy.

Policy PO2: CIL

The Council is not introducing a CIL alongside the Local Plan but Policy PO2 proposes that this will be established through a later planning process. That process will require to be subject to viability appraisal, taking into account the burdens that have been placed on development by the policies of the Local Plan. It should be noted that the current intention is that CIL would not apply to strategic developments which are being negotiated through section 106 agreements.

Implementation

Policy IMP1: Delivery of Development

This policy states that the Council will as a last resort consider the use of compulsory purchase or other appropriate powers to deliver the policies of the Local Plan. For larger developments, the Council is unlikely to have the resources to make substantial purchases without these being underwritten by developers. Such arrangements are

being discussed in relation to certain strategic developments and where appropriate, these are referred to within the assessment of individual development sites within Appendix 3 of this Paper.

[Development Management Policies – Design and Sustainable Construction](#)

Policy DSC1: General Design Principles

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DSC2: Extensions and Alterations to Existing Development

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DSC3: Design Affecting the Public Realm

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DSC4: Management and Maintenance

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DSC5: Sustainable Construction

There are no extraordinary requirements within the Policy to necessitate any further supporting evidence. Application of the policy would, however, require to take into account the affordability of any measures sought.

Policy DSC 6: Designing Out Crime

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DCS7: Comprehensive Urban Regeneration

Seeking comprehensive development does have impacts on viability. Where this is the case for strategic developments promoted by the Plan, the matter is addressed within Appendix 3.

Policy DSC8: Shop Fronts and Fascias

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy DSC9: Advertisements and Signs

No supporting evidence necessary.

[Development Management Policies – Housing](#)

Policy H1 – Affordable Housing

For all qualifying developments, the Policy seeks 40% of units to be affordable and for a housing split of 65% social/affordable rented and 35% intermediate and shared ownership. These requirements are explicit within the strategic housing allocations and most other significant housing allocations. However, there are a number of examples where the policy indicates that a commuted sum may be more appropriate than on-site provision.

It is indisputable that this Policy places a significant burden on the returns from development compared to market sale housing. The question of whether it is an unaffordable requirement in its own right always comes down to individual site circumstances, the costs and returns on those individual sites and choices that frequently need to be made on the balance between different contributions.

The starting point in negotiations with developers is always to seek the requirements of the Policy and recent experience is showing this to be attainable in respect of both greenfield (e.g. Rosedale Park) and brownfield (e.g. Britannia Nurseries) sites. Where applicants seek to deviate from the Policy, Broxbourne's practice is always to seek a viability appraisal to demonstrate that the requirement is not affordable. Cheshunt Lakeside is a current example of this where only 10% of units are being offered as affordable within the recently submitted outline planning application. Appendix 3 of this Paper report discusses the application of the Policy to all the main site allocations and section 5 concludes on whether this has any implications for the content/soundness of the Policy.

Policy H2: Conversion of non-residential Buildings to Residential Use

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy H3: Housing Mix

Whilst the mix of housing within a development is clearly an important factor in viability and deliverability, the Policy is not prescriptive enabling flexibility to address and viability issues that may arise through viability appraisals.

The Policy also requires that on schemes over 20 units, 5% should be accessible and adaptable dwellings. This reflects Building regulations parts M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings). The costs of this requirement are as follows³:

- 1 bedroom apartment: £940
- 2 bedroom apartment: £907

³ Housing Standards Review: Cost Impacts (DCLG, 2014), page 38. M4(2) refers to category 2: dwellings which provide enhanced accessibility and adaptability. This should not be confused with the costs of M4(3) which refers to fully wheelchair compatible dwellings, the costs of which are considerably higher.

- 2 bedroom terrace: £523
- 3 bedroom semi-detached: £521
- 4 bedroom detached: £520

Costs associated with this policy are relatively low and it is not considered that these will have any significant impact on viability.

Policy H4: Houses in Multiple Occupation

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy H5: Housing for Specific Needs

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy H6: Loss of Specialist Residential Accommodation

Whilst there could be viability issues involved with developments that seek to depart from the Policy, this would come down to individual circumstances.

Policy H7: Residential Annexes

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy H8: Permanent Residential Moorings

No supporting evidence necessary.

[Development Management Policies - Economic Development](#)

Policy ED1: New Employment Uses

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy ED2: Employment Areas

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy ED3: Loss of Employment Uses – Rest of Borough of Broxbourne

No supporting evidence necessary.

[Development Management Policies – Retail](#)

Policy RTC1: Retail Hierarchy

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy RTC2: Development within Designated Centres

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy RTC3: Evening Economy

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy RT4: Hot Food Take-Away Uses

No supporting evidence necessary.

Development Management Policies – Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities

Policy ORC1: New Open Space, Leisure, Sport and Recreational Facilities

This policy requires planning contributions to the provision of new open space, community and leisure facilities for new residential development proposals. It makes particular reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (see section 3).

Policy ORC2: Loss of Open Space, Leisure, Sport and Recreational Facilities

Whilst the protection of open spaces could impact on the viability of development, there are not considered to be any instances within the Local Plan that are not examined in the site allocations in Appendix 3 of this document that would require further assessment.

Policy ORC3: Local Green Space

The policy references specific areas of local green space that are associated with developments. These are discussed in more detail in Appendix 3. The creation and protection of these spaces through the Local Plan is essential to the principle of these developments.

Policy ORC4: Amenity Spaces

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy ORC5: Community Uses

This Policy presumes against the loss of existing community uses/building. The Policy recognises that there may be viability issues associated with retention in individual cases. These are matters that would be assessed on a case by case basis and it is not necessary for the Local Plan to provide any further supporting evidence in support of the Policy.

Policy ORC6: Equestrian Development

No supporting evidence necessary.

Development Management Policies – Water

Policy W1: Improving the Quality of the Environment

Protecting the water environment can impact on the viability of development. However, the Council is satisfied that it has achieved an appropriate balance within its policies and site allocations and that no further supporting evidence is therefore necessary.

Policy W2: Water Quality

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy W3: Water Efficiency

Part G of the Building Regulations⁴ includes an optional requirement to restrict water consumption to 110 litres per person per day, below the standard 125 litre limit. The evidence of need for the Policy is provided by the classification of the Thames Region as a Water Stressed Area⁵. The cost of this measure is limited to water efficient fixtures and fittings (previously code for Sustainable Homes Level 4), which the Cost Impacts analysis of the Housing Standards Review suggested would be an additional £6-£9 per dwelling above normal build costs⁶. This is considered to have negligible impact on viability.

Policy W4: SUDS

The Policy seeks best practice is promoting SUDS networks within developments. This can have major financial implications for individual developments that are beyond the scope of the Local Plan to assess. Where developments are proposed that are not policy compliant, particularly in relation to meeting planning obligation requirements, viability assessments are sought that will include costs for SUDS networks. In certain instances that may result in underground solutions and that is the case at two allocated sites at Broxbourne School and Cheshunt Football Club. It is not considered that the Policy should be altered to address such circumstances.

Policy W5: Flood Risk

No supporting evidence necessary.

⁴ Approved Document G: sanitation, hot water safety and water efficiency (2016)

⁵ Water Stressed Areas – Final Classification (August 2013): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/water-stressed-areas-2013-classification>

⁶ Housing Standards Review: Cost Impacts, DCLG (2014), section 3.5

Development Management Policies – Green Belt

Policy GB1: Green Belt

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy GB2: Residential Development on Derelict Glass House Sites

An assessment of viability to demonstrate that glass house sites are incapable of accommodating a viable horticultural business is a key clause within the Policy. No further viability evidence in support of the policy is considered to be necessary.

Policy GB3: Rural Diversification

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy GB4: Occupancy Conditions

No supporting evidence necessary.

Development Management Policies – Natural Environment and Biodiversity

Policy NEB1: General Strategy for Biodiversity

The Policy in general and seeking net gains in biodiversity in particular could have major financial implications for developments. However, the Council considers that in making its site allocations it has been mindful of the intentions of the Policy and that in most if not all allocations the Policy will be met. It is not considered that any further generic viability evidence in support of the Policy would be necessary.

Policy NEB2: Wildlife Sites

Where designated wildlife sites affect the viability of site allocations, information is included within Appendix 3 of this paper.

Policy NEB3: Green Infrastructure

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy NEB4: Landscaping and Biodiversity in New Developments

Whilst this Policy confers costs on development, it is a generic policy that applies best practice in landscaping and biodiversity and whilst there will be costs associated with it, it is not considered that any further viability evidence in support of the Policy is necessary.

Policy NEB5: Ancient Woodland, Protected Trees and Hedgerows

No supporting evidence necessary.

Development Management Policies – Environmental Quality

Policy EQ1: Residential and Environmental Quality

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy EQ2: Air Quality

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy EQ3: Lighting

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy EQ4: Noise

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy EQ5: Contaminated Land

Some of the proposed site allocations are affected by contaminated land. This is covered by the analyses in Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy EQ6: Unstable Land

The Brookfield and High Leigh site allocations are affected by unstable land. Viability issues that arise from this are covered in Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Development Management Policies – Historic Environment

Policy HA1: General Strategy for the Historic Environment

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA2: Conservation Areas

Whilst the viability of development in conservation areas can be challenging, the only significant developments allocated within conservation areas are at the Council offices in Churchgate and at Broxbourne School. Possible viability issues are covered in Appendix 3.

Policy HA3: Demolition in a Conservation Area

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA4: Listed Buildings

This is a generic policy for the protection of listed buildings and no supporting viability evidence is necessary.

Policy HA5: Locally Listed Buildings

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA6: Works Affecting the Setting of Heritage Assets

This Policy does impact on the viability of the key strategic allocation of Brookfield Garden Village. This issue is covered in Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy HA7: Demolition of Listed Buildings

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA8: Historic Parks and Gardens

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA9: Archaeology

This Policy does impact on the viability of the key strategic allocation of Brookfield Garden Village. This issue is covered in Appendix 3 of this Paper. Otherwise, there is

no evidence that this Policy will have material impacts on any other development proposed within the Local Plan.

Policy HA10: Scheduled Monuments

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy HA11: Non-Designated Heritage Assets

No supporting evidence necessary.

Development Management Policies – Transport and Movement

Policy TM1: Sustainable Transport

This is a generic policy seeking to ensure that developments maximise sustainable transport and movement opportunities. There are costs associated with the implementation of this Policy but these are being managed within the detailed development of individual schemes. Those costs include planning obligations which are covered in section 3 of this Paper.

Policy TM2: Transport and New Development

There are costs associated with mitigating the transport impacts of developments pursuant to site allocations within the Local Plan. Those costs can impact on viability. The general costs of implementing the Broxbourne Transport Strategy are covered in Section 3 of this Paper. Specific cost/viability implications on individual sites are covered within Appendix 3.

Policy TM3: Access and Servicing

No supporting evidence necessary.

Policy TM4: Electric Vehicle Charging Points

The Council has proposed a main modification to this policy in order to improve its effectiveness, even for small developments, to require provision of ‘active’ EV charging points, *“or passive charging points where it can be demonstrated that provision of active charging points is not reasonable.”* (document EXAM 6, 10 May 2018, page 10)

A recent report by the Office for Low Emission Vehicles states that the cost for on-street charging points is in the region of £200-£500 per unit⁷.

A recent viability study for the London Plan states that: *“It should be noted that whilst it is important to make an allowance for any of these additional costs, some (e.g. affordable workspace, cycle parking [£758 per space]) have a minimal impact on overall build costs as they are a very small percentage, often less than 1% of GDV [Gross Development Value]. Therefore, any minor amendments of the policy through the plan process, or its application, will have very limited effect on overall viability”*⁸ In light of the costs set out above, it is considered that electric vehicle charging points fall into the above cost category.

Policy TM5: Parking Guidelines

The application of parking guidelines has a major impact on the costs and viability of developments, particularly within town centres and urban areas. Any specific issues relating to parking are covered within Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy TM6: Vehicle Cross-Overs

No supporting evidence necessary.

⁷Grants to provide residential on-street chargepoints for plug-in electric vehicles: Guidance for Local Authorities (Office for Low Emission Vehicle, January 2018)

⁸ London Plan Viability Study (Greater London Authority, December 2017), paragraph 7.2.10 page 50.

APPENDIX 2: INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

Policy INF1: Infrastructure

This umbrella Policy seeks to implement the IDP. Viability and deliverability issues associated with this policy are supported by the IDP itself and by the policy and site assessments within this Paper.

Policy INF2: Broxbourne Transport Strategy

This Policy seeks to implement the Broxbourne Transport Strategy. It is supported by the content of that Strategy, by the IDP and by the policy and site assessments within this Paper.

Policy INF3: Road Infrastructure

This Policy seeks to secure the necessary strategic road infrastructure in support of the Local Plan. It is supported by the content of the Broxbourne Transport Strategy, by the IDP and by the policy and site assessments in this Paper.

Policy INF4: Crossrail 2/four tracking

The Local Plan is not reliant on these projects and the inherent viability and deliverability issues associated with them. No supporting evidence is therefore necessary.

Policy INF5: Railway Stations

Whilst the Local Plan is not inherently reliant on these projects, there are issues associated with the development of the Park Plaza strategic development sites and the sustainable delivery of developments on those sites. Should it be proven that there is a business case for the provision of a railway station at Park Plaza, significant contributions will be sought from the two Park Plaza sites. The IDP makes provision for such contributions which are further discussed within Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy INF6: Level Crossings

The only viability issue in relation to a replacement level crossing that could affect Local Plan implementation is that proposed at Park Plaza North. This is discussed within Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy INF8: Bus Transport

Both the Local Plan and the Transport Strategy propose the introduction of new bus services. The Transport Strategy considers the cost of these services and the level of subsidy that is likely to be required to support them. These are also matters addressed within the IDP with costs assigned to the strategic developments. It is not therefore considered necessary to introduce further supporting evidence on the viability of these services. However, the associated costs are pertinent to the viability and deliverability of the strategic sites. The potential for these new services have been, are and will therefore continue to be discussed with the bus service operator and with the developers and promoters of the strategic development sites. These matters are further discussed within the strategic site analyses within Appendix 3.

Policy INF8: Local Cycling and Walking Plan

The deliverability of this Plan is considered within the Broxbourne Transport Strategy and the IDP with appropriate costs being assigned to development sites. No further supporting evidence is considered to be necessary.

Policy INF9: Utilities Statements

Utilities costs are one of the most significant costs on development and its viability. However, consultations with statutory undertakers have not highlighted extraordinary costs associated with the main development site allocations. The implementation of these allocations is therefore proceeding on the basis of normal utilities requirements.

Policy INF10: Reserve Secondary School Site

In identifying this site as a secondary school safeguard, the Council has been mindful of issues relating to viability and deliverability, mainly relating to access and ecological mitigation. The evidence base in relation to these issues is sufficient at this stage to enable the safeguarding to proceed. The delivery of the secondary school itself is further considered within section 6 of the IDP and contributions are being sought from strategic developments to support its ultimate delivery.

Policy INF11: New and Expanded Primary Schools

Delivery of the primary school programme set out within the Policy is considered within section 6 of the IDP and contributions are assigned to the strategic developments. Where the deliverability of primary schools impacts on the deliverability of individual developments, this is discussed within Appendix 3 of this Paper.

Policy INF12: Educational Facilities

Delivery of education facilities in relation to residential developments in accordance with the Policy is pertinent to the deliverability of the strategic development sites and is further discussed in relation to these sites in Appendix 3.

Policy INF13: Health Care

There has been a long standing dialogue with the NHS and the Clinical Commissioning Group on health facilities that are required to support the long- term development of Broxbourne and clear advice is still being sought from those bodies. The Policy is framed to reflect that position.

The provision of health care facilities is addressed within section 8 of the IDP. Costs are assigned to the strategic development sites and where pertinent to the deliverability of those sites, health care provision is discussed within Appendix 3.

Policy INF14: Hotels

This is a promotional policy that sets out and supports opportunities for new hotels within Broxbourne. It is not anticipated that all of these sites will ultimately support hotels and other uses may come forward in relation to these sites that are in accordance with the Plan.

APPENDIX 3: LOCAL PLAN SITES

Strategic Allocations – Brookfield

The Brookfield Site Allocation within Policy BR1 consists of two discrete but interconnected elements: Brookfield Riverside, a commercial/business/civic/leisure/residential mixed use town centre development; and Brookfield Garden Village, a largely residential new village. Whilst they are interconnected within the same Local Plan policy, the delivery mechanisms for each are very different and each is addressed separately below.

What is common to both allocations is the Brookfield Link Road that connects Brookfield Lane West to the Turnford Interchange. That link road will pass mainly through Brookfield Riverside and both developments will contribute to its construction.

The IDP has considered Brookfield as a single entity in establishing draft infrastructure cost requirements – a total of £37.62 million. Those requirements have not yet been sub-divided between the two developments.

Brookfield Riverside

Policy BR1 Brookfield sets out the requirements for Brookfield Riverside as being:

1. Up to 30,000 square metres net retail comparison floorspace;
2. c. 3,500 square metres retail convenience floorspace;
3. Up to 10,000 square metres leisure floorspace;
4. A civic centre;
5. c. 250 new homes;
6. 40% affordable homes;
7. Elderly persons' accommodation;
8. Business campus with c. 30,000 to 50,000 square metres floorspace;
9. Exceptional quality public realm;
10. Car parking;
11. Easy pedestrian connectivity to the existing Brookfield Centre, Brookfield Retail Park and proposed Brookfield Garden Village; and
12. New community woodland.

The Policy also requires the relocation of the Halfhide Lane travellers site, the Halfhide Lane allotments, the Household Waste Recycling Centre, and the Broxbourne Council Depot, all of which are located within the allocation area.

The main infrastructure costs associated with Brookfield Riverside are the Brookfield link road network, car parks and the package of measures associated with the IDP.

There are not known to be any other extraordinary costs required to deliver the development.

The contents of Policy BR1 have arisen from the evidence base supporting the Local Plan and in particular the Broxbourne Retail Study and the Broxbourne Economic Development Study. Whilst needs analysis goes some way to establishing a viable case for those uses, it does not guarantee market delivery and viability. That will ultimately be largely established through the successful implementation of a procurement process.

Land ownership within Brookfield is divided between Broxbourne Borough Council (BBC), Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) and two private land owners/option holders. As the principal land owners within the core of the development, BBC and HCC have made substantial progress on an OJEU procurement of a development partner to deliver Brookfield Riverside. The requirements of Policy BR1 are central to that procurement process. At the first stage of procurement, a number of expressions of interest were submitted and those have resulted in the short listing of four prospective development partners. All of those partners are in the process of producing master plans to inform the Councils' ultimate selection of its preferred partner.

In support of the Councils' procurement, they are being advised by Cushman & Wakefield a specialist firm of retail agents. The Councils are seeking wider Government support from the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF). As the procurement progresses, further information in support of the deliverability of Policy BR1 will be submitted into the Examination.

The Council is seeking to enter into partnership with the private land owners to deliver development on those lands. As a last resort, Policy BR1 states that compulsory purchase would be pursued by the Council.

Brookfield Garden Village

Policy BR1 Brookfield sets out the requirements for Brookfield Garden Village as being:

1. c. 1,250 new homes;
2. 40% affordable homes;
3. Elderly persons' accommodation;
4. Three forms of entry primary school;
5. Local centre;

6. Public open space and woodland including enhancement of the valley of the Turnford Brook as a green corridor and linear park through the development;
7. Protection and enhancement of scheduled monuments.

The main infrastructure costs associated with Brookfield Garden Village are the Brookfield link road network, car parks and the package of measures associated with the IDP (appendix 3).

There are also significant costs associated with:

1. areas of unstable ground. Whilst these areas will be substantially retained as open space, development within them is expected to require piled foundations;
2. protection of the historic garden and landscape at Wormleybury. This is primarily a design issue for master planning and does not impact significantly on viability.

The primary owners of the land associated with Brookfield Garden Village are Broxbourne Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council. However, one field at the south eastern corner is in private ownership and under option. BBC and HCC have jointly commissioned WYG, to master plan and project manage Brookfield Garden Village through to the anticipated delivery of an outline planning permission. The master plan has been produced and a planning application is expected to be submitted prior to the examination hearings and to further inform those hearings. The master plan is taking on board all of the foregoing policy and other provisions. The Councils have engaged Cushman & Wakefield to advise on scheme viability and procurement.

The Councils have yet to determine the procurement route for the delivery of the Garden Village. However, various models have been considered and the selected model is likely to be the one that provides the best returns in terms of place making and financial returns to the councils.

[Strategic Allocations – Cheshunt Lakeside](#)

Policy CH1 sets out that Cheshunt Lakeside will be developed as a new mixed use urban village to accommodate:

1. c. 1,750 new homes;
2. 40% affordable homes;
3. Buildings limited to a maximum of 8 storeys in height;

4. Elderly persons' accommodation;
5. Businesses and business floorspace for new business start-ups;
6. A local centre, situated along Windmill Lane, connecting Cheshunt Lakeside to Cheshunt Railway station;
7. A two form of entry primary school;
8. Landscaped open space;
9. Relocation of Network Rail depot.

As a developed industrial site, there are significant costs associated with land purchase, site clearance and probable de-contamination. There will also be significant re-location costs for businesses. Master planning is seeking basement and semi-basement car parks which will confer additional extraordinary costs. Most other costs will be normal site development costs.

The primary land owner is Cheshunt Lakeside Ltd (CLL), a joint venture development vehicle established by Inland Homes and Stonegate Homes. CLL is the majority landowner, having acquired a large portion of the site from Tesco's, whose headquarters were relocated from Delamare Road to Welwyn in 2017. The Council has been in discussions with CLL for 18 months and has resolved to enter into a formal agreement which would enable CLL to deliver Cheshunt Lakeside in its entirety as lead developer. However, a Development Agreement is not yet in place.

Whilst CLL is seeking to acquire as many interests as possible through negotiation, it is anticipated that the Council will have to promote a compulsory purchase order(s) to deliver the development in its entirety.

An outline planning application has now been submitted and validated for the Cheshunt Lakeside development. That is not expected to have been determined in advance of the Examination hearings.

A master plan accompanies the planning application that has been developed in full consultation with the Council. That master plan would deliver on the spatial requirements of the Policy.

There are two significant challenges to the Policy within the application:

1. The affordable housing content is 10%;
2. Planning obligations offered to date fall significantly short of those sought by the Council.

A full viability appraisal has been submitted that seeks to justify the content of the planning application. The Council is seeking independent advice on that appraisal. Whilst it is anticipated that this advice will have been received in advance of the examination hearings, CLL has indicated that the appraisal is a commercially confidential process that it would not wish to be brought into the public domain. The Council has advised that should the provisions of the draft NPPF that seek to publicise viability appraisals be contained within the final NPPF, then it would give notice of its intention to publicise the relevant documents following a notice period. The position regarding the release of viability evidence into the examination therefore remains uncertain.

CLL will be present at the examination hearings in respect of Cheshunt Lakeside to demonstrate viability and deliverability on the overall scheme. Further discussions will be held with CLL with a view to enhancing the viability evidence.

[Strategic Allocations – Rosedale Park](#)

Policy CH2 sets out that Rosedale Park will be developed as a series of interlinked new suburban parkland communities as follows:

Rosedale Park South

1. c. 360 new homes;
2. including a retirement “village”;
3. 40% affordable homes;
4. Low density parkland development between the nursery and the existing urban boundary;
5. No more than 5% to be apartments;
6. A local shop;
7. Landscaped open space;
8. Parkland and green areas;
9. Extensive pedestrian connections, in particular to the proposed primary school in the Rags Valley;

South of Andrews Lane and East of Burton Lane

1. c. 50 homes;
2. 40% affordable homes;
3. Provision of the St. James’ Green Link;
4. Pedestrian connections to Rosedale Park North and South;

Rosedale Park North

1. c. 380 new homes;
2. Sensitivity to valley setting and views;
3. Including elderly persons accommodation;
4. 40% affordable homes;
5. No more than 5% to be apartments;
6. Two form of entry primary school;
7. Andrews Lane to become a local access route only;
8. Extensive pedestrian connections including with Tudor Nursery;

Rags Brook Park

1. Fully accessible public park between Rosedale Way and Burton Lane with multiple connections to Andrews Lane, Peakes Way and Goffs Lane;
2. Net gains in biodiversity across the development;
3. Extensive tree planting throughout the development;
4. Expansion of Rosedale Sports Club;
5. Enhanced facilities at Rosedale Sports Club in accordance with a masterplan.

The Council has now resolved to approve three outline planning applications in respect all four areas set out within the Policy. The details of the section 106 agreements attaching to those planning permissions is being negotiated and it is anticipated that outline planning permission will have been granted for all three applications prior to the examination hearings. Successful implementation of these planning permissions will deliver on all aspects of the policy and the wider policies of the draft Local Plan.

As the planning applications have been policy compliant in their entirety, no further viability evidence has been sought or offered. The promoters of the planning applications have full control over all of the lands within them The Council will be supported at the hearings by those promoters to provide evidence that the permissions will be implemented in full.

There is one field within the policy allocation that has not been included within the planning applications. This could accommodate c. 20 homes. That field is unconstrained and a planning application for its development is expected in due course. No further viability evidence is necessary.

Strategic Allocations – High Leigh Garden Village

Policy HOD4 sets out to deliver High Leigh Garden Village in accordance with outline planning permission 07/13/0899/O. That permission has now been implemented. There is an extensive section 106 agreement attaching to the planning permission that sets

out a suite of planning obligations and that alongside the planning permission will act as a delivery vehicle for the development.

The lead developer of High Leigh Garden Village is Lands Improvement Holdings Ltd. (LIH), a company that the Council has worked with for many years to bring forward the development. LIH is putting in place the main road junction, utility and drainage infrastructure. Construction of that infrastructure is well advanced.

Concurrent with construction of the infrastructure, LIH is procuring housing developers to deliver the development. The Council will work with LIH and the developers to produce design codes as a forerunner to the submission of reserved matters applications. This process is imminent.

The section 106 agreement was subject to a full viability appraisal that demonstrated the development to be viable and that informed the scale of planning obligations. That appraisal remains confidential.

The development will include a two form of entry primary school to be constructed by Hertfordshire County Council. Financial provision has been made for that school within the section 106 agreement.

The southern section of the High Leigh site is made up ground from a former domestic refuse tip. That area is subject to appropriate remediation through the planning permission for sports and parkland use.

The site is traversed by a high voltage transmission network. The planning permission requires the undergrounding of the cables.

High Leigh Garden Village will be fully implemented within the early part of the Plan period and no further viability evidence is necessary.

Strategic Allocations – Park Plaza West

Policy PP1 allocates Park Plaza West for the development of a business campus based on the following principles:

1. Up to 100,000 square metres gross floorspace;
2. Gateway development sensitive to Green Belt setting;
3. Restricted to use classes B1a (offices) or B1b (research and development) or other uses that support the campus or clearly demonstrate that they meet the employment objectives of the Local Plan;
4. Generous and well landscaped setting including southern area of the site to be laid out as public open space (minimum 12.5 hectares);

5. Landmark development at corner of A10 and Lieutenant Ellis Way;
6. Bus service to be provided;
7. Parking in accordance with Local Plan guidelines;
8. Pedestrian and cycle connections to be made to the urban area;
9. New River and environs to be developed as a Green Corridor;
10. Cecil's Pond to be restored; and
11. Historic assets (including the listed barn) and their setting should be respected.

The main infrastructure costs associated with Park Plaza West are the road and movement infrastructure required to support the development.

The site is under option to Commercial Estates Group with whom the Council has been in liaison for several years regarding this prospective development. CEG is advised by Lichfields Planning and Development Consultancy and a conceptual master plan has been produced for the development. This master plan has informed the policy and vice versa. Development in accordance with the master plan would deliver all aspects of the Policy.

This is a very high profile employment site, the development of which has been fully supported by the Council's economic development study. It is also supported by the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership.

Lichfields advises and the Council would agree that it will take a significant period of time for a strategic scale business campus to become established in the market place and reach its full potential in terms of attracting leading occupiers, and which will be subject to a phased programme of delivery over at least 15-20 years. Whilst servicing is expected to commence early within the Plan period, this is therefore a long term allocation in terms of its complete delivery. All parties are, however, committed to that outcome and will support the Local Plan hearings in advocating the importance of the allocation.

Whilst marketing material has been produced that badges the site as 25:25 and confidential discussions have taken place with other development bodies, the site is unlikely to be fully marketed in advance of a successfully adopted Local Plan allocation.

CEG/Lichfields have questioned the scale and timing of the obligations set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Whilst Lichfields agrees that a fully developed 100,000 square metre business park could support substantial planning obligations, much of the off-site expenditure would be required at the front end of the development. The Council has explained that it is and will be seeking government/LEP support towards that infrastructure and is confident that this would be forthcoming for if the site allocation is adopted. This is likely to correspondingly reduce any obligations sought from the

development. Development of a station at Park Plaza North is likely be towards the end of the Local Plan period and any contributions to this would likely be triggered through on-going development of the Business Park.

It is anticipated that all parties (promoter, Council and LEP) will present a united position at the Local Plan hearings to further demonstrate the deliverability of an allocated site at Park Plaza West.

Strategic Allocations – Park Plaza North

Policy PP2 seeks the allocation of Park Plaza North for a variety of small and medium sized enterprises as follows:

1. Restricted to use classes B1, B2 or businesses requiring relocation as a result of regeneration developments proposed within this Local Plan; and
2. Landmark development at the corner of the A10 and Winston Churchill Way

There are no major site constraints to the development of Park Plaza North. There was a long standing issue related to the access into the site but that has now been resolved.

For many years, the Council had been promoting a business park at Park Plaza but that did not proceed due to disaggregation of the site, access and servicing, land ownership and market issues. The current Local Plan therefore adopted a different strategy for the site as encapsulated within the Policy. The Council has produced a conceptual master plan to demonstrate how that strategy could be delivered. That strategy was largely agreed with the previous site owner, CWS, and the site was marketed by CWS with the support of the draft Local Plan policy. During the two marketing periods for the site in 2017 and 2018, dialogue took place with prospective site purchasers with a view to support for the implementation of the Local Plan policy. The Council also bid for the site with a view to implementing its policy. However, it has recently emerged that the site purchaser is IKEA. The Council does not yet know what IKEA's plans are for the site but it is likely that the company will be seeking a substantial distribution operation possibly allied to the development of a store. Neither of these uses would be in accordance with the Local Plan policy which at the present time the Council would stand by.

Dialogue with IKEA is imminent and further evidence will be submitted into the Examination on the Council's approach to Park Plaza North as it becomes available.

Strategic Allocations – Waltham Cross Northern High Street

Policy WC2 sets out that Waltham Cross Northern High Street will be developed as a mixed use quarter as follows:

1. c. 300 new homes;

2. 40% affordable housing;
3. Shops/commercial/community ground floor uses.

The implementation of Policy WC2 is inextricably linked with the Council's policy approach to Park Plaza North as it seeks the relocation of the Homebase and Wickes stores (alongside Fishpools) to the Park Plaza North site. In the absence of those relocations, the policy would fall without an alternative relocation site as there would be no site for comprehensive redevelopment unless those stores discontinued trading within Waltham Cross. That in turn will have major consequences for the regeneration of Waltham Cross.

Positive discussions were held with Homebase, the land owner for the Homebase store, Wickes and CWS in 2016 towards possible relocation to Park Plaza North and a residential led redevelopment. Fishpools also strongly continues to advocate relocation of their store to the site. However, until there was clarification on site ownership at Park Plaza North it was not possible to advance the proposition. In the absence of dialogue with IKEA that remains the case.

As things stand, the Council continues to advocate the policy and further evidence will be submitted into the examination as it becomes available.

[Local Plan Allocations – Broxbourne](#)

Policy BX3: Broxbourne School

Outline planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of Broxbourne School in 2016. This involves the development of up to 153 new homes on the site of the current school which will finance new school buildings on the adjacent playing fields. That permission was subject to a detailed viability appraisal that sought to demonstrate viability. The development was only viable without the imposition of obligations for affordable housing and planning permission was granted on that basis.

Planning permission was granted in 2018 for a further extension to the new school to accommodate a sixth form. However, a reserved matters application for the housing is still awaited. That is expected to be submitted in 2018 and the overall development is expected to proceed in 2018/19.

[Local Plan Allocations – Cheshunt](#)

Policy CH7: Cheshunt Football Club

Policy CH7 proposes the development of c. 165 new homes, community and commercial floorspace to enable the development of the Cheshunt FC Stadium.

Planning permission was refused for a development that sought to meet the terms of the emerging policy in 2017. The reasons for refusal related to design, scale and density in relation to very special circumstances and insufficient information in relation to highways and ground heights. A new application has recently been submitted and seeks to address all of these issues.

The viability of the development was subject to a confidential detailed viability appraisal that sought to justify an absence of affordable housing on the basis of the sporting, recreational and community benefits that would accrue. The new detailed application is also subject to a viability appraisal that demonstrates that the development is deliverable without affordable housing.

The development is further complicated by the ownership position. Hertfordshire County Council owns the freehold and the head lease is owned by Broxbourne Borough Council. Land agreements with both parties remain outstanding.

The viability assessments demonstrate that the entire development is viable and it is anticipated that land deals will be agreed in due course to enable the development to proceed.

Policy CH9: Theobalds Brook Field

Theobalds Brook field is allocated for 96 homes. The site is owned by Hertfordshire County Council and an outline planning application has been submitted for the development. A planning obligations package is being negotiated with the County Council.

This is an unconstrained greenfield site with a willing land owner and it is not considered that further evidence is required to demonstrate its viability or deliverability.

Policy CH10: East of Dark Lane

This site is allocated for 60 homes. The site is owned by Hertfordshire County Council and an outline planning application has been submitted for the development. A planning obligations package is being negotiated with the County Council.

This is an unconstrained greenfield site with a willing land owner and it is not considered that further evidence is required to demonstrate its viability or deliverability.

Policy CH11: Former Eastern Playing Field

This site is allocated for a residential care home comprising 75 units. The site is owned by Hertfordshire County Council. The County Council had been seeking a general needs housing development on this site but both council's now agree that the site is ideally suited to supported elderly care housing. The County Council is therefore in the process of working up a scheme for the site. It is anticipated that further information will be available in due course for submission into the examination.

Policy CH12: Land North of Bonney Grove

There are three options for the development of this land:

1. A free standing housing development on the vacant field at the southern end of the V&E club, potentially allied to improvements to the Club; or
2. A comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site, retaining the V&E club on site; or.
3. A comprehensive redevelopment with relocation of the V&E Club.

All three options remain possibilities and discussions have taken place regarding potential relocation options for the Club. The policy allocation encompasses the entire site to give the Council and the land owners flexibility to deliver the scheme that ultimately offers the greatest benefits to the community. The Policy also proposes the production of a development brief which would encompass a feasibility study to consider the development options in more detail.

Policy CH13: Council Offices, Churchgate

There are two elements to this proposed development:

1. Development of the area of open space to the east of the Council offices. It is anticipated that this will proceed early in the Local Plan period and that it will be guided by a development brief to be prepared by the Council. The site is relatively unconstrained and it is not considered that further evidence is required to demonstrate its feasibility.

2. Conversion/redevelopment of the Council offices. It is only likely that this would take place when the Council relocates to Brookfield. That would also be subject to a development brief and likely feasibility study which will be undertaken later in the Local Plan period.

Policy CH14: South of Hammondstreet Road

The site is allocated for 44 homes. It is privately owned by a local resident who has confirmed that we wants to see it delivered in the first five years of the plan. He has now appointed a planning consultant and plans are being worked up. There are no known obstacles to delivery and the site is not in the Green Belt, with access options off both Hammondstreet Road and Argent Way. Delivery is considered straightforward.

Local Plan Allocations – Goffs Oak

Policy GO2: North of Goffs Lane

This site consists of three nursery sites and the Council had been working with a single land promoter, Land Chain, to implement a single master plan for the conjoined sites. Land Chain has not been successful in assembling the three sites but retains an option on the easternmost – Tawe Chain (or Gap) Nursery. Pre application discussions have been held with regard to the early submission of a planning application for development of this site and an application is expected to be submitted in the near future. Contamination may be present but the site is understood to be otherwise unconstrained and a housing development in full in accordance with the Local Plan policy is anticipated.

In-ex nursery has been acquired by a developer and positive pre application discussion has been held with a view to an elderly persons' development, allied to the commercial frontage sought by the Local Plan policy. A planning application is anticipated in the near future.

Policy GO3: South of Goffs Lane

This site is listed in the Local Plan as capable of providing 30 dwellings, but is being promoted for 73 dwellings by Countryside Properties. Recent enquiries have established that the former travelling showman's yard is not available for development in the short-term, but the allocation can be made deliverable through the inclusion of Lafiya House. Beyond the demolition of the existing structures including Lafiya House and removal of the structures associated with the former piggeries to the rear it is not considered that there are any abnormal costs associated with the site.

Policy GO4: Newgatestreet Road

This site has been promoted by the Council with a view to creating a new public open space for the village of Goffs Oak. Discussions have taken place with the land owner who has agreed to promote a development in accordance with the Local Plan policy. It is understood that the promoters are looking to achieve a policy compliant development.

Policy GO5: North of Cuffley Hill

This site is being promoted as two separate developments:

1. The C.G Edwards site is subject to a current planning application. That is expected to have been determined prior to the Local Plan hearings. The site is being acquired by Chase New Homes and subject to approval, development is expected to proceed in the near future.
2. The development of the Fairmead and Rosemead Nurseries sites are being promoted by Countryside Properties, which is proposing 60 dwellings on the site, more than the Local Plan policy proposal. The level of development will depend on whether an acceptable justification can be provided for the removal of any of the mature trees within the site.

[Local Plan Allocations – Hoddesdon](#)

Policy HOD2: Turnford Surfacing Site

The development of this site is subject to a Development Brief that has been produced by the Council. There have been long standing issues over access to the site across the railway bridge and more recently in relation for an unauthorised distribution use on the site. Both of these are now understood to be resolved and the Council is in active discussions with the owner and agent to bring forward a planning application for a development that is in accordance with the Council's brief.

[Local Plan Policies – Lee Valley Regional Park](#)

Broxbourne Leisure Pool site

There is an existing Development Brief that promotes the recreational development of this site but that excludes residential development. Both the Council and the LVRPA have now recognised that there is the potential for this site to accommodate some housing given its location adjacent to Broxbourne Station which is also the anticipated northern terminus of Crossrail 2. Policy LV3 states that the Council and the Park Authority will up-date the brief and that document will be the vehicle for promoting the site for development.

The site does face a number of constraints, particularly in relation to flood plain, levels and services. As far as is feasible, the amended brief will address those constraints but it is only likely through engagement with a development partner that the true potential of the site will be realised.

Policy LV4: Spitalbrook

As with the Broxbourne Leisure Pool site, the Spitalbrook area has been promoted for housing development by the LVRPA. Its potential is also being examined in relation to the Crossrail 2 business case. This area was the original selected site for the Lee Valley Olympic White Water Centre but did not proceed due to contamination issues associated with its previous uses for landfill and as an aggregates depot. It therefore has major constraints that require detailed feasibility prior to any development being considered. Policy LV4 promotes its reclamation and the Council, LVRPA and the Crossrail 2 team have held initial scoping discussions. Any development that is ultimately proposed would need to come forward through a Local Plan review or through a very special circumstances Green Belt case.

Policy LV6: Former Britannia Nurseries Site, Waltham Cross

This brownfield and previously contaminated site is currently under development for 96 new homes. This is in accordance with a planning permission that will deliver 40% affordable homes, a major new reception area for the Lee Valley Regional Park and a planning obligations package of contributions of c. £1.5 million. This permission was the subject of a detailed viability appraisal that ultimately demonstrated the ability of a heavily constrained site within Broxbourne to deliver on a wide ranging package of planning obligations.

[Local Plan Allocations - Gypsy and Traveller Sites](#)

Policy GT1: Gypsy and Traveller Sites allocates the following sites:

Expansion of Hertford Road

This small potential site expansion would be onto an open field in the ownership of Broxbourne Borough Council. The allocation of this site has come about through a predicted need arising from the Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment from the Hertford Road site. The site will be safeguarded and released to the Hertford Road community when the specific need arises.

St. James' Road Site

The Council accepts traveller needs for two new pitches arising from this site and those can be accommodated within the existing site boundaries.

Halfhide Lane Site

The Council is proposing to accommodate expanded needs arising from the existing Hertfordshire County Council owned Halfhide Lane travellers site through relocation to a site at Park Land Paradise within the Brookfield development. That is subject to an imminent planning application. The costs for this relocation will be met from the development.

Wharf Road

The Council proposes the establishment of a permanent expanded travellers' site at Wharf Road. Should the proposed allocation not proceed, the Council will continue to meet current and needs arising from Wharf Road through the on-going issue of certificates of lawfulness and potentially, planning permissions.

[Local Plan Allocations: Travelling Showpeople](#)

Goffs Lane

The needs of the travelling showpeople community at Goffs Lane will be met from within the current boundaries of that site. This has been discussed with the site owner and requires a variation of the existing planning permission to enable that outcome. The Local Plan allocation will secure the principle of that proposal. There are no other obstacles to deliverability of the site.

[Local Plan Allocations - SLAA and Brownfield Sites](#)

The Council is proposing to draw existing SLAA/Brownfield Register sites into the Local Plan through a series of main modifications.

Gasholder Site North of Broxbourne Station

The site is owned by National Grid and operated by Cadent Gas Ltd. Recent discussions suggest that the site is available and the proposal for 36 dwellings is achievable within the first five years of the plan. The costs of site clearance and remediation are considered to be within a reasonable range and present no insuperable obstacles to development within the above timeframe.

Land Rear of Flamstead End Shops

The site is owned by Broxbourne Borough Council and is considered capable of accommodating 10 dwellings. There are no abnormal costs associated with development in this location.

19 Amwell Street and Scania House

This site is owned by B3 living housing association. There have been several planning applications for 19 Amwell Street, which include conditional approval of the demolition of existing Doctor's Surgery and replacement new surgery with offices over in 1977. The demolition of the existing buildings may be required; however, this depends on the scheme that is brought forward. Demolition works may affect the viability of the scheme. It is considered that there are no policy constraints that would prevent this site from coming forward.

Westfield Primary School

The site is owned by Hertfordshire County Council and currently contains the 1FE primary school. There will be costs associated with the demolition of the existing building and relocation to High Leigh Garden Village but these costs will be covered from development of 40 homes on the site and an existing S106 contribution from High Leigh Garden Village. Hertfordshire County Council has recently (June 2018) announced that the school is due to open in September 2022⁹.

Former Hoddesdon Police Station

The former police station site is owned by Hertfordshire Constabulary which is keen to see it developed as soon as possible. Surveys carried out to date indicate that c. 30 dwellings could be accommodated on the site during the first five years of the plan. The costs of demolition of the offices and site clearance are anticipated within the normal range.

Theobalds Grove Station Car Park

This site is owned by Network Rail which is currently preparing a planning application. A massing study has been commissioned which is expected to yield an appropriate dwellings figure for the site. It is anticipated that the planning application will be received during 2018. There are not considered to be any abnormal costs associated with this site.

East of Dinant Link Road

The site is owned by Broxbourne Borough Council. The central part of the site is anticipated to provide for a new link road south of the very narrow Essex Road bridge to alleviate pressure on this critical access to Hoddesdon business park. LEP funding of £6.5million has been secured to fund the link road and therefore no further contributions from the development are anticipated. Recent masterplanning suggests that the site is

⁹ EDUCATION, LIBRARIES AND LOCALISM CABINET PANEL TUESDAY, 5 JUNE 2018: "ENLARGEMENT AND RELOCATION OF WESTFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, HODDESDON, OUTCOME OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION" – paragraph 2.3

capable of accommodating 30 dwellings on land immediately to the south of the planned road.