

## 16/00899/FUL

### TIMBER GROVE, LONDON ROAD, RAYLEIGH

#### 1. Reply to Consultation - NHS Castle Point and Rochford CCG

Advise that, further to a review of the applicants' submission, the following comments are made with regard to the primary healthcare provision on behalf of Castle Point and Rochford CCG, incorporating NHS England Midlands and East (East).

#### Review of Planning Application

The planning application does not appear to include a Health Impact Assessment or propose any mitigation of the healthcare impacts arising from the proposed development.

A Healthcare Impact Assessment (HIA) has been prepared by Castle Point and Rochford CCG to provide the basis for a developer contribution towards capital funding to increase capacity within the GP catchment area.

#### Assessment of Development Impact on Existing Healthcare Provision

The existing GP practices do not have capacity to accommodate the additional growth resulting from the proposed development and cumulative growth in the area. The development could generate approximately 208 residents and subsequently increase demand upon existing constrained services.

The primary healthcare services directly impacted by the proposed development and the current capacity position is shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Summary Position for Primary Healthcare Services Within a 2km Radius (or Closest to) the Proposed Development**

Premises	Weighted List Size <sup>1</sup>	NIA (m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>2</sup>	Capacity <sup>3</sup>	Spare Capacity (NIA m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>4</sup>
Audley Mills Surgery (including its branch)	19,514	871.66	12,712	-466.44
William Harvey Surgery	3,597	213.00	3,106	-33.65
Downhall Park Surgery	2,682	141.00	2,056	-42.91
Church View Surgery (including its branch in Hockley)	13,017	703.56	10,260	-189.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>38,810</b>	<b>1,929.22</b>	<b>28,134</b>	<b>-732.03</b>

Notes:

1. The weighted list size of the GP Practice based on the Carr-Hill formula; this figure more accurately reflects the need of a practice in terms of resource and space and may be slightly lower or higher than the actual patient list.
2. Current Net Internal Area occupied by the Practice.
3. Based on 120m<sup>2</sup> per single GP practice (with an optimal list size of 1750 patients) incorporating DH guidance within “Health Building Note 11-01: facilities for Primary and Community Care Services.”
4. Based on existing weighted list size.

The development would have an impact on primary healthcare provision in the area and its implications, if unmitigated, would be unsustainable. The proposed development must therefore, in order to be considered under the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ advocated in the National Planning Policy Framework, provide appropriate levels of mitigation.

**Healthcare Needs Arising from the Proposed Development**

The intention of Castle Point and Rochford CCG is to promote Primary Healthcare Hubs with co-ordinated mixed professionals. This is encapsulated in the strategy document: The NHS Five Year Forward View.

The development would give rise to a need for improvements to capacity, in line with emerging CCG estates strategy, by way of extension, refurbishment, reconfiguration or potential relocation at Audley Mills Surgery (including its branch); a proportion of the cost of which would need to be met by the developer.

Table 2 below provides the Capital Cost Calculation of additional primary healthcare services arising from the development proposal.

**Table 2: Capital Cost Calculation of Additional Primary Healthcare Services Arising from the Development Proposal**

Premises	Additional Population Growth (83 dwellings) <sup>5</sup>	Additional floorspace required to meet growth (m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>6</sup>	Spare Capacity (NIA) <sup>7</sup>	Capital required to create additional floor space (£) <sup>8</sup>
Audley Mills Surgery (including its branch)	208	14.26	-466.44	32,798
<b>Total</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>14.26</b>	<b>-466.44</b>	<b>£32,798</b>

A developer contribution will be required to mitigate the impacts of this proposal. NHS England calculates the level of contribution required in this instance to be **£32,798**. Payment should be made before the development commences.

Castle Point and Rochford CCG therefore requests that this sum be secured through a planning obligation linked to any grant of planning permission, in the form of a Section 106 planning obligation.

### **Conclusions**

In its capacity as the primary healthcare commissioner with full delegation from NHS England, Castle Point and Rochford CCG has identified that the development will give rise to a need for additional primary healthcare provision to mitigate impacts arising from the development.

The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth generated by this development.

Assuming the above is considered in conjunction with the current application process, Castle Point and Rochford CCG would not wish to raise an objection to the proposed development. Otherwise the Local Planning Authority may wish to review the development's sustainability if such impacts are not satisfactorily mitigated.

The terms set out above are those that Castle Point and Rochford CCG deem appropriate having regard to the formulated needs arising from the development.

Castle Point and Rochford CCG is satisfied that the basis and value of the developer contribution sought is consistent with the policy and tests for imposing planning obligations set out in the NPPF.

Castle Point and Rochford CCG look forward to working with the applicant and the Council to satisfactorily address the issues raised in this consultation response and would appreciate acknowledgement of the safe receipt of this letter.

## **2. Further Reply to Consultation Rochford District Council Assistant Director, Community and Housing Services**

As a point of further clarification the Strategic Housing Department had discussed numbers and possible make up for the affordable Housing with the housing providers who were interested in the Timber Grove development. We would receive 35% of the units (less the supported living units, as these can not be counted as affordable units) with the usual 80:20 split in favour of affordable rent. (Perhaps in future we need to discuss and provide direct information to the Planning Officer before they do their presentation at the Committee meeting with an explanation of how we have come up with the figures. I have provided numbers in the past, but perhaps we just need to formalise it a bit more)

When we discuss the breakdown of affordable rent accommodation with a housing provider, we take into account:-

- (1) The numbers on the Housing Register (currently over 650 applicants).

- (2) Bedroom size demands - where is the demand - 1, 2, 3, 4 bedrooms? (Currently there are 4 times the amount of applicants waiting for 1 and 2-bedroom units compared to 3 and 4-bedroom units)
- (3) If there is a particular demand for a type of property such adapted/ground floor (like we did at the Christmas Tree site where we had 7 properties built specifically to meet the needs of disabled clients who had been on the waiting list for a long time). We would discuss a similar arrangement for most sites.

Finally, if there is a particular demand such as the high demand we are currently experiencing for 2-bedroom properties for homeless families in emergency/ temporary accommodation.

The biggest problem with these calculations is the timescale between us providing the information and agreeing it with the developer and the actual delivery (I did a calculation for Hall Road in 2010 originally and again in 2014) and obviously demands change over time. We need to speed up the delivery time between us agreeing these numbers in the s.106 agreements and delivery on site. The affordable housing provider announced that it had secured a Hall Road affordable housing agreement in 2015, but with no delivery until the end of 2017. This is not the only site where there have been delays on delivery.

The 35 % definition is based on properties (units), not bedrooms, and I believe that this is a Government guideline (perhaps some one in Planning can confirm this). So we would need to change the wording on the planning policy documents. If we attempted 35% of bedrooms on a site would we not need to change the limit from 15 properties to X amount of bedrooms? I am sure there would be more challenges over viability issues if we did this and it would hurt the delivery of future affordable housing in the long term.

### **3. Supplement to Officer Report – Technical Space Standards**

The below details provide an analysis for the various house types below against the nationally described space standards for dwellings.

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : Technical Housing Standards: Nationally Described Space Standards</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Gross Floor Space Area sq.m.</b>	<b>Minimum Gross Floor Space Area required sq.m.</b>	<b>Built in storage</b>	<b>Comment / Standard Met</b>
Ht1a	1	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2a	2	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht1b	3	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2b	4	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht1a	5	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2a	6	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht4a	7	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : Technical Housing Standards: Nationally Described Space Standards</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Gross Floor Space Area sq.m.</b>	<b>Minimum Gross Floor Space Area required sq.m.</b>	<b>Built in storage</b>	<b>Comment / Standard Met</b>
Ht1b	8	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2b	9	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht1b	10	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2b	11	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht4a	12	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht4a	13	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht10	14	4B with Office	200	97	9.9	Supported Living Units 4 double bedrooms
Ht10	15	4B with Office	200	97	9.9	Supported Living Units 4 double bedrooms
Ht10	16	4B with Office	200	97	9.9	Supported Living Units 4 double bedrooms
Ht1b	17	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2b	18	4B/6P	114	112	3.00	YES
Ht4a	19	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht6a	20	3B/5P	106	93	2.75	YES
Ht4b	21	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht6a	22	3B/5P	106	93	2.75	YES
At1	23	2B/4P	75	70	2.0	YES
At2	24	2B/4P	76	70	2.0	YES
Ht1b	25	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2b	26	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht2a	27	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht1a	28	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2a	29	4B/6P	114	112	3.00	YES
Ht1a	30	3B/4P	89	84	2.75	YES
Ht2a	31	4B/6P	114	112	3.00	YES
Ht8a	32	3B/5P	102	93	2.70	YES
Ht8b	33	3B/5P	102	93	2.70	YES
Ht9	34	2B/4P	80	79	2.0	YES
Ht9	35	2B/4P	80	79	2.0	YES
Ht8b	36	3B/5P	102	93	2.70	YES
Ht8a	37	3B/5P	102	93	2.70	YES

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : Technical Housing Standards: Nationally Described Space Standards</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Gross Floor Space Area sq.m.</b>	<b>Minimum Gross Floor Space Area required sq.m.</b>	<b>Built in storage</b>	<b>Comment / Standard Met</b>
Ht12	38	3B/4P	94	84	2.75	YES
At1	39	2B/4P	75	70	2.0	YES
At2	40	2B/4P	76	70	2.0	YES
Ht4b	41	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht4b	42	3B/5P	98	93	2.75	YES
Ht2a	43	4B/6P	114	112	3.0	YES
Ht3	44	3B/4P	86	84	2.5	YES
Ht3	45	3B/4P	86	84	2.5	YES
Ht7a	46	1B/2P	52	50	2.0	YES
Ht7a	47	1B/2P	52	50	2.0	YES
Ht7b	48	1B/2P	52	50	2.0	YES
Ht7b	49	1B/2P	52	50	2.0	YES
Ht5	50	5B/7P	164	116	3.5	YES
Ht5	51	5B/7P	164	116	3.5	YES
Ht6a	52	3B/5P	106	93	2.75	YES
Ht6b	53	3B/5P	106	93	2.75	YES
Ht6a	54	3B/5P	106	93	2.75	YES
Ht5	55	5B/7P	164	116	3.5	YES
At3	56	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At4	57	1B/2P	64	50	1.5	YES
At3	58	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At3	59	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At5	60	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	61	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At6	62	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At6	63	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At3	64	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At4	65	1B/2P	64	50	1.5	YES
At3	66	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At3	67	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At5	68	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	69	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At6	70	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At6	71	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At3	72	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At5	73	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	74	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At3	75	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : Technical Housing Standards: Nationally Described Space Standards</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Gross Floor Space Area sq.m.</b>	<b>Minimum Gross Floor Space Area required sq.m.</b>	<b>Built in storage</b>	<b>Comment / Standard Met</b>
At5	76	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	77	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At6	78	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At6	79	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES
At3	80	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At5	81	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	82	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At3	83	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At5	84	2B/3P	64	61	2.0	YES
At3	85	1B/2P	51	50	1.5	YES
At6	86	1B/2P	55	50	1.5	YES

**4. Supplement to Officer Report – Garden Areas**

The below details provide an analysis for the various house types and their relevant garden areas for the respective plots they are proposed.

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : GARDEN AREA PROVISION</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Garden Areas Required</b>	<b>Garden Areas Proposed Sq m</b>	<b>Difference sq m</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Ht1a	1	3B/4P	100	114	14	
Ht2a	2	4B/6P	100	109	9	
Ht1b	3	3B/4P	100	111	11	
Ht2b	4	4B/6P	100	112	12	
Ht1a	5	3B/4P	100	112	12	
Ht2a	6	4B/6P	100	109	9	
Ht4a	7	3B/5P	100	131	31	
Ht1b	8	3B/4P	100	112	12	
Ht2b	9	4B/6P	100	100	0	
Ht1b	10	3B/4P	100	101	1	
Ht2b	11	4B/6P	100	124	24	
Ht4a	12	3B/5P	100	379	279	
Ht4a	13	3B/5P	100	354	254	
Ht10	14	4B with Office	100	174	74	
Ht10	15	4B with Office	100	197	97	
Ht10	16	4B with Office	100	315	215	
Ht1b	17	3B/4P	100	120	20	

<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : GARDEN AREA PROVISION</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Garden Areas Required</b>	<b>Garden Areas Proposed Sq m</b>	<b>Difference sq m</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Ht2b	18	4B/6P	100	105	5	
Ht4a	19	3B/5P	100	117	17	
Ht6a	20	3B/5P	100	141	41	
Ht4b	21	3B/5P	100	170	70	
Ht6a	22	3B/5P	100	168	68	
At1	23	2B/4P	50	84.5	34.5	
At2	24	2B/4P	50	84.5	34.5	
Ht1b	25	3B/4P	100	107	7	
Ht2b	26	4B/6P	100	107	7	
Ht2a	27	4B/6P	100	154	54	
Ht1a	28	3B/4P	100	180	80	
Ht2a	29	4B/6P	100	263	163	
Ht1a	30	3B/4P	100	230	130	
Ht2a	31	4B/6P	100	221	121	
Ht8a	32	3B/5P	50	177	127	
Ht8b	33	3B/5P	50	117	67	
Ht9	34	2B/4P	50	79	29	
Ht9	35	2B/4P	50	77	27	
Ht8b	36	3B/5P	50	105	65	
Ht8a	37	3B/5P	100	119	19	
Ht12	38	3B/4P	100	103	3	
At1	39	2B/4P	50	69.5	19.5	
At2	40	2B/4P	50	69.5	19.5	
Ht4b	41	3B/5P	100	113	13	
Ht4b	42	3B/5P	100	134	34	
Ht2a	43	4B/6P	100	133	33	
Ht3	44	3B/4P	100	134	34	
Ht3	45	3B/4P	100	100	0	
Ht7a	46	1B/2P	50			
Ht7a	47	1B/2P	50			
Ht7b	48	1B/2P	50	52.5	2.5	
Ht7b	49	1B/2P	50	52.5	2.5	
Ht5	50	5B/7P	100	102	2	
Ht5	51	5B/7P	100	105	5	
Ht6a	52	3B/5P	100	115	15	
Ht6b	53	3B/5P	100	121	21	
Ht6a	54	3B/5P	100	100	0	
Ht5	55	5B/7P	100	100	0	
At3	56	1B/2P				Apartments 56-71 have 296 m sq of communal amenity space



<b>16/00899/FUL: TIMBER GROVE : GARDEN AREA PROVISION</b>						
<b>House Type</b>	<b>Plot No.</b>	<b>Bedroom/ People</b>	<b>Garden Areas Required</b>	<b>Garden Areas Proposed Sq m</b>	<b>Difference sq m</b>	<b>Comment</b>
At4	57	1B/2P				
At3	58	1B/2P				
At3	59	1B/2P				
At5	60	2B/3P				
At3	61	1B/2P				
At6	62	1B/2P				
At6	63	1B/2P				
At3	64	1B/2P				
At4	65	1B/2P				
At3	66	1B/2P				
At3	67	1B/2P				
At5	68	2B/3P				
At3	69	1B/2P				
At6	70	1B/2P				
At6	71	1B/2P				
At3	72	1B/2P				Apartments 72-79 are located adjacent to 0.57 acres of public open space
At5	73	2B/3P				
At3	74	1B/2P				
At3	75	1B/2P				
At5	76	2B/3P				
At3	77	1B/2P				
At6	78	1B/2P				
At6	79	1B/2P				
At3	80	1B/2P				Apartments 80-86 have 610 sq m of communal amenity space
At5	81	2B/3P				
At3	82	1B/2P				
At3	83	1B/2P				
At5	84	2B/3P				
At3	85	1B/2P				
At6	86	1B/2P				

**5. Revised Recommendation**

Officers have been in contact with the applicant with a view to the provision of play equipment on the site. On the basis that the applicant agrees, this requirement would need to be secured by way of a further requirement (heads of terms) to the legal agreement to any grant of planning permission.

The **REVISED RECOMMENDATION is APPROVAL**, subject to the following additional heads of terms to the legal agreement:-

- (D) A developer contribution of £32,798 to the CCG to mitigate the impacts of this proposal upon local NHS provision. Payment should be made before the development commences.
- (E) Provision of play equipment on the site.

And to the conditions set out in the report.