

**Buckinghamshire County Council**

---

**Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Project Phase 2:  
Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe Districts**

---

**Final Report  
January 2008**

---

**Michael Ling – Town Planning Consultant**

## Contents

### Executive Summary

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 Purpose of project
- 1.2 Approach
- 1.3 Structure of Report

#### 2 Context

- 2.1 South East Plan housing proposals
- 2.2 Population projections
- 2.3 Distribution of planned housing

#### 3 Key aspects of each service

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Schools
- 3.3 Transport
- 3.4 Green Infrastructure
- 3.5 Libraries
- 3.6 Adult Learning
- 3.7 Waste disposal & Refuse Collection
- 3.8 Social Care
- 3.9 Open Space
- 3.10 Recreation facilities
- 3.11 Crematoria and Burial Grounds
- 3.12 Police
- 3.13 Fire and Rescue Service
- 3.14 Ambulance Service
- 3.15 Primary Health Care
- 3.16 Acute Hospitals
- 3.17 Mental Health Care
- 3.18 Higher Education

#### 4 Future Infrastructure Provision

- 4.1 Infrastructure upgrading
- 4.2 Long term planning
- 4.3 New delivery models
- 4.4 Co-location opportunities
- 4.5 Potential for Developer Contributions

## Appendices

- A Main Information Base
- B Key Drivers

## Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Project: Phase 2 Report

- C Facility Distribution Maps
- D Composite Infrastructure Investment Programme
- E Agency Contacts
- F Utility Issues

## Executive Summary

### *Aim and Scope of Project*

The Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Project was initiated in Spring 2006. The aim is to prepare a costed assessment of new infrastructure requirements to support future growth and population change in Buckinghamshire and to maintain this on an ongoing basis.

The overall aim of Phase 2 of the Project is to establish what progress has been made towards this aim by producing a comprehensive position statement on the service planning that has so far been undertaken by the various agencies responsible for planning and, in most cases, provision of future infrastructure. The present report comprises the position statement for the three southern districts, a separate report having been prepared for Aylesbury Vale.

### *Population context*

The latest population projections prepared by Bucks County Council in 2007 indicate that despite, the additional housing proposed in the three districts under the South East Plan (following amendments in the EIP Panel Report), the projected decrease in average household size results in very limited population change in Chiltern and South Bucks and a very modest increase of around 4,600 in Wycombe. The requirements for infrastructure in these districts over the South East Plan period are therefore not driven by the need to serve substantial additional population.

The relatively static population projections hide important changes to the age structure of the population. Projected increases in the population aged 65 and over, which makes major demands on health and social care services, are very substantial in all districts, ranging between 30% and 45% on the 2006 base by 2026.

### *Planning processes*

Most agencies have recently undertaken or are currently undertaking some form of review of the adequacy of their facilities in terms of the suitability of premises to satisfy their required function. These reviews vary considerably in their scope and detail from ad hoc identification of shortcomings of individual facilities to full estate strategies and comprehensive asset assessments.

Agencies vary considerably in the extent to which they have recently been undertaking long term planning of their facilities to meet future requirements. The County Council have been responding most directly to requirements generated by the housing proposals of the South East Plan to 2026, particularly where service needs are closely related to the size of particular age groups. Most agencies, however, are far more intent on developing their future provision arrangements to respond to inadequacies in their existing infrastructure and to reflect their emerging delivery models.

The planning processes for each service are also varied, both in their scope and stage reached, some being complete, some in progress and some about to start; in a few cases no processes have been identified. In most cases facility planning covers only the short or medium term, up to five years or so at most, rather than the 20 years of the South East Plan period. However, these time horizons are generally considered by the agencies concerned to be appropriate and adequate for handling the urgent changes needed. The implication appears to be that once the changes are in place the new arrangements will generally be serviceable into the medium and longer term future, or at least until further changes are made necessary by national policy or external factors.

#### *Delivery models*

Many agencies are currently engaged in changing the way they deliver their services, often with significant implications for the geographical distribution of their infrastructure and facilities. There are two clear tendencies within the variety of delivery models which are emerging: centralisation and decentralisation. Centralisation is aimed primarily at achieving efficiencies of scale, and decentralisation at improving the level of service received by clients and customers. Most new delivery models involve a combination of these two approaches. A further tendency within the decentralising trend involves changing the balance of delivery from dedicated centres to within the community itself, either through mobile services or visits to individuals in their homes.

#### *Co-location opportunities*

One of the objectives of the Bucks Infrastructure Project is to identify opportunities for joint provision of services or the use of shared facilities/co-location in meeting future needs. Most agencies express a desire and willingness to pursue synergies in facility provision, both because of the potential economies to be made in capital and running costs, and because of the benefits to be gained for the quality and efficiency of their service provision.

By bringing together information on the planning exercises of a wide range of agencies it is to be hoped that the present project will encourage agencies to engage further with each other to achieve the benefits of sharing locations and facilities. A first step towards this would be for agencies to share information on their emerging future proposals and on the locations where they are seeking to provide facilities so that the requirements of different agencies can be matched through joint provision where possible.

#### *Composite investment programme*

Appendix D of this report brings together the current firm proposals of each of the agencies responsible for planning or providing infrastructure (as far as it has been possible to identify these) into a single composite investment programme. These proposals include new facilities, major upgradings and relocations, as well as facility closures and site disposals.

#### *Potential for Developer Contributions*

Of the three districts, only Wycombe DC has so far published a *Developer Contributions SPD* (2007) specifying and justifying the contributions and obligations it will seek to fund infrastructure provision. The housing numbers proposed for Wycombe are substantial and will clearly generate demand for additional services. However, the relationship between the smaller additional housing numbers in Chiltern and South Bucks (and the negligible projected population change) and the infrastructure requirements in those districts is more tenuous. Much of the infrastructure required is to make up for existing deficiencies or to implement new delivery models. Justifying developer contributions to support the full range of infrastructure provision in such cases may be less straightforward.



## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of project

The Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Project was initiated in Spring 2006. The initial aim was to quantify and cost infrastructure required to support planned housing growth in the County in the period of the South East Plan, 2006-26. The work was progressed as two separate projects, one covering Aylesbury Vale, a growth area under the South East Plan, and the other the County's remaining three districts: Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe.

Phase 1 of the southern three districts workstream examined the impact of key drivers in shaping future infrastructure provision for public sector infrastructure categories (excluding County Council services, which were dealt with separately). It concluded that planned additional housing, which is relatively limited in these districts, is by no means the most significant factor determining the level of infrastructure provision required to meet the needs of the future population over the Plan period. Other contributors to requirements include:

- Meeting existing infrastructure shortfalls in terms of current desirable provision standards
- Maintaining current standards of infrastructure provision by ongoing maintenance and renewal
- Raising current standards of infrastructure provision by upgrading, extending and adding facilities
- Meeting additional infrastructure needs likely to arise among the population, for example as a result of the changing age structure and disposable incomes
- Adjusting forms of infrastructure provision to reflect new ways of delivering services

The remit of the Project has therefore been broadened to comprise a costed assessment of new infrastructure requirements to support future growth and population change in Buckinghamshire, i.e. all requirements over the plan period. As estimates of future infrastructure requirements may be expected to change over time the aim is to maintain the assessment on an ongoing basis.

The overall aim of Phase 2 of the Project is to establish what progress has been made towards the aims of the project by producing a comprehensive position statement on the service planning that has so far been undertaken by the various agencies responsible for planning and, in most cases, provision of future infrastructure. The present report comprises the position statement for the three southern districts, a separate report having been prepared for Aylesbury Vale.

More specific objectives are:

- To estimate and cost (where possible) future infrastructure requirements for the three southern Districts for all public sectors services, including County Council services in the period up to 2026;
- To identify opportunities for joint provision of services and the potential for sharing facilities;
- To examine existing sources of funding for each infrastructure category and potential funding streams;
- To examine the potential for securing developer contributions in Chiltern and South Bucks Districts and to widen the scope of the Wycombe Developer Contributions SPD.
- To provide an overview of any major issues relating to the provision of utilities in each District (water, gas, electricity, sewage and flood defences)

It is intended that this report will provide an evidence base for existing and future infrastructure provision to support the preparation of Local Development Frameworks in each of the three southern Districts in Buckinghamshire, as well as background information to assist infrastructure providers in the planning of their services.

## 1.2 Approach

The overall task of ensuring adequate infrastructure is provided to serve the future population can be broken down into a number of tasks that need to be undertaken by any service-providing agency, as follows:

- Auditing existing facilities
- Assessing adequacy of existing facilities
- Establishing a future delivery model
- Assessing future needs
- Planning future provision
- Establishing a programme of delivery
- Identifying funding sources

This report presents a systematic assessment of the progress that has so far been made towards undertaking these tasks.

The project covers all infrastructure relevant to the three districts whose planning or provision is the responsibility of a public service agency. These are:

*County Council responsibilities:*

- Schools
- Transport
- Green infrastructure

- Libraries
- Adult learning
- Waste disposal
- Social care

*District Council responsibilities:*

- Open space
- Recreation and leisure
- Crematoria and burial grounds
- Refuse collection and recycling

*Emergency services:*

- Police
- Fire and Rescue
- Ambulance

*Health services:*

- Primary health care
- Hospitals
- Mental health

*Others:*

- Higher education

Assessments for County Council services and for other services have been undertaken separately, the former by the County Council and the latter by the consultant. However, the results of assessments for both categories of service have been brought together as far as possible within a consistent framework in the present report on the Phase 2 work.

Information has been gathered from the following sources:

- Documents and papers prepared by the relevant agencies
- National and regional policy documents
- Agency websites
- Meetings with officers from each District Council
- Meetings, telephone discussions and email exchanges with officers of relevant agencies

A list of the key contacts in each agency and their contact details is given in Appendix E .

### **1.3 Structure of Report**

The Phase 2 work has involved assembling and examining a wide range of information on the activities of numerous agencies. While much of this information is directly relevant to the aims of the Project it would be unwieldy to present it in the main body of

the report. Two very substantial Appendices therefore provide information to back up the broad statements made in the main text, which summarise the position in relation to each service.

Following this Introduction, Chapter 2 provides some context on the planned future of the three southern districts, in terms of the South East Plan housing proposals, future population levels associated with these, and the extent to which the distribution of housing and population can be determined at present.

Chapter 3 presents a summary of the key aspects of each service. This comprises first a list of the key drivers affecting the need for change in future provision of infrastructure to support the service and secondly the position reached by the agency in relation to each of the tasks listed above.

Chapter 4 presents a synoptic view of the progress achieved so far by all agencies in undertaking long term planning of infrastructure provision in the three districts.

## 2 Context

### 2.1 South East Plan housing proposals

Table 2.1 sets out the numbers of net additional homes proposed to be built in the three southern districts of Buckinghamshire over the period 2006-2026 according to the submitted South East Plan and the modifications proposed in the South East Plan EIP Panel Report.

The final column shows the housing figures which underpin the latest July 2007 draft population projections for Buckinghamshire, undertaken by University of Manchester. These are based on housing trajectories in Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) produced by the District Councils and submitted to the Government Office for the South East (GOSE). Although these trajectories relate to the housing numbers in the submitted South East Plan (SEP), they are nevertheless broadly compatible with the latest EIP Panel Report figures, except that they fall 500 dwellings short of the latter's figure for Wycombe.

**Table 2.1 Planned housing numbers 2006 to 2026**

| District    | Housing numbers |                      |   |
|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
|             | Submitted SEP   | SEP EIP Panel Report | Bucks CC July 2007 Population projections |
| Chiltern    | 2,400           | 2,900                | 2,780                                     |
| South Bucks | 1,800           | 1,880                | 2,190                                     |
| Wycombe     | 6,600           | 7,800                | 7,320                                     |

### 2.2 Population projections

Population projections commissioned by the County Council were published in April 2006. These have since been revised to include more recent demographic data and the housing trajectories referred to above. The revised forecasts, covering the period 2001-26, were produced in July 2007 and are still in draft form. Although six scenarios were modelled, the figures for the three southern districts are constant over all the scenarios. Table 2.2 shows the total population in 2006 and 2026 and the change over the period, for each of the three districts.

**Table 2.2 Total Population, 2006 to 2026**

| District    | Total population |         |                   |            |
|-------------|------------------|---------|-------------------|------------|
|             | 2006             | 2026    | Change 2006 to 26 |            |
|             |                  |         | Total             | Percentage |
| Chiltern    | 89,970           | 89,020  | -940              | -1%        |
| South Bucks | 63,690           | 63,780  | +90               | 0%         |
| Wycombe     | 160,400          | 165,020 | +4,620            | +3%        |

Table 2.2 indicates clearly that despite the additional housing proposed in the three districts, the projected decrease in average household size results in very limited population change in Chiltern and South Bucks and a very modest increase in Wycombe. It is clear from this that the requirements for infrastructure in these districts over the South East Plan period will not be driven by the need to serve substantial additional population.

The relatively static population projections, however, hide important changes to the age structure of the population. Table 2.3 shows the population aged 65 and over in 2006 and 2026 and the change over the period, for each of the three districts. The projected increases in this age group, which makes major demands on health and social care services, are very substantial in all districts.

**Table 2.3 Population Aged 65 and over, 2006 to 2026**

| District    | Total population |       | Change 2006 to 26 |            |
|-------------|------------------|-------|-------------------|------------|
|             | 2006             | 2026  | Total             | Percentage |
|             |                  |       |                   |            |
| Chiltern    | 16078            | 23377 | 7299              | 45%        |
| South Bucks | 11394            | 15955 | 4561              | 40%        |
| Wycombe     | 23920            | 31389 | 7469              | 31%        |

### 2.3 Distribution of planned housing

Table 2.4 indicates the stage reached in the preparation of key Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which will establish the distribution of planned housing in each of the three districts and the current programme for their completion as set out in the relevant Local Development Schemes.

**Table 2.4 Progress towards adoption of key DPDs**

| District    | DPD             | Stage              | Date          |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Chiltern    | Core Strategy   | Preferred Options  | May/June 2008 |
|             |                 | Submission         | Mar 2009      |
|             |                 | Adoption           | May 2010      |
|             | Site Allocation | Preferred Options  | May/June 2009 |
|             |                 | Submission         | April 2010    |
|             |                 | Adoption           | July 2011     |
| South Bucks | Core Strategy   | Preferred Options  | Mid 2008      |
|             |                 | Submission         | Spring 2009   |
|             |                 | Adoption           | Mid 2010      |
|             | Site Allocation | Commencement       | 2010          |
| Wycombe     | Core Strategy   | Public Examination | Nov 2007      |
|             |                 | Adoption           | July 2008     |
|             | Site Allocation | Preferred Options  | Feb 2007      |
|             |                 | Submission         | Nov/Dec 2008  |

|  |  |          |      |
|--|--|----------|------|
|  |  | Adoption | 2010 |
|--|--|----------|------|

*Source: District Councils' latest Local Development Schemes*

Neither Chiltern nor South Bucks have yet prepared Preferred Options for their Core Strategies, although both expect to publish them in mid 2008. Thus, although most new development is likely to be located in and around the larger existing settlements, there is significant uncertainty about the detailed distribution of planned housing in these two districts. Both districts undertook housing capacity studies in 2006 and Chiltern is currently undertaking a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, but these cannot give a firm indication of the distribution of future housing, which will be determined in the Core Strategies and Site Allocation DPDs.

Wycombe has submitted a Core Strategy (which was subject to an Examination in Public in late 2007) and prepared a Preferred Options for a Site Allocations DPD. Table 4.3 of the Consolidated Core Strategy (an amalgamation of the Submission Core Strategy and Pre-examination Changes) of August 2007 presents a broad indication of the potential distribution of urban capacity (i.e. excluding additional greenfield sites), totalling 7350 dwellings, among the main settlements in the district, as follows:

- High Wycombe urban area – 5400 dw
- Marlow – 550 dw
- Remainder of Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley Subregion – 250
- Princes Risborough – 350 dw
- Remainder of District – 800 dw



### 3 Key aspects of each service

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter draws the main points for each service from the full range of information contained in Appendices A and B, which set out the comprehensive information base and key drivers respectively for each service.

##### *Information base*

The information in Appendix A is given under the following headings:

- *Name, status and scope of assessments/strategies/plans/programmes* - lists any significant documents dealing comprehensively with infrastructure assessment and planning, with their date of production, status (draft or adopted), and indicates their broad coverage.
- *Review process* - sets out the arrangements in place for updating infrastructure assessments and proposals, including the timing for the next stages in the process.
- *Existing provision* - lists the different types of infrastructure related to the service and their locations within the three districts. The distributions of these facilities are illustrated in a set of maps in Appendix C.
- *Adequacy of existing provision* - covers both quantitative and qualitative adequacy in relation to current needs; identifies the documents in which assessments are presented and lists the facilities recorded as inadequate.
- *Assessment of future needs* - documents work that has been undertaken to assess future needs, noting whether this takes account of long term housing proposals and population projections; notes whether needs have been quantified globally on a per capita basis or whether particular locations requiring provision have been identified.
- *Programme* - itemises firm proposals for infrastructure provision or change (i.e. those for which at least a moderate level of commitment and a clear timescale have been established), including closures and site disposals; provides capital costs where available and timing; and identifies key supporting decisions, such as planning approvals. It should be noted that items are not included in the programme just because a need for them has been demonstrated in an assessment.
- *Funding sources* - lists the normal sources of funding for capital costs, points out any significant deficiencies in these, and lists potential options for additional sources.
- *S106 scope* - indicates whether the facilities could potentially attract developer contributions (especially if this is the case elsewhere) and whether they can do so under current local planning policy, particularly in Wycombe which has prepared a draft Developer Contributions DPD.
- *Co-location potential* - notes the extent to which the service is currently provided in or from shared premises or in partnership with others and whether there are likely to be significant opportunities to increase such sharing.

Although Appendix A aims to present the information on each service consistently under these headings, it must be appreciated that agencies have very different approaches to reviewing their operations and planning their future facilities. Assessments of current adequacy of facilities, estimates of future needs, derivation of future delivery models, and delivery programmes are not always dealt with as separate tasks and may not be formally documented at all. It is therefore not always possible to present totally comparable information under each of the headings.

#### *Costing of infrastructure requirements*

One of the specified aims of the Bucks Infrastructure Project is to prepare and maintain a *costed* assessment of new infrastructure requirements. There are two broad potential approaches to assessing the costs of infrastructure requirements. The first is to make generalised assessments based on per capita cost assumptions which are applied to the numbers of additional dwellings or the projected population or relevant age group. The second is to identify the actual items of infrastructure that will be required and to sum their estimated individual costs.

The generalised approach is appropriate where much of the additional infrastructure requirement is expected to be generated by additional dwellings and population. This is the case in planned growth areas such as Aylesbury Vale. It also has some validity in relation to those services whose provision levels relates closely to population numbers or the projected future size of particular client groups such as children and old people. It has therefore been used here for a number of County Council services including Libraries and Social Care.

For most services in the southern three districts, however, the per capita approach would be misleading as future requirements are driven far less by additional demand for services due to household and population increase and far more by the need to overcome existing quantitative or qualitative inadequacies in provision, and by changes to the delivery models by which services are provided. Costs of meeting future requirements can therefore only be compiled where the facilities required to meet needs have been identified and costs estimated for them. For most services this stage has not been reached so estimates of overall costs of infrastructure requirements cannot be presented in this report.

#### *Content of service assessment summaries*

The following sections on each service are introduced by a summary of the key drivers which have been identified as most likely to affect the need for change in future provision of infrastructure to support the service. These are the drivers which have been categorized as being of “high” significance, in Appendix B, which assesses and categorises the significance of the full range of potential drivers. (However, where two or more “high” significance drivers are effectively the same, coming to the same point from different directions, only one is selected for the summary. For example, “changes in way services are delivered” may themselves result from “national policy” or “property/asset reviews”.)

The remaining subsections on each service summarise the position reached by the relevant agency in relation to the main tasks identified under Approach in Chapter 1. They aim to establish whether each task has been commenced, and if so what progress has been made towards planning and programming future infrastructure provision. However, they do not set out the detailed output from these tasks, such as the results of adequacy assessments and the contents of programmes. For these, reference should be made to Appendices A and D.

### 3.2 Schools (Buckinghamshire County Council)

#### (a) Key drivers

The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future schools provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers of primary and secondary school pupils are expected to decrease by 1,600 in Chiltern, 1,100 in South Bucks, and by 1,100 in Wycombe.
- *Site specific location of development* - The location of new development in relation to existing school catchment areas will be a significant factor in determining future requirements in existing schools and the need for new schools.
- *National policy* - In 2005 the Government announced a programme for upgrading, refurbishing or rebuilding half the primary Schools in England by 2022/23. A similar 15 year Government funded programme, which commenced in 2005, will result in the refurbishment or rebuilding of every secondary school in England, with Buckinghamshire falling in the last stages (i.e. years 13-15). In January 2007, the Government confirmed plans to raise the school leaving age from 16 to 18 by 2013; this will not necessarily mean that pupils will have to stay at school but they will have to continue to receive training. The Government's agenda for extended schools aims to ensure that all children should have access to a variety of school activities beyond the school day.

#### (b) Existing provision and future needs

Existing pupil numbers (2006-07) and numbers projected up to 2011/12 have been compared to current permanent capacity for all schools in each District. A number of primary and secondary schools are operating well in excess of current (2006/7) and/or forecast (2011/12) capacity. At the end of 2006 BCC prepared estimates of future education requirements up to 2026 based on pupil generation rates produced in October of that year. However, these estimates do not take account of the increased housing allocations in the EIP Panel report, BCC's revised population projections consequent on these (July 2007), and more recent figures for existing (2006/7) and projected (2011/12) capacity within existing schools (surpluses and deficits).

#### (c) Planning of future provision

Working in partnership with schools and other stakeholders Buckinghamshire CC will develop Local School Place Planning Commissioning Plans (Area Plans) that will establish the future scope of education provision in a local area, based on: population

trends, present school place information, quality of schools both in terms of educational outcomes and state of the property, housing growth. A plan for Wycombe Town will be the next to be prepared, after one for Aylesbury Town and adjoining developments.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

BCC will continue to provide education through primary (with pre-school places) and secondary (with post-16 places) schools. However, while secondary schools currently include grammar schools, under current legislation the Council is not allowed to increase the number of places in existing grammar schools or to build new grammar schools. Given the high level of demand for additional grammar school places, BCC faces the choice between restricting the number of grammar school places to current levels by raising the standards of admission, or ceasing to make places available to pupils living outside the county.

(e) Provision programme

There is no comprehensive programme of future schools provision as yet. One school, Cressex Community school, is planned to be rebuilt (under Government's the Building Schools for the Future initiative), by Sept 2009.

(f) Funding

Government's *Building Schools for the Future* initiative of 2003, a 15 year Government funded programme, covering the refurbishment or rebuilding of every secondary school in England, will be rolled out in phases, with Buckinghamshire falling into the last stages (2018 to 2020). The Government's Primary Capital programme, 2008-22, aims to rebuild, remodel and refurbish at least half of all primary school buildings in by 2022/3 in England. Under *Wycombe DC's Developer Contribution SPD (2007)* contributions towards additional capacity in primary/nursery, secondary and post-16 schools will be sought from most developments of 4 dwellings or more.

### **3.4 Transport (Buckinghamshire County Council)**

(a) Key drivers

Key drivers have not yet been identified in relation to transport infrastructure provision.

(b) Existing provision, future needs and planning of future provision

Buckinghamshire County Council's *Second Local Transport Plan - 2006/7- 2010/11* (2006) - describes Bucks CC's long-term 20-year vision for transport, identifying the wider policy framework that sets the boundaries for our work. It also explores the problems and opportunities that face transport in Buckinghamshire, and sets out transport strategies and plans for action for the next five years (between 2006 and 2011).

(c) Provision programme

The LTP programme has been updated by the County Council for the present exercise. It sets out all significant items of road, rail and other transport infrastructure provision for which a requirement has been identified or which are recommended for investigation.

The status of each is given, together with its estimated cost, probable funding source, and the year by which it is projected to be required.

(d) Funding

The usual sources for funding capital costs of transport infrastructure are:

- Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF)
- Transport Innovation Fund (TIF)
- Local Transport Plan (LTP)
- DfT
- SEERA
- Regional Funding Allocations (RFA)
- Targeted Programmes of Investment (TPI)
- Developer Contributions.

Under *Wycombe DC's Developer Contribution SPD (2007)*, contributions will be sought from developments of 4 or more new dwellings, or 200 sq m or more of commercial floorspace to reflect the net increase in vehicle movements attributable to new development in the district, with the figure per traffic movement derived from the cost of transport schemes included in the 5-year programme of the Buckinghamshire LTP (2006-2011), for which funding through developer contributions is sought.

### 3.4 Green Infrastructure (Buckinghamshire County Council & District Councils)

(a) Key drivers

Key drivers have not yet been identified in relation to green infrastructure provision.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

A *Green Infrastructure Strategy for Buckinghamshire*, currently under preparation, is identifying green infrastructure assets and projected deficits and needs for accessible greenspace in the three districts. An initial document *Towards a Vision for Green Infrastructure for Buckinghamshire (TVGIB)* (Nov 2006) identifies the main assets. A final report has not yet been produced.

(c) Planning of future provision

*TVGIB* contains indicative proposals for a High Wycombe and South Bucks Action Area, for the various elements of the Green Infrastructure Vision listed below. There are various green infrastructure proposals in the *Wycombe Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options* (2007).

(d) Delivery model for future provision

*TVGIB* proposes the designation of Green Infrastructure Action Areas for the creation and enhancement of strategic scale green infrastructure, each comprising: countryside access hubs, strategic access links, and strategic green infrastructure opportunity areas.

(e) Provision programme

There is no programme as yet for the provision of facilities under the *Green Infrastructure Strategy*.

(f) Funding

No funding sources are specified in *TVGIB*. There are no specific requirements for developer contributions for green infrastructure in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but reference is made to Policy 19 of the Core Strategy, which lists "through the development control process" as one of the delivery mechanisms for environmental assets, including green infrastructure.

### 3.5 Libraries (Buckinghamshire County Council)

(a) Key drivers

The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future library provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *SE Plan Housing Growth and its population impact* (Wycombe only) - Additional housing will generate net population increase in Wycombe of about 4500 between 2006 and 2026 (but negligible net population change in Chiltern and South Bucks).
- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+), who are frequent users of the library service, are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe.
- *National policy* - Government's Public Library Service Standards and 10-year strategy for libraries require Counties to ensure 85% of the population live within 2 miles of a static library with alternative mobile services being made available elsewhere, and encourage the promotion of reading and informal learning; access to digital skills and services; measures to tackle social exclusion and moves towards enhancing the skills of the workforce
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - Move towards mobile provision rather than new or extended static provision and encouragement to provide library services in existing buildings at community 'hubs' e.g. schools
- *Availability of resources* - Little capital funding for libraries means most authorities cannot keep up with maintenance requirements, resulting in partnership arrangements or complex funding packages to deliver service improvements. The potential of developer contributions towards funding library provision needs to be realised.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

No assessment of the adequacy of current facility provision is yet available. Demand for library space is taken to be population-related and current floorspace per capita standards have been used to make a broad assessment of future needs based on the latest 2007 BCC population projections. Given the current new library being provided at Wycombe there is no need to consider further new libraries to service population growth resulting from planned house building in the three Districts.

(c) Planning of future provision

The Service is currently undertaking a member-led review of current and future library provision which will report in Spring 2008.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The County Council's policy on library provision is: for populations of less than 5,000 to provide a mobile service if there is demand; for populations of between 5,000 and 7,500 to provide a mobile or static branch library; and for populations of more than 7,500 to provide a static library.

(e) Provision programme

As well as a new library at High Wycombe currently under construction, a number of modernization and redevelopment proposals are currently programmed under a variety of funding schemes.

(f) Funding

Library services have little Government assistance with capital funding and infrastructure funding is derived from a number of sources including: Lottery, LSC and developer contributions. BCC currently seeks to include Libraries in developer contributions agreements which are negotiated on a one-off basis when large developments take place. *Wycombe DC's Developer Contribution SPD (2007)* seeks contributions from housing developments with a net gain of four or more dwellings in three areas only: around Bourne End, Marlow and Hazelmere.

### 3.6 **Adult Learning** (Buckinghamshire County Council)

(a) Key drivers

The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future adult learning provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *SE Plan Housing Growth and its population impact* (Wycombe only) - Additional housing will generate net population increase in Wycombe of about 4500 between 2006 and 2026 (but negligible net population change in Chiltern and South Bucks).
- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+), who are a major component of demand for both recreation and re-skilling, are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - Buckinghamshire Adult Learning is working with other Post-19 providers to develop a more coordinated strategy for Post-19 education and training and also encouraging provision of ACL services in existing buildings e.g. schools
- *Availability of resources* - The Learning and Skills Council has set a maximum cost it is prepared to support for new and refurbished ACL buildings: £2,100 per m<sup>2</sup> for a new build and £1,100 per m<sup>2</sup> for a refurbishment (excluding land costs, landscaping and car parking).
- *Behavioural change* - The popularity of ACL is constantly growing.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

No assessment of the adequacy of current facility provision is yet available. Demand for adult learning space is taken to be population-related and current floorspace per capita standards have been used to make a broad assessment of future needs based on the latest 2007 BCC population projections. This suggests that only Wycombe will require additional ACL infrastructure (about 460sq.m) by 2026.

(c) Planning of future provision

There is as yet no clear indication of the required distribution of facilities to meet future needs. The Property Strategy for Adult Learning in Buckinghamshire is now coordinated through an Accommodation Group comprising representatives from the curriculum, operations, assets and finance teams in order to give input from all service perspectives.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

ACL teaching locations throughout Buckinghamshire are extremely diverse, using existing community facilities and Outreach Centres as well as the dedicated centres.

(e) Provision programme

There is no comprehensive programme of infrastructure provision as yet but capital bids have recently been submitted, with one approved towards provision in Wycombe and one awaiting outcome for rebuilding inadequate premises in Beaconsfield (South Bucks).

(f) Funding

The Learning and Skills Council provides funds to support new and refurbished ACL buildings. The County Council Culture & Learning Service has set out the basis on which developer contributions should be sought. *Wycombe DC's Developer Contribution SPD (2007)* seeks contributions towards adult learning facilities from housing developments with a net gain of four or more dwellings, and industrial, commercial, retail and other developments of 2500 sq m or more.

### **3.7 Waste disposal & Refuse Collection** (Buckinghamshire County Council and District Councils)

(a) Key drivers

The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Legislation* - The 1999 EU Landfill Directive imposes limits on the amount of biodegradable waste that can be landfilled in future. Using 1995 as a base date, biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) will need to fall to 75% of 1995 levels by 2010, 50% by 2013 and 35% by 2020.
- *National policy* - To ensure the targets in the EU Landfill Directive can be met, the Government introduced the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATs), which sets landfill allowances for each local authority. Failure to meet the LATs targets will result in the County Council having to pay a penalty of £150 for every tonne that exceeds the landfill allowance.

- *Local policies* - Bucks CC's adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan safeguards sites for waste transfer stations together with materials recycling facilities, at High Heavens (Wycombe District), and London Road Amersham (Chiltern District).
- *Availability of resources* - Availability of appropriate resources will be critical to the timely delivery of major waste management facilities.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

The *Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS), Consultation Draft* (Feb 2006) provides forecasts of waste arisings in Buckinghamshire up to 2020 using population projections based on the housing numbers in the submitted South East Plan (i.e. not the latest 2007 projections).

(c) Planning of future provision

The *JMWMS Consultation Draft* sets out proposals for the management of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) produced in the county to 2025, exploring alternative approaches to dealing with the forecast arisings. The *Buckinghamshire Waste Development Plan Document: Preferred Options Consultation Report* (June 2007) presents options for strategic allocations for future waste management facilities of different types.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The delivery model is set out in the *JMWMS Consultation Draft*.

(e) Provision programme

*JMWMS* suggests an investment programme to deliver refurbished Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs) but there is as yet no overall programme of provision of other facilities, some of which are awaiting site selection under the LDF process.

(f) Funding

The main funding sources for waste disposal are the Bucks County Council capital programme and private sector funding. Developer contributions towards waste management facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) although they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

### 3.8 Social Care (Buckinghamshire County Council)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for social care provision will not be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan, but rather by the substantial projected increase in the numbers of the elderly, who make heavy demands on the service. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+) are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe. The very elderly (80+) are expected to increase at an even higher rate: by 2,300 (+51%) in Chiltern, 1,200 (+38%) in

South Bucks, and by 2700 (+41%) in Wycombe. Little change is expected in the other age groups: children, young people and adults.

- *Commitments* – The programme for rolling out new Children’s Centres committed.
- *National policy* - “Choice for parents, the best start for children: a ten year strategy for childcare” (2004) set out the government’s proposals for establishing Sure Start Children’s Centres to provide seamless integrated services and information, and access help from multi-disciplinary teams of professionals for children under five. The ‘Better Government for Older People’ programme aims to minimise use of institutional services and maximise community based services, including support to carers.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - Extra Care Housing (a Department of Health initiative) will provide responsive, flexible and cheaper care within a domestic setting, as opposed to more traditional, institutional care. Future day care needs are increasingly likely to be provided in generic community centres and halls rather than in purpose built accommodation. A network of Sure Start Children’s Centres across the county will require suitably managed accommodation for the delivery of integrated multi-agency services.
- *Availability of resources* - In terms of care for the elderly, increases in residential provision would normally be provided by the private sector, with care providers meeting the capital costs. It is also anticipated that there will be increasing numbers of self-funders and more care provided in the home as opposed to in residential accommodation, reducing potential capital demands on the public purse. However, there could be a need for initial capital investment by the County Council. to manage the (short term) gap between demand and supply in the event of any shortfall in the availability of beds.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

Some accommodation is being upgraded/redeveloped to higher standards. The County Council have made assessments of the scale of future needs to 2026 for different types of service based mainly on their own latest (2007) projections of population and age structure. These include broad assessments of the need for additional residential places, care dwellings and day centre places, based on current demand ratios.

(c) Planning of future provision

Planning has been completed of the distribution of children’s centres, which need to be urgently rolled out across the county, but projections of need for other services over the long term have not yet been converted into physical requirements.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

Current policy and thinking encourages care and provision to be undertaken in the home and family environment and/or community as far as is practicable and possible. While this reduces demand for residential facilities it increases the requirement for other facilities such as day care centres.

(e) Provision programme

There is a programme for rolling out the provision of children's centres across the three districts by 2010 but no programme for other facilities up to or beyond that date.

(f) Funding

As more care takes place at home and in the community, revenue costs are likely to increase and capital costs decrease as less built infrastructure will need to be provided by the County Council but more staff, equipment and support will be necessary.

*Residential provision* - Increases in residential provision would normally be provided by the private sector, with care providers meeting the capital costs. The County Council would not be expecting to provide capital funding, but would revenue fund bedspaces as required. However, there could be a need for initial capital investment by the County Council to manage the (short term) gap between demand and supply in the event of any shortfall in the availability of beds.

*Extra Care Housing* - For capital funding, most extra care schemes rely on a mixture of Social Housing Grant, Department of Health Grant, and private finance (where the developer borrows part of the cost which is re-paid through sales, rent, or equities growth at the point of resale).

Developer contributions towards social care facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

### **3.9 Open Space** (Chiltern, South Bucks & Wycombe District Councils)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for open space provision will be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan only in Wycombe. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *SE Plan Housing Growth and its population impact* (Wycombe only) - Additional housing will generate net population increase in Wycombe of about 4500 between 2006 and 2026 (but negligible net population change in Chiltern and South Bucks).
- *Existing deficiencies* – Assessments in all three districts have identified significant deficiencies in terms of quantity standards, quality and accessibility of open space provision.
- *Specific location of development* - Apart from very small localised children's play areas, additional open space is likely to be required to serve new housing only if this is concentrated in single locations. However, new housing allocations and other major development proposals provide opportunities to insert replacement facilities where needed to resolve inadequacies and deficiencies.
- *Local policies* – Local planning policies and open space strategies in emerging LDFs will set out standards and requirements for open space provision.
- *Availability of resources* - There is likely to be high dependence on developer provision either directly or through contributions. This approach cannot easily resolve problems of redressing shortfalls in dense built-up areas.

## **Chiltern District**

(b) Existing provision and future needs

*Chiltern District Council Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Audit and Needs Assessment Final Report* (June 2005) provides a comprehensive audit of existing provision of all types of open space, sports pitches and recreation facilities and identifies significant deficiencies in relation to children's playgrounds and youth facilities in open space. This has been followed up in the *Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2007-10* (Nov 2006) which assesses requirements and deficiencies that should be made up. This does not refer to needs generated by future housing and population levels and distribution, however, but this would be unlikely to affect the assessment because of the minimal projected population change in Chiltern.

(c) Planning of future provision

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2007-10* identifies proposals to be given top strategic priority, including improved and new children's playgrounds and youth facilities in open space. The strategy proposes a continuous monitoring and review process comprising: annual update of audit details, annual evaluation and review of the delivery of the action plans, and three yearly review of the strategy.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2007-10* (Nov 2006) aims to address achievement of: joined up management of open space; accessible, high quality open spaces in both urban and rural areas; and appropriate balance between new provision and enhancement of existing provision.

(e) Provision programme

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy* in its Appendix E presents a district-wide Action Plan as well as a Parish by Parish set of actions. The district-wide action plan sets out a short description of each project, the lead group promoting it, estimated cost, funding opportunities, key actions required, and the target timescale. The latter only go as far as 2008.

(f) Funding

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy* refers to opportunities to promote the myriad of funding opportunities as a way of increasing the amount of external funding for the delivery of actions plans. Recent schemes for improving play opportunities have been funded by the Big Lottery Fund. The *Strategy* mentions the possibility of a developer contribution document as part of the LDF, but Chiltern DC has no overall policy on developer contributions at present.

## **South Bucks District**

(b) Existing provision and future needs

*South Bucks District Council Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities Strategy (OSSRF)* (Second draft) Dec 2007 provides a comprehensive audit of existing provision

of all types of open space, sports pitches and recreation facilities. The Strategy assesses future needs mainly through identification of significant existing deficiencies in quantity, quality and accessibility of open space provision, while noting that little population change is projected arising from housing growth.

(c) Planning of future provision

The *OSSRF* aims to provide a strategic direction for future maintenance, enhancement or extension of open spaces, sports and recreational facilities in South Bucks. It presents Action Plans for individual parishes comprising proposals for improvement or new provision and shows enhancement proposals for all sites audited,.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The *OSSRF* sets out a hierarchy for each type of open space, sports and recreational facility and sets standards for accessibility, quality and quantity. It proposes that the council prepare an Open Space SPD setting out planning policy guidance for implementing these standards. The South Bucks 2007 Local Development Scheme, however, does not include such a SPD, although it mentions the possibility of one in the future

(e) Provision programme

There is no programme of implementation of open space provision or improvement. The *OSSRF* states that a programme for implementation, monitoring and review of the strategy should be established.

(f) Funding

The *Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities Strategy* identifies the following sources of funding: Section 106 agreements, public sector grant funding, private sector grant funding, earned income, and endowments. It also recommends that the Council assess alternative models of management and financing, including the feasibility of establishing a green space trust.

South Bucks DC has no overall policy on developer contributions at present.

## **Wycombe District**

(b) Existing provision and future needs

*Wycombe District Open Space Study* (2005) provides a comprehensive audit of existing provision of all types of open space, sports pitches and recreation facilities. It found that play sites were often poorly located, with surpluses in some areas and deficiencies in others, and identified a few localised areas of open space deficiency. The *Open Space Study's* assessment of requirements does not refer to needs generated by future housing population levels and distribution. The latest 2007 BCC projected population change between 2006 and 2026 in Wycombe of around 4,500 may be expected to generate some increased demand for open space.

(c) Planning of future provision

Localised areas of open space deficiency have been taken up in the LDF preparation. The 2007 *Wycombe Site Allocations DPD Preferred Options* proposes a series of actions to meet the main open space deficiencies identified in the *Open Space Study*.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The *Open Study* sets out a conventional typology and hierarchy of types of open space.

(e) Provision programme

There is no programme of implementation of open space provision or improvement, beyond a statement in the Core Strategy that open space provision should be made in Desborough by 2016.

(f) Funding

The *Open Space Study* does not identify potential funding sources beyond the use of Section 106 agreements. South Bucks DC has no overall policy on developer contributions at present.

### 3.10 Recreation facilities (Chiltern, South Bucks & Wycombe District Councils)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for recreation facilities provision will be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan only in Wycombe. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Existing deficiencies (Wycombe only)* – Wycombe Sports Centre is coming to the end of its life and requires replacement, and there may be a case for sports hall provision at Princes Risborough and community pool provision in Marlow. Wycombe Wanderers Football Ground in High Wycombe needs to be replaced with a higher capacity ground to accommodate Wasps Rugby Club.
- *Specific location of development* - Proposed housing numbers are generally insufficient to generate a sufficient concentration of new population in any one location to justify, in their own right, insertion of new facilities. However, new housing allocations and other major development proposals provide opportunities to insert replacement facilities where needed to resolve inadequacies and deficiencies.
- *Property reviews/asset management (Wycombe only)* – Wycombe DC propose to redevelop the existing Wycombe Sports Centre for housing to pay for a new Leisure Centre planned to replace it. This would require a replacement site to be found for the existing athletics track attached to the Sports Centre, which is a sub-regional facility.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - There is likely to be a greater emphasis on joint use of school facilities in order to increase the viability of provision and increase opportunities for government funding.
- *Availability of resources* - Shortage of public funding is likely to mean that provision will depend heavily on developer obligations, asset sales, joint use and demonstrations of commercial viability of facilities..

(b) Existing provision and future needs

*Chiltern District Council Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Audit and Needs Assessment Final Report* (June 2005) provides a comprehensive audit of existing provision of all types of recreation facilities. *South Bucks District Council Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities Strategy* (OSSRF) (Second draft - Dec 2007) does the same for South Bucks. For all three districts, however, *Buckinghamshire Sports Facilities Strategy Final* (June 2007) (BSFS), provides the most up to date comprehensive audit of existing provision of sports halls, swimming pools and athletics facilities and identifies priorities for investment in facilities with reference to the London 2012 Olympic Games and to county and district wide sporting and community needs. The *BSFS* took account of South East Plan housing growth (pre-EIP Panel Report), using the 2006 BCC population projections to 2020, rather than the latest 2007 projections.

(c) Planning of future provision

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2007-10* identifies recreation facility proposals to be given top strategic priority to meet district requirements. South Bucks' *OSSRF* does not make such proposals. For Wycombe various planning documents propose actions to meet deficiencies and provide for future needs, including the *Submission Core Strategy DPD* (2006), the *Site Allocation Preferred Options DPD* (2007), and the *Developer Contributions Guide to Prospective Developers* (2007).

*Buckinghamshire Sports Facilities Strategy Final* (June 2007) identifies priorities for investment in facilities throughout the county with reference to the London 2012 Olympic Games and to county and district wide sporting and community needs. It recommends that the next stage of development of sports facilities in the County should be: to address the few identified quantitative facility deficiencies, to establish the target sports that are to be developed within the county and where, to identify the current facilities that could best facilitate this development and their programming, technical and qualitative. No timescale is set for this process.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The *BSFS* found that Buckinghamshire as a whole is generally well provided with sports facilities in quantitative if not qualitative terms and recommended that future investment should focus on the refurbishment, replacement, extension and adaptation of existing facilities rather than on new provision.

(e) Provision programmes

*Chiltern:*

*Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy* in its Appendix E presents a district-wide Action Plan as well as a Parish by Parish set of actions. The district-wide action plan sets out a short description of each project, the lead group promoting it, estimated cost, funding opportunities, key actions required, and the target timescale. The latter only go as far as 2008.

*South Bucks:*

There is no provision programme and neither the OSSRF nor the BSFS refers to any District Council proposals for further recreation facilities in South Bucks.

*Wycombe*

Various planning documents propose actions to meet deficiencies and provide for future needs in Wycombe but there is no programme or costing for their implementation, beyond a statement in the Wycombe *Core Strategy* that a new sports centre for High Wycombe should be provided by 2016.

(f) Funding

South Bucks' *OSSRF* identifies the following as suitable sources of funding: Section 106 agreements, public sector grant funding, private sector grant funding, earned income, and endowments. While both Chiltern and South Bucks strategies propose S106 for funding, neither currently has an overall policy on developer contributions at present. Wycombe's *Developer Contributions SPD* (2007) states that planning obligations should be used to remedy local deficiencies in the quantity or quality of sports and recreation provision but the level of contributions for recreation facilities is not specified.

**3.11 Crematoria and Burial Grounds** (Chiltern, South Bucks & Wycombe District Councils)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for crematoria and burial grounds will be little affected by the scale of housing growth in the South East Plan. Requirements for both are driven more by death rates than any other factor. As the only crematorium in the three districts, Chilterns Crematorium at Amersham, has ample capacity, there is unlikely to be any need for change so no significant key drivers are identified for crematoria. In the case of burial grounds, the only significant key driver apart from death rates is space deficiency in Wycombe District.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

As noted above, there is only one crematorium in the three districts, at Amersham. This has recently been subject to substantial investment to increase its chapel and cremator capacity well beyond current demand levels. Future demand in the three districts will depend on the forecast death rate and the proportion of deaths using cremation as opposed to burial, as well as the numbers attracted to other crematoria. Bucks CC have not yet provided death rates which take account of SE Plan housing figures but no major change is expected, even as the population ages. The current proportion of funerals using cremation is around 72%, a figure which has been reached gradually over many years but has probably peaked. There is very unlikely to be any shortfall in capacity over the South East Plan period.

There have been no audits of burial grounds in the three districts but information from the district councils indicates that there is a shortage of space at Princes Risborough.

(c) Planning of future provision

In relation to crematoria, there is no urgent need for long term future planning as the existing facility has ample capacity. Furthermore, consideration is currently being given to providing a crematorium in Aylesbury Vale to serve the growth area. Such a facility would release further capacity at Chilterns Crematorium. There does not appear to have been any forward planning exercise in relation to burial grounds.

(f) Funding

Developer contributions towards crematorium and burial facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

### 3.12 Police (Thames Valley Police)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for police provision will be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan primarily in Wycombe. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Existing deficiencies* - Gerrards Cross and High Wycombe police stations are unsuitable. Other deficiencies are expected to be identified in ongoing property reviews.
- *Specific location of development* – Concentrations of development may need new neighbourhood policing facilities or alter the categorisation of a neighbourhood and hence its manpower and property requirements. Non-residential types of development, especially large new retail/leisure development, town centre intensification, local commercial centres, industrial estates and distribution centres also generate particular policing requirements. New housing allocations and other major development proposals provide opportunities to insert required facilities.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* – The rolling out of Neighbourhood Policing has been generating the need for new Neighbourhood Police facilities within existing and expanding communities. In the long term TVP aim to scale down large police stations in town centre locations to smaller operational bases, while moving administrative office functions to edge of centre sites.
- *Availability of resources* - Current funding sources (Home Office Grant, Revenue Support Grant, Business Rates and Council Tax) are sufficient only to fund revenue expenditure. PFI is considered uneconomic and unduly protracted. New sources for capital funding are required, but no Home Office funding is available, therefore there will be significant reliance on developer contributions.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

While some inadequacies have been identified there has not yet been a recent comprehensive assessment of the TVP estate. TVP is currently commencing preparation of Local Policing Strategies for each local planning authority across their area. These will examine the suitability and sufficiency of existing accommodation as well as the impact of planned growth on future requirements, especially the need for new or expanded

neighbourhood policing facilities. The programme for their completion is: Wycombe early March 2008, South Bucks end April 2008, and Chiltern mid May 2008

A strategic property review will also be undertaken and should be complete by the end of 2008. This will examine the use of buildings, working practices, location and suitability of property, gap analysis and models/options for any identified re-provision.

(c) Planning of future provision

There is a statutory requirement for the Police Force to produce a three year Strategic Plan, and an annual Policing Plan. New legislation will result in the Three Year Strategic plan being refreshed annually from 2008 onwards and replacing the Annual Policing Plan by presenting a detailed plan for the first of the three years. The current *TVPA Strategic Plan* covers the years 2005-08, supported by an *Annual Policing Plan 2007 – 2008*.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The typical hierarchy of police facility provision at district level is: Tier 1 – Neighbourhood police office, Tier 2 – Sector Station (small town), Tier 3 – Local Policing Area HQ Station. The County level (BCU) HQ is in Aylesbury. The main element affecting the need for premises is the roll-out of neighbourhood policing by the end of March 2008: 12 neighbourhood units in Chiltern, 9 in South Bucks, and 16 in Wycombe. Each unit will require a space in a building as a base for teams of 2 up to 10 officers, but not every neighbourhood will have its own premises and some units will be housed in existing buildings such as police stations, schools and parish council buildings.

(e) Provision programme

TVP have not yet produced an itemised capital programme for police facilities.

(f) Funding

There is a small general allocation of capital grant and a small number of specific limited grants but this is normally allocated to non property areas. The remainder of the capital programme is funded by the sale of other assets or by borrowing or revenue support. TVP are engaging with district councils to obtain funding for capital expenditure attributable to new developments through planning obligations.

Wycombe DC has not yet incorporated a requirement for contributions to policing in their 2007 Developer Contributions SPD although the Police are mentioned there. The DC have agreed to take account of information on schemes identified through TVPA's Local Policing Strategies in revisions to their draft SPD in August 2007 and in their Annual Programme of Schemes.

### **3.13 Fire and Rescue Service (Bucks Fire and Rescue Service)**

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for fire and rescue service provision will be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan only in Wycombe. The key drivers likely to

have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Existing deficiencies* - Existing fire stations at High Wycombe, Amersham and Beaconsfield are in need of major refurbishment or replacement.
- *Current commitments* – There are commitments to relocation of the temporary Search & Rescue (SAR) facility at Beaconsfield Fire Station to Aylesbury, replacement of the existing High Wycombe fire station on a new site to be agreed, and refurbishment of Amersham fire station.
- *Availability of resources* - BFRS can no longer use the sale of capital assets to finance capital expenditure and it is therefore necessary for the fire authority to seek financial support from developer contributions.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

Using the Fire Services Emergency Cover (FSEC) modelling tool BFRS have validated the capacity of the existing fire stations to meet the required response time of ten minutes to 97% of reported incidents. The *Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP)2007-08 Action Plan* (April 2007) identifies a number of deficiencies in fire station accommodation in the three districts.

Under the *IRMP 2007-08 Action Plan* the BFRS are developing modelling capacity to supplement FSEC in order to help work out where to put fire stations, their expansion requirements, and what appliances and crews are needed, in order to achieve the optimum emergency cover for a given area. This should enable them to predict expansion requirements and costs in five year periods to 2031.

(c) Planning of future provision

BFRS is required by the Fire and Rescue Services Act (2004) to prepare an Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP), and to review this annually. This update is done through the annual IRMP Action Plan. Using the models under development, BFRS aim to have evaluated the implications of the South East Plan housing proposals for the number, type and location of Fire stations, as well as for community safety infrastructure and installations, by March 2008.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The BFRS delivery model is to ensure fire stations are located so as to enable fire appliances to achieve the required response targets.

(e) Provision programme

The BFRS *Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP)2007-08 Action Plan* contains a five year capital programme covering the years 2006/7 to 2010/11. This includes relocation or upgrading of several fire stations.

(f) Funding

BFRS can borrow without the need for Government consent provided they can afford to service the debt and the repayments. As part of the Local Government Finance Settlement each year an amount is factored into the revenue support grant to fund the interest

charges on an amount of capital borrowing. Capital spending is thus covered by borrowing, sale of assets (mainly land surplus to requirements) and government grants.

Wycombe DC's *Developer Contributions: Guide for Prospective Developers* (2007) proposes contributions for provision of fire hydrants, and to cover the cost of a Community Safety Cohesion Centre at High Wycombe Fire Station. BFRS have since obtained legal opinion stating that provision of fire hydrants could be ensured through planning conditions rather than developer obligations and are planning to pursue the former approach with Chiltern and South Bucks DCs.

### 3.14 Ambulance Service (South Central Ambulance NHS Trust)

#### (a) Key drivers

The requirement for Ambulance Service provision will be more affected by the distribution of new housing than by the scale of housing growth in the South East Plan. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The projected increase in numbers of the elderly in the three districts may be expected to increase demand for ambulance services both for both emergency and non emergency purposes.
- *National policy* - Department of Health have reduced the acceptable response time between an emergency call being answered and arriving on scene, from April 2008. This will significantly affect the appropriate distribution of ambulance facilities. Government policy to improve the ambulance service includes extending role of ambulances and ambulance staff, beyond dealing with emergencies to providing mobile health care.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* – South Central Ambulance Trust proposes the replacement of the three existing ambulance stations with a single hub or resource centre, to be located in or around High Wycombe, supported by a mixture of satellite stations or serviced stand-by points from which resources can be flexibly deployed.
- *Existing deficiencies* - All three ambulance stations in the area (High Wycombe/Chalfont St Peter/Amersham) are substandard, with issues either of capacity or suitability.

#### (b) Existing provision and future needs

The *SCAS Estate Strategy* (Feb 2007) assesses the whole of the Trust's estate and finds that much of it is in poor condition, with a particularly high proportion of the poor standard stock in Buckinghamshire. Deficiencies include premises being old, below acceptable standards for physical condition, not functional, overcrowded, below acceptable standards for statutory and non statutory standards, and below standards of energy efficiency. All three ambulance stations in the area, High Wycombe (Wycombe), Chalfont St Peter (Chiltern) and Amersham (Chiltern) are substandard, with issues either of capacity or suitability.

(c) Planning of future provision

Prior to merger in July 2006, the former separate Trusts were at varying stages of strategic planning with regard Service Strategies and resulting Estate requirements. The service strategy for the new Trust is under currently under development. The Estate Strategy will be reviewed and updated once these reviews have been completed.

The Estate Strategy proposes that a Berkshire/Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire joint feasibility study be undertaken to consider whether to redevelop or relocate the ambulance station at High Wycombe as a resource centre serving the South Buckinghamshire Locality.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The Estate Strategy proposes the replacement of the three existing ambulance stations with a single hub or resource centre. The latter would be located in or around High Wycombe.

(e) Provision programme

The *SCAS Estate Strategy* contains an eight year capital programme, covering the years 2006/7 to 2013/14. This includes new provision and site disposals.

(f) Funding

The main funding sources for the ambulance service are loans and the Trust's own resources, especially property disposals.

Wycombe DC has not incorporated a requirement for contributions to the ambulance service in their Adopted *Developer Contributions SPD* (2007). This states that the DC will engage with the Ambulance Service to see what facilities they are likely to require, their funding sources and whether any developer contributions are likely to be required. This information will be included in revisions to the SPD and the Annual Programme of Schemes.

### **3.15 Primary Health Care (Bucks Primary Care Trust)**

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for primary health provision will be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan only in Wycombe. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+), who place heavy demands on the ambulance service, are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe. The very elderly (80+) are expected to increase at an even higher rate: by 2,300 (+51%) in Chiltern, 1,200 (+38%) in South Bucks, and by 2700 (+41%) in Wycombe.
- *Existing deficiencies* – A relatively high proportion of existing GP premises are small relative to national space standards, not purpose-built, or not compliant with the Disability Discrimination Act.

- *Specific location of development* - Proposed housing numbers are generally insufficient to generate a sufficient concentration of new population in any one location to justify, in their own right, insertion of new facilities. However, new housing allocations and other major development proposals provide opportunities to insert replacement facilities where needed to resolve inadequacies and deficiencies.
- *National policy* - The Government health care modernisation agenda, which has been embodied in Department of Health PSA Targets for health care, aims to shift care out of hospitals, avoiding unnecessary admissions, and to provide more care closer to home. This will substantially increase the demands made on primary health care providers.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - The trend towards consolidation of GP practices within larger health centres, offering a range of services, will continue.
- *Availability of resources* - Bucks PCT has a large financial deficit and does not have resources to spend on projects. Neither does it intend to use PFI or LIFT which it considers are slow and bureaucratic methods. It is therefore largely dependent on initiatives from GPs and developers.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

Buckinghamshire PCT is not the owner of most of the primary care facilities in the area and has not produced an Estates Strategy. It has undertaken a prioritisation of all GP premises in terms of their need for investment and has identified a number of inadequate premises and areas that are poorly served.

The PCT undertook a community provision needs assessment in 2006 which reviewed the incidence of disease in the county and the availability of services. It used BCC population projections made in 2004 and therefore not taking account of the South East Plan housing figures. The assessment was not able to quantify the need for additional services.

(c) Planning of future provision

The PCT has prepared a Draft Strategic Plan (July 2007) which makes a general assessment of health needs, and identifies key strategic objectives, commissioning principles and priorities. However, the key vehicle for planning future provision is the Strategic Service Development Plan (SSDP). The PCT is currently working on integrating the SSDPs of the former three PCTs for Bucks into a single SSDP and this should be completed by April 2008.

Under the coordination of the Buckinghamshire Health Partnership Board (comprising representatives from the PCT, other NHS providers and BCC), the PCT are encouraging providers and BCC to share their plans and aspirations so that all their estates can be used to best effect. An estates group is being set up within the Partnership to take this forward.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

The PCT seeks rationalisation of GP services into well located health centres instead of numerous small individual GPs and branch surgeries. A key emerging concept is primary

care hubs, based on existing community hospitals or new facilities. These will provide a varying range of services including: intermediate services; therapy services and base for community care services; and diagnostics and minor ops facilities.

(e) Provision programme

Primary health premises are individually owned and do not form a single estate in the ownership of one authority. The PCT cannot therefore initiate change in provision, only pursue opportunities as and when they arise, e.g. through retirement of a GP, or voluntary combining of practices. There can therefore be no comprehensive plan or programme of change, only individual proposals such as the Chesham Health Zone and expressions of aspiration.

(f) Funding

Bucks PCT has a large financial deficit and does not have resources to spend on projects. The Department of Health has established a new delivery vehicle for primary health care facilities, the Local Improvement Finance Trust (LIFT). A LIFTco owns and maintains the building and leases the premises to PCTs, GPs, Local Authority Social Services, dentists, pharmacists, etc. The local PCTs are shareholders in the LIFTco to protect the public interest. However, the PCT considers this and the alternative PFI too slow and bureaucratic. Their favoured process is one by which a developer builds a facility and leases it to GPs and other agencies.

Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) states that contributions towards health facilities are not currently being sought. However, it notes that the PCT is currently carrying out studies to identify the need for new or improved GP surgeries and that requirements arising from these studies will be set out in future guidance.

### 3.16 Acute Hospitals (Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust)

(a) Key drivers

The requirement for acute hospital provision will not be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+) are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe. The very elderly (80+) are expected to increase at an even higher rate: by 2,300 (+51%) in Chiltern, 1,200 (+38%) in South Bucks, and by 2700 (+41%) in Wycombe.
- *National policy* - Government Policy, which has been embodied in Department of Health PSA Targets for health care, aims to shift care out of hospitals, avoiding unnecessary admissions, and to provide more care closer to home. Other things being equal, this will tend to reduce demand for hospital services, including beds.
- *Changes in way services are delivered* - Wycombe and Stoke Mandeville hospitals are being merged into a single hospital on two sites, with individual specialities allocated to each rather than shared between them.

- *Availability of resources* - BH NHS Trust develops its own business and investment plan on the basis of its expected income, rather than receiving allocations from a regional capital programme. Resources may be difficult to predict, especially given introduction of patient choice of which hospital to use.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

BH NHS Trust has made an internal review of its estates, summarised in its *Annual Plan 2007-08* (March 2007). Stoke Mandeville Hospital comprises low density, largely single storey buildings on a very extensive site, substantial areas of which are surplus to requirements. Wycombe Hospital site is particularly compact and includes a tower block that does not lend itself easily to refurbishment for modern health care; there is therefore little space to adapt the services in the Hospital.

The Trust has undertaken long term (20 year) projections of need based on BCC population projections which do not take account of the South East Plan housing targets and show a 7% increase in population in the county as a whole (compared with a 7.5% increase between 2006 and 2026 under the latest 2007 projections). The Trust is planning for a 25% reduction in outpatient attendances over the 20 year period, as a result of demand management and filtering out inappropriate outpatient visits, and no long term increase in demand for midwifery and paediatrics services. There should be no change in the total capacity required to deal with outpatients in terms of space and doctors.

(c) Planning of future provision

According to Board Paper 4.1, September 2007, the Trust aims to have a fully developed Corporate Strategy to guide investment decisions and the development of clinical services ready by December 2007. Preparation of an Estates Strategy was in progress during 2007.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

Hospital services in Bucks are being rationalised by merging Wycombe and Stoke Mandeville hospitals into a single hospital on two sites, with individual specialities allocated to each rather than shared between them. The use of the wards at High Wycombe Hospital to be vacated by Obstetrics, Gynaecology and Paediatrics when these services transfer to Stoke Mandeville Hospital will be reviewed in 2008.

(e) Provision programme

Phase 2 of a very significant investment programme is about to commence at Stoke Mandeville Hospital, involving replacement of clinical and non clinical accommodation from the remainder of the North and South Corridor (Ophthalmology Eye Ward and Theatre and Diabetes) in a new Out Patient and Day Case treatment Block.

(f) Funding

As a Foundation Trust BH NHS Trust does not receive allocations from a regional capital programme but develops its own business and investment plan on the basis of its expected income, based on national tariffs and predicted levels of work from its commissioners (especially Bucks PCT, which accounts for more than 60 % of its

income). Stoke Mandeville Hospital Phase 2 development is fully funded by the capital receipts arising from sales of surplus land from the site.

All three of the Trust's hospitals are covered by Private Finance Initiatives, which were heavily relied on for the most recent and current hospital improvements and expansions. However PFIs are no longer the Trust's favoured financing mechanism, especially given the lack of flexibility resulting from the 30 year franchise durations.

Developer contributions towards acute hospital facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

### **3.17 Mental Health Care** (Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Mental Health NHS Trust)

#### (a) Key drivers

The requirement for mental health provision will not be significantly influenced by the growth agenda of the South East Plan, but rather by the substantial projected increase in the numbers of the elderly, who make heavy demands on the service. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Change in demographic structure* - The numbers and proportion of elderly (65+) are expected to increase by 7,300 (+45%) in Chiltern, 4,600 (+40%) in South Bucks, and by 7500 (+31%) in Wycombe. The very elderly (80+) are expected to increase at an even higher rate: by 2,300 (+51%) in Chiltern, 1,200 (+38%) in South Bucks, and by 2700 (+41%) in Wycombe.
- *Existing deficiencies* - Many of the premises providing mental health services at present are substandard and unsuitable for their purpose.
- *National policy* - Standards for Better Health (Dept of Health, 2005, updated 2006) set out a new performance framework for the NHS, which changed the emphasis from targets towards standards that all organizations providing NHS care are expected to meet or aspire to.
- *Property reviews/asset management* - A comprehensive review of the Trust's estate has identified substantial changes needed to enable it to meet its strategic objectives. A number of existing facilities will relocate, mainly within the three districts.

#### (b) Existing provision and future needs

Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Mental Health NHS Trust has prepared an *Estates Strategy* (Approved March 2007) which makes a thorough audit of all existing premises and assesses their adequacy. Much of the estate is found to be not fit for its current use. The Strategy also assesses future requirements for the long term based on demographic projections to 2025. Although these assessments use the ONS 2003-based Sub national population projections, which pre-date the South East Plan housing targets, they show the major increase in demand from the elderly and limited change in other age groups characteristic of the latest BCC projections.

(c) Planning of future provision

The *Estates Strategy* is the key vehicle for planning future provision. It is intended that this will be reviewed annually.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

All inpatient facilities are to be brought together on a single site in Aylesbury. Community Services will continue to be provided from bases in Amersham and Wycombe, although some of these need relocation as they are unfit for purpose.

(e) Provision programme

The OBMHT Estates Strategy includes an investment programme for the five years 2007/8 to 2012/13.

(f) Funding

The Estate Strategy Capital Investment Programme will be financed by cash (40%), loans (22%), Public Dividend Capital (PDC) (20%) and asset sales (16%), although asset sales returns depend on planning permission being obtained.

Developer contributions towards mental health facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

### **3.18 Higher Education** (Bucks New University & Amersham & Wycombe College)

(a) Key drivers

The need for higher education (HE) provision is not directly driven by local housing and population growth as institutions take students from outside the three districts and similarly, a proportion of potential students from within the districts choose to go to other nearby or distant institutions elsewhere. The key drivers likely to have the greatest impact on future provision of HE over the South East Plan period are as follows:

- *Existing deficiencies* - the Buckinghamshire Chiltern University College campuses are dispersed and thus inefficient to operate; the buildings of Amersham and Wycombe College in both locations are old and costly to maintain, and therefore in need of replacement.
- *National policy* - Government targets for increasing participation in higher education combined with the uncertain impact of the new student "market".
- *Regional policy* - The Regional Economic Strategy and South East Plan both contain proposals to upskill in key professional areas to support the regional economy including major economic and employment growth in nearby Aylesbury Vale.
- *Property reviews/asset management* - Both HE institutions are engaged in major plans to reorganise their estates.
- *Availability of resources* - Individual HE institutions control their own finances, raising finance and buying and selling assets, and make their own investment decisions.

(b) Existing provision and future needs

There are two Higher Education institutions in the three districts: Bucks New University (BNU, formerly Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College), and Amersham & Wycombe College (AWC). Both have reviewed their existing estates and form of provision and have examined their future needs, although not in relation to any specific socio-economic projections. Both have also prepared strategic plans for their future long term development, involving substantial change to their current arrangements.

(c) Planning of future provision

*Bucks New University*

BNU has developed a Strategic Plan 2006-2011(August 2006) for redevelopment and refurbishment on its High Wycombe town centre site, with closure of its premises at Wellesbourne (also High Wycombe) and Chalfont St Giles (Chiltern).

*Amersham & Wycombe College*

AWC's Three Year Development Plan (2006) involves redevelopment on both its High Wycombe and Amersham sites, with closure of its premises at Chesham.

(d) Delivery model for future provision

*Bucks New University*

Facilities, currently dispersed among three separate campuses, are to be consolidated on a single site in High Wycombe.

*Amersham & Wycombe College*

Facilities, currently dispersed among three separate campuses, are to be consolidated on two sites in High Wycombe and Amersham.

(e) Provision programme

*Bucks New University*

Planning applications for the redevelopment of the main campus in Queen Alexandra Road, High Wycombe and developer plan to redevelop BNU's Wellesbourne campus for housing were expected to be considered by Wycombe District Council in December 2007. New buildings on the redeveloped main campus in Queen Alexandra Road, High Wycombe are planned to begin in summer 2008 for completion by summer 2009. Further refurbishment and new build is planned on the main High Wycombe site by 2011.

*Amersham & Wycombe College*

Negotiations with Wycombe District Council to acquire a site in central High Wycombe are in progress and the College are expecting to submit a planning application in summer 2008 for complete redevelopment of the existing Amersham site. Occupation of the site is planned by summer 2011. AWC are expecting to submit a planning application in summer 2008 for complete redevelopment of their Amersham site, for occupation by summer 2012.

(f) Funding

HE institutions use a variety of funding sources. Current restructuring programmes at both institutions are funded mainly by site disposals and borrowing. Other sources include Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), NHS, Learning and Skills Council, as well as employers and the community.

Developer contributions towards higher education facilities are not included in Wycombe DC's *Developer Contribution SPD* (2007) but they are collected by some authorities outside Buckinghamshire (e.g. Milton Keynes tariff).

## 4 Future Infrastructure Provision

### 4.1 Infrastructure upgrading

Most agencies have recently undertaken or are currently undertaking some form of review of the adequacy of their facilities in terms of the suitability of premises to satisfy their required function. Relevant factors include physical fabric, meeting space and other regulatory standards, and site location and access. These reviews vary considerably in their scope and detail from ad hoc identification of shortcomings of individual facilities to full estate strategies and comprehensive asset assessments.

The following agencies have undertaken comprehensive reviews of the adequacy of their estates within the last three years:

- *South Central Ambulance Service* - Estates Strategy (2007)
- *Buckinghamshire Primary Care Trust* – GP Surgeries (2007)
- *OB Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust* - Estates Strategy (2007)

The following agencies are currently undertaking asset reviews:

- *Bucks CC* – Countywide property review
- *Thames Valley Police* – Strategic property review by end of 2008

The following agencies have undertaken systematic reviews of the adequacy of their area's open space and/or recreation assets within the last three years:

- *Bucks CC* – Sports facilities (2007)
- *Chiltern DC* – Open space and recreation facilities (2005 and 2006)
- *South Bucks DC* – Open space and recreation facilities (2007)
- *Wycombe DC* – Open space (2005)

As a result of these and other more ad hoc reviews, the facilities listed in Table 4.1 have been identified as inadequate for their purpose, requiring either thorough refurbishment, redevelopment or upgrading.

**Table 4.1 Facilities identified as inadequate for purpose**

| Service        | Facility                                      | Action proposed          |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|
| Police         | High Wycombe Police Station                   | Relocate in High Wycombe |
|                | Gerrards Cross Police Station                 | Not yet known            |
| Fire           | High Wycombe Fire Station                     | Relocate in High Wycombe |
| Ambulance      | High Wycombe Ambulance Station                | Relocate in High Wycombe |
|                | Chalfont St Peter Ambulance Station           | Close                    |
|                | Amersham Ambulance Station                    | Close                    |
| Acute Hospital | High Wycombe Hospital (tower block)           | Not yet known            |
| Mental Health  | Children/Adolescents facility at High Wycombe | Relocate in High Wycombe |

|                  |                                  |                          |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
|                  | Older Adult facility at Amersham | Relocate in Amersham     |
|                  | Adult facility at Chesham        | Relocate in Chesham      |
|                  | Adult facility at Marlow         | Relocate in Marlow       |
| Higher Education | BNU: High Wycombe campus         | Redevelop                |
|                  | BNU: Wellesbourne campus         | Close                    |
|                  | BNU: High Wycombe campus         | Close                    |
|                  | AWC: High Wycombe campus         | Relocate in High Wycombe |
|                  | AWC: Amersham campus             | Redevelop                |
|                  | AWC: Chesham campus              | Close                    |

Key: BNU = Bucks New University; AWC = Amersham & Wycombe College

## 4.2 Long term planning

Agencies vary considerably in the extent to which they have recently been undertaking long term planning of their facilities to meet future requirements. The County Council have been responding most directly to requirements generated by the housing proposals of the South East Plan to 2026 particularly where service needs are closely related to the size of particular age groups. It needs to be borne in mind, however, that the housing provisions of the South East Plan in the southern three districts are not the generally the most critical factor driving future infrastructure needs there. Most agencies are therefore far more intent on developing their future provision arrangements to respond to inadequacies in their existing infrastructure and to reflect their emerging delivery models.

The pressure for this activity has come not from the South East Plan but from a combination of the demands of evolving national government policy and recent major restructuring of agencies. Three of the key component agencies of the health service in Bucks took their current organisational form and geographical coverage within the last two years:

- Buckinghamshire Primary Care Trust (PCT) was established in October 2006 by amalgamating its three predecessor PCTs (Aylesbury, Chiltern & South Bucks and Wycombe);
- South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust (SCAS) was formed in July 2006 from the former Two Shires Ambulance Service (Buckinghamshire element), Oxfordshire Ambulance Service, Royal Berkshire Ambulance Service and Hampshire Ambulance Service NHS Trusts;
- Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (OBMH) was created in March 2006 by the amalgamation of the former Oxfordshire Mental Healthcare NHS Trust and the former Buckinghamshire Mental Health NHS Trust.

They have been heavily engaged in reviewing their objectives and assets, sometimes hampered by changes in personnel as a result of the reorganisations.

Several of the external non-County Council agencies have, in the last two or three years, initiated formal organisational planning processes. These normally comprise three to five year strategic corporate plans, setting out broad objectives and targets, supported by annual reviews or action plans. These formal plans are usually too high level even to set the framework for facility planning so there is additionally a range of lower level

planning processes. Some of these are undertaken as part of estates reviews; others are relatively independent exercises.

The planning processes for each service and the existing documents resulting from them are set out in Table 4.2. As the table indicates, some of these processes have been completed, some are in progress and some are about to start (those described as “ongoing” have advanced into the second or later cycles of planning.) In a few cases no processes have been identified. The table also shows the time horizons for planning where these are defined. In most cases planning covers only the short or medium term, up to five years or so at most, rather than the 20 years of the South East Plan period. However, these time horizons are generally considered by the agencies concerned to be appropriate and adequate for handling the urgent changes needed. The implication appears to be that once the changes are in place the new arrangements will generally be serviceable into the medium and longer term future, or at least until further changes are made necessary by national policy or external factors.

**Table 4.2 Long term planning process and progress**

| <b>Service</b>       | <b>Planning document and/or process</b>   | <b>Position reached</b> | <b>Time horizon</b> | <b>Timetable</b>   |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Schools              | <i>Local School Place Planning Commissioning Plans</i> to establish future education provision in a local area are to be prepared by Bucks CC, in partnership with schools/other stakeholders.      | Not yet started         | Not stated          | Not known  |
| Transport            | <i>Second Local Transport Plan - 2006/7-2010/11</i> (2006)  | Ongoing                 | To 2026             | Reviewed annually  |
| Green Infrastructure | <i>Green Infrastructure Strategy for Buckinghamshire</i>  | In progress             | Not stated          | Not known  |
| Libraries            | The service is currently undertaking a member led review of current and future library provision.   | In progress             | Not stated          | Review will report in Spring 2008  |
| Adult Learning       | <i>Property Strategy for Adult Learning in Bucks</i> is coordinated through an Accommodation Group comprising representatives from the curriculum, operations, assets and finance teams.            | Ongoing                 | Not stated          | Not known  |
| Waste                | <i>Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (JMWMS), Consultation Draft</i> (Feb 2006) subject to three yearly review; specifies action plans flowing from its recommendations, for annual review. | Ongoing                 | 2025                |  |
|                      | BCC project underway to assess future HWRC requirements in the County.  | In progress             | Not stated          | Not known  |
|                      | <i>Buckinghamshire Waste Development Plan Document: Preferred Options Consultation Report</i> (June 2007)   | In progress             | 2021                | Public participation on Minerals/Waste Core Strategy in Feb/March 2008, with Core Strategy |

**Table 4.2 Long term planning process and progress**

| Service                 | Planning document and/or process  | Position reached     | Time horizon | Timetable   |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|--------------|---|
|                         |   |                      |              | adoption Jan 2010   |
| Social Care             | <i>Buckinghamshire Children's Centres Strategic Plan</i> (Feb 2006) Committed.  | Under implementation | 2009         |   |
|                         | <i>Buckinghamshire Children and Young People's Plan Draft</i> April 2006)   | Ongoing              | 2009         | Not known   |
| Open Space & Recreation | <i>Chiltern Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2007-10</i> (Nov 2006)   | Ongoing              | 2010         | Strategy proposes annual updates and three yearly review. |
|                         | <i>South Bucks District Council Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities Strategy</i> (Second draft) (Dec 2007)   | In progress          | Not stated   | Awaiting adoption.  |
|                         | Wycombe DC has no specific long term planning process for open space and recreation beyond Core Strategy and Site Allocation DPDs.                                      |                      |              |   |
|                         | <i>Buckinghamshire Sports Facilities Strategy Final</i> (BSFS) (June 2007). Proposes further planning to produce detailed proposals.                                    | Ongoing              | 2020         | Not known   |
| Crematoria              | Informal review only  | Complete             | Not stated   |   |
| Burial grounds          | No planning process identified.   |                      |              |   |
| Police                  | <i>TVPA Strategic Plan 2005-08</i> . This is not a facility planning document.  |                      |              |   |
|                         | Development of Local Policing Strategies has recently been initiated for each local planning authority to assess the impact of planned growth on facility requirements. | In progress          | 2026         | May 2008  |
| Fire                    | <i>Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP)</i> (2005) and <i>IRMP Action Plan 2007-08</i> (April 2007) reviewed annually   | Ongoing              | 2010         |   |
|                         | Using models currently under development, BFRS will evaluate the implications of the SE Plan for the number, type and location of fire stations.                        | Not yet started      | 2026         | March 2008  |
| Ambulance               | <i>SCAS Estate Strategy</i> (Feb 2007) Service strategy for the Trust currently under development, after which Estate Strategy will be reviewed and updated.            | Ongoing              | 2014         | Not known   |
| Primary health care     | <i>Strategic Service Development Plan</i> (SSDP). Bucks PCT is currently working on integrating the SSDPs of the former three PCTs for Bucks into a single SSDP.        | In progress          | Not stated   | April 2008  |

**Table 4.2 Long term planning process and progress**

| Service            | Planning document and/or process   | Position reached     | Time horizon | Timetable |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Acute hospitals    | <i>Corporate Strategy</i> . It is intended that this will guide investment decisions and the development of clinical services. | In progress          | Not stated   | Dec 2007  |
| Mental health care | <i>Estates Strategy</i> (Approved March 2007). To be reviewed annually   | Ongoing              | 2013         |           |
| Higher education   | <i>Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College Strategic Plan 2006-11</i> (August 2006)                                       | Under implementation | 2011         |           |
|                    | <i>Amersham and Wycombe College Three Year Development Plan</i> (2006). 2007 update was due to go to Board in Nov 2007)        | Under implementation | 2009         |           |

### 4.3 New delivery models

Many agencies are currently engaged in changing the way they deliver their services, often with significant implications for the geographical distribution of their infrastructure and facilities. There are two clear tendencies within the variety of delivery models which are emerging: centralisation and decentralisation. Centralisation is aimed primarily at achieving efficiencies of scale, and decentralisation at improving the level of service received by clients and customers. Most new delivery models involve a combination of these two approaches.

The following services are substantially revising their delivery models:

- *Police* – TVP are currently engaged in rolling out neighbourhood policing units, identifying premises to accommodate teams of 2/3 up to 10 officers in all existing neighbourhoods, although not every neighbourhood will have its own premises.
- *Ambulance* – South Central Ambulance Service is introducing a hub and spoke model, which involves replacing the three existing ambulance stations with a single new Resource Centre at High Wycombe, while rolling out a mixture of satellite stations and serviced or non-serviced stand-by points from which ambulances can be flexibly deployed.
- *Primary health care* – Bucks PCT is continuing to promote rationalisation of GP services into well located health centres instead of numerous small individual GPs and branch surgeries. At the same time it is introducing a “primary care hub” concept based on existing community hospitals or new facilities, which will provide a varying range of services.
- *Acute hospitals* – Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust is merging Wycombe and Stoke Mandeville hospitals into a single hospital on two sites, with individual specialities allocated to each rather than shared between them.
- *Mental health care* - OBMHT is planning to bring together all inpatient facilities on a single site in Aylesbury.

- *Higher Education* – Both Bucks New University is planning to consolidate its facilities on a single site in High Wycombe and closing its other two campuses at Chalfont and Wellesbourne, while Amersham & Wycombe College is planning to consolidate its facilities on two sites in High Wycombe and Amersham, closing its other campus at Chesham.

A further tendency within the decentralising trend involves changing the balance of delivery from dedicated centres to within the community itself, either through mobile services or visits to individuals in their homes. This can be seen in the following services:

- *Libraries* – BCC is moving towards increasing mobile provision rather than new or extended static provision.
- *Social and health care* - current policy and thinking encourages care and provision to be provided in the home and family environment and/or community as far as is practicable and possible, rather than in residential institutions and hospitals.
- *Ambulance* - Changes in service delivery in prospect include ambulance crews offering more tests, care and referrals in the home rather than in hospital.

#### 4.4 Co-location opportunities

One of the objectives of the Bucks Infrastructure Project is to identify opportunities for joint provision of services or the use of shared facilities/co-location in meeting future needs. Most agencies express a desire and willingness to pursue synergies in facility provision, both because of the potential economies to be made in capital and running costs, and because of the benefits to be gained for the quality and efficiency of their service provision.

By bringing together information on the planning exercises of a wide range of agencies it is to be hoped that the present project will encourage agencies to engage further with each other to achieve the benefits of sharing locations and facilities. A first step towards this would be for agencies to share information on their emerging future proposals and on the locations where they are seeking to provide facilities so that the requirements of different agencies can be matched through joint provision where possible.

Table sets out a list of facilities for which agencies are currently seeking to identify sites to meet their future requirements. The list does not include facilities for which sites have already been identified. It should be noted that inclusion of a facility on this list does not necessarily indicate a commitment to provide. In some cases, alternative means of meeting requirements may be found.

**Table 4.1 Facilities for which locations are currently being sought**

| Service | Facility                    | District | Location sought | Level of need |
|---------|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Police  | Police station              | Wycombe  | High Wycombe    | Confirmed     |
| Police  | Neighbourhood policing unit | Chiltern | Chesham         | Possible      |

**Table 4.1 Facilities for which locations are currently being sought**

| Service       | Facility                    | District           | Location sought    | Level of need |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Police        | Neighbourhood policing unit | Chiltern           | Little Chalfont    | Possible      |
| Police        | Neighbourhood policing unit | South Bucks        | Gerrards Cross     | Possible      |
| Police        | Neighbourhood policing unit | South Bucks        | Stoke Poges        | Possible      |
| Police        | Neighbourhood policing unit | Wycombe            | Princes Risborough | Possible      |
| Fire          | Fire Station                | South Bucks        | Beaconsfield       | Confirmed     |
| Fire          | Fire Station                | Wycombe            | High Wycombe       | Confirmed     |
| Ambulance     | Resource Centre             | Wycombe            | High Wycombe       | Confirmed     |
| Mental Health | Community Services          | Chiltern           | Amersham           | Confirmed     |
| Mental Health | Community Services          | Wycombe            | High Wycombe       | Confirmed     |
| Recreation    | Synthetic turf pitch        | Chiltern           | Chiltern           | Confirmed     |
| Recreation    | Football/rugby stadium      | Wycombe            | High Wycombe       | Confirmed     |
| Recreation    | Athletics track             | Wycombe            | High Wycombe       | Confirmed     |
| Recreation    | Sports hall                 | Princes Risborough | High Wycombe       | Possible      |

In some sectors there is already a substantial level of joint provision. Not surprisingly, the main instances to date have involved co-operation between different services within the same umbrella organisation. Within Bucks County Council, for example, Adult and Community Learning teaching locations use a wide range of existing community facilities and outreach centres as well as dedicated centres. Similarly, there is significant sharing of sites and facilities between members of the NHS family of organisations, with Bucks NHS Trust hospital sites accommodating mental health facilities run by the OBMH NHS Trust.

There are, however, indications of a growing interest in looking more closely at the potential for planning and providing services cooperatively, sometimes driven by national policy. Some examples (see Appendix A) are described below.

*(a) Adult and Community Learning/Higher Education*

Buckinghamshire Adult Learning is working with other post-19 providers to develop a more coordinated strategy for Post-19 education and training. These partnerships currently involve Buckinghamshire County Council and Amersham and Wycombe College, Aylesbury College, and Buckinghamshire New University.

*(b) Health Care/ Social Care*

Co-location with other providers of health and social services is a key feature of provision in these sectors and underpins much of the plans for future change. An ongoing review of service provision over the whole health economy of Buckinghamshire should identify opportunities for co-location and joint action between the PCT, Buckinghamshire Hospitals NHS Trust, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Mental Health NHS Trust, and Buckinghamshire County Council's Social Care Services for Adults and Children. A joint commissioning strategy combining health, housing, voluntary and independent sectors and covering the period 2008-11 was due to be agreed by March 2007.

The new Children's Centres being rolled out across the county will offer a seamless service for children, with care, education, health and wellbeing all provided under one roof.

*(c) Education/Community uses*

There is already significant community use of sports and recreation facilities within schools and this approach often offers the best opportunity for increasing the level and standard of provision for the community. When sports facilities are related to education provision it is easier to attract funding. Buckinghamshire County Council is engaging in the "Extended Schools" national initiative which aims at maximising opportunities for community use of facilities in schools.

Higher Education institutions also recognise the potential for arranging for community access to the sports facilities they provide for their students.

*(d) Police/Other agencies*

Thames Valley Police are keen to explore opportunities for co-location and possibly sharing of space, assuming suitability of location, access, security, quantity and cost of accommodation available. Co-location and sharing are more likely to be appropriate at a local neighbourhood level in local or neighbourhood centres, for example to house neighbourhood policing units. Sector police stations, or at least some of their functions, may be able to co-locate but district and higher level facilities are unlikely to be able to share for operational reasons. Joint provision has not been considered but could be linked to co-location where freehold/long leasehold tenure opportunities exist.

*(e) Fire/Other Emergency services*

BFRS are engaged in or seeking a wide range of partnership arrangements particularly to advance their community cohesion and safety roles. These include sharing mobile facilities (BFRS has part-funded two community safety vehicles) and providing a multi-agency room at High Wycombe Fire Station, currently used by multi-agency personnel and as a meeting place for minority groups.

The Community Safety Cohesion Centre at the proposed new fire station at High Wycombe would be a multi-agency education centre, like the one operating in Milton Keynes.

There is potential for associating ambulance infrastructure with fire services provision. Several of the planned new ambulance standby points are to be located at fire stations.

#### 4.5 Composite Infrastructure Programme

Appendix D brings together the current firm proposals of each of the agencies responsible for planning or providing infrastructure (as far as it has been possible to identify these) into a single composite investment programme. These proposals include new facilities, major upgradings and relocations, as well as facility closures and site disposals.

Because of the range of agencies involved, their particular responsibilities and powers, their varied types of funding, and the different stages they have reached in forward investment planning, there is no common definition of which infrastructure items should be treated as “programmed”. The general principle has been to include items for which at least a moderate level of commitment is indicated by the degree of clarity in defining the project content (and possibly its cost) and establishing its timing. It should be recognised, therefore, that the programme does not include all items identified in assessments of adequacy or to meet future needs unless these show the requisite level of commitment.

The Appendix covers the following aspects of each proposal:

- *Sector* – such as Social Care, Primary Health etc;
- *District* – within which the proposal is located, although some proposals are not confined to a single district;
- *Proposal* – brief description of the content of the proposal; for further details reference should be made to Appendix A;
- *Location* – town or other settlement within which the site of the proposal falls, or, in the case of a transport proposal, the route involved;
- *Proposing agency* – this may or may not be the agency with authority to approve the project;
- *Cost* – capital cost of the project, where this has been estimated;
- *Status* – whether funding is committed and any key supporting decisions still to be made (such as granting of planning permission); this information is not always available;
- *Year* – date by which agency expects the investment to be complete (or the site disposal to have been made).

#### 4.6 Potential for Developer Contributions

Developer contributions through Section 106 agreements are playing an increasing role in funding infrastructure provision, particularly in areas where significant housing growth is planned. The housing numbers proposed for Wycombe are substantial and will clearly generate demand for additional services. However, the relationship between the smaller additional housing numbers in Chiltern and South Bucks (and the negligible projected population change) and the infrastructure requirements in those districts is more tenuous.

This report has found that much of the infrastructure required is to make up for existing deficiencies or to implement new delivery models.

Under current government policy as set out in Circular 05/2005, “planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision or to secure contributions to the achievement of wider planning objectives that are not necessary to allow consent to be given for a particular development” (Para B9). The recent briefing document on the Government’s planned new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (Jan 2008) makes it clear that CIL will follow fundamentally the same approach. It should “only include items of infrastructure that are likely to enable, facilitate or mitigate the impact of development in the area” (Para 31). Furthermore, it “should not be used for general local authority expenditure, nor to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision, unless these have been, or will in time be, aggravated by new development” (Para 33). Justifying developer contributions to support the full range of infrastructure provision in areas with limited housing growth like Chiltern and South Bucks may therefore be less straightforward than in Wycombe.

A number of planning authorities have been establishing formulae or standard charges to give developers greater certainty about their expected contributions. Circular 05/2005 encourages local authorities to set out their approach to developer contributions in documents forming part of their Local Development Framework. In the three districts, only Wycombe DC has so far published a *Developer Contributions SPD* (2007) specifying and justifying the contributions and obligations it will seek. Its provisions are explained further in an explanatory document entitled *Developer Contributions - A Guide for Prospective Developers* (2007).

Neither Chiltern DC’s nor South Bucks DC’s 2007 LDS shows any current proposal to produce a developer contribution SPD, but the latter indicates that this may be considered in a future LDS. In Chiltern’s case there appears to be some concern that requiring contributions for infrastructure from developers may undermine the viability of their providing the required levels of affordable housing. Whether this would be the case can only be ascertained through residual land value appraisals of sample schemes in the area.

Table 4.2 indicates which infrastructure items are covered by proposed developer contributions in the Wycombe *Developer Contributions SPD*. It may be noted that the Milton Keynes tariff, which is the most comprehensive S106 tariff to date, includes all the listed items except fire and police services.

**Table 4.2 Infrastructure items covered by Wycombe Developer Contributions SPD**

| Infrastructure item  | Treatment in SPD     |  |              |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|--------------|
|                      | Contribution defined | To be considered for inclusion in later editions | Not included |
| Schools              | Yes                  |  |              |
| Transport            | Yes                  |  |              |
| Green Infrastructure |                      |  | Yes          |

| Infrastructure item       | Treatment in SPD     |  |              |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------|
|                           | Contribution defined | To be considered for inclusion in later editions | Not included |
| Libraries                 | Yes                  |  |              |
| Adult Learning            | Yes                  |  |              |
| Waste Disposal            |                      |  | Yes          |
| Social Care               |                      |  | Yes          |
| Open Space                | Yes                  |  |              |
| Recreation/Leisure        |                      | Yes  |              |
| Crematoria/Burial Grounds |                      |  | Yes          |
| Police                    |                      | Yes  |              |
| Fire                      | Yes (i)              |  |              |
| Ambulance                 |                      | Yes  |              |
| Primary Health Care       |                      | Yes  |              |
| Acute care                |                      |  | Yes          |
| Mental health care        |                      |  | Yes          |
| Higher Education          |                      |  | Yes          |

*Note (i) The contribution is to cover cost of a Community Safety Cohesion Centre and fire hydrants,, not fire stations*



## Appendices

- A Main Information Base
- B Key Drivers
- C Facility Distribution Maps
- D Composite Infrastructure Investment Programme
- E Agency Contacts
- F Utility Issues