

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**LOCAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 6 OCTOBER 2016**

Title of report	<b>INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN</b>
Contacts	<p>Councillor Trevor Pendleton 01509 569746 <a href="mailto:trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">trevor.pendleton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Director of Services 01530 454555 <a href="mailto:steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Head of Planning &amp; Regeneration 01530 454782 <a href="mailto:jim.newton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">jim.newton@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Planning Policy Team Manager 01530 454677 <a href="mailto:ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">ian.nelson@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>
Purpose of report	To outline the findings of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and how the Council will manage the future delivery of infrastructure.
Council Priorities	<p>These are taken from the Council Delivery Plan:</p> <p>Value for Money Homes and Communities</p>
Implications:	
Financial/Staff	The cost of preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been met from existing budgets. The management of future infrastructure provision is likely to have implications for both staff and financial resources. These will be managed through the council's budget processes.
Link to relevant CAT	None
Risk Management	The establishment of an Infrastructure Partnership will enable the Council to manage the future delivery of the infrastructure which will benefit local communities
Equalities Impact Screening	None
Human Rights	None

Transformational Government	Not applicable
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The Report is Satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The Report is Satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The Report is Satisfactory
Consultees	None
Background papers	National Planning Policy Framework which can be found at <a href="http://www.gov.uk/government/publications?topics%5B%5D=planning-and-building">www.gov.uk/government/publications?topics%5B%5D=planning-and-building</a>  Infrastructure Delivery Plan which can be found at <a href="http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/files/documents/nwl_infrastructure_delivery_plan_2016/NWLDC%20IDP%20Final%20Version.pdf">http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/files/documents/nwl_infrastructure_delivery_plan_2016/NWLDC%20IDP%20Final%20Version.pdf</a>
Recommendations	<b>THAT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOTES: (I) THE FINDINGS OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN AND; (II) THE PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN INFRASTRUCTURE PARTNERSHIP</b>

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Members will be aware that a key component of the Local Plan is the provision of an evidence base. This reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which requires that local plans are “*based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects for the area*”. It also advises that such evidence should be proportionate (i.e. not evidence for evidences sake).
- 1.2 The NPPF (paragraphs 158 to 177) outlines the type of evidence which may be required to support a local plan.
- 1.3 In terms of Infrastructure the NPPF advises that “*Local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to:*
- *assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and*
  - *take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”*

- 1.4 The NPPF requires that proposals in a local plan should be deliverable. This includes understanding what infrastructure is required to support new development.
- 1.5 To address the above an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was commissioned in late 2015 from consultants (AECOM) who have had significant experience of preparing similar evidence elsewhere across the country.
- 1.6 This report outlines the process for the preparation of the IDP, its findings and how the work from the IDP will be taken forward.

## **2.0 HOW WAS THE STUDY UNDERTAKEN?**

2.1 The consultants were tasked with establishing the following in consultation with the various infrastructure providers:

- Baseline provision for those infrastructure types listed below;
- An assessment of what infrastructure is required to support the strategy for the district as set out in the draft Local Plan, including, but not restricted to, the level of growth for housing, employment and retail;
- An assessment of service providers plans to identify what other infrastructure provision is likely to occur up to 2031;
- The identification of any gaps in infrastructure provision having regard to the above and infrastructure provision secured to date;
- A prioritisation of identified infrastructure in consultation with NWLDC and stakeholders;
- The identification of additional strategies and plans required for the various types of Infrastructure;
- The identification of any funding gaps to meet the identified needs;
- The identification of potential funding sources that could be used to overcome any funding gaps and possible future governance arrangements for managing the delivery of infrastructure.

2.2 The types of infrastructure to be considered were:

- Transport
- Education
- Health
- Emergency Services
- Community & Civic
- Sport and Recreation
- Green Infrastructure
- Utilities
- Waste
- Flood Defences

2.3 In order to help build a picture of existing provision and plans for new provision, the consultants used a range of primary and secondary data. In addition, the consultants engaged with the various infrastructure providers including holding a daylong workshop in February 2016 where the various topics were discussed in a series of round table discussions.

2.4 To inform future needs, the consultants took information created for the Local Plan in respect of how much housing and employment development will take place and when. They identified how this might translate in to changes in the age and structure of the population of the district. This information was then used to assess how this would impact on future infrastructure needs.

### **3.0 WHAT DID THE STUDY FIND?**

3.1 From the work outlined above the study identified a wide range of infrastructure projects which, in an ideal world, would be needed to support the level of growth planned across the district. It also identified the possible costs for the various types of infrastructure. Some of this is more certain than other aspects. For example, a known road scheme might have a detailed cost but an extension to a school might be based on a formulaic approach in the absence of detailed costs. Many of the projects are based on a theoretical modelling exercise (for example open space provision) and attributed to a place (e.g. Coalville), but at this stage there is no specific project identified (e.g. enhancement of an existing open space).

3.2 The infrastructure identified in the study is set out in a separate schedule in the final report. Appendix A of this report provides an overview of those projects listed in the schedule.

3.3 In total some 162 individual projects were included in the schedule. These projects are at different stages of development, from nothing happening to date to those currently being undertaken (e.g. J22 of M1). As a result, not only are the costs better understood for some projects, but also the potential funding available as well. However, in the vast majority of cases the exact cost and possible funding are not known. Taking what information is known a funding gap has been estimated each project.

3.4 The schedule groups projects by topic and also by place. It identifies a Delivery Lead organisation and potential costs, any identified funding and funding gaps for each project.

3.5 The study recognises that some types of infrastructure are more important from the point of view of enabling new development to go ahead. For example, improvements to a road may be required in order to achieve a safe means of access to a development without which development could not happen, whilst improvements to other infrastructure would be of benefit to an area they may not be absolutely necessary to allow a development to go ahead (for example, contributions sought by the police as they have other funding streams available and a duty to provide a service).

3.6 Therefore the infrastructure identified in the study was prioritised according to the principles as set out below.

Table 1 – categories of priority for infrastructure

Critical Infrastructure	This defines infrastructure that must happen to enable growth. These infrastructure items are known as ‘blockers’ or ‘showstoppers’ and are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure. It also includes Essential Services that are required to facilitate growth or be delivered in advance of residential / commercial development, i.e. connection to the potable water and wastewater network.
Essential Infrastructure	This defines infrastructure that is required to mitigate impact arising from the operation of the development. Although a lack of infrastructure in this category is unlikely to prevent development in the short term, failure to invest in it could result in delays in development in the medium term as capacity in available facilities and networks is constrained. These items are most common in relation to trip and population generated by the development. This will largely be secondary infrastructure that is profiled subsequent to Critical Infrastructure.
Policy High Priority Infrastructure	This defines infrastructure that is required to support wider strategic or site specific objectives which are set out in planning policy or is subject to a statutory duty. This type of infrastructure does not have a direct relationship of addition population meaning direct additional need. This type of infrastructure would not necessarily prevent development from occurring.
Desirable Infrastructure	This defines infrastructure that is required for sustainable growth but is unlikely to prevent development in the short to medium term. This is often aligned to placemaking objectives and is infrastructure that does not require previous enabling.

- 3.7 The study identified the following potential costs for the various categories of infrastructure, both with and without strategic highway schemes (i.e. those funded through Highways England/Department of Transport) which are fully funded. Exclusion of such schemes significantly reduces the costs of critical infrastructure but does not have any impact upon the other categories.

Table 2 - Costs by priority categories

	<b>Total costs</b>	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Policy High</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
Total	£905,364,000	£737,580,000	£70,753,000	£67,121,000	£29,910,000
Excluding strategic road network	£217,784,000	£50,000,000	£70,753,000	£67,121,000	£29,910,000

- 3.8 Depending on the costs associated with the non strategic highway network projects (i.e. those funded through Leicestershire County Council as highway authority) the overall funding gap identified ranges from £149.5 million to £168.4 million (Table 3 below). It should be appreciated that this is only an approximation and could be an under or over estimation of the funding gap. For example, some of the identified projects already have some potential funding available through S106 Agreements.

- 3.9 In terms of the Critical Infrastructure highlighted below, this relates to the A511 corridor improvements from Junction 22 of the M1 to J14 of the A42. The exact nature of proposals and their costs is the subject of a current study being undertaken jointly with Leicestershire County Council.

Table 3 - Funding gap by priority

	<b>Total costs</b>	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Essential</b>	<b>Policy High</b>	<b>Desirable</b>
Total Excluding strategic road network		£30-£50 million	£70.8 million	£67.1 million	£29.9 million
Funding gap	£149.45 - £168.4 millions	£5 - £25.8 million	£50.7 million	£66.5 million	£25.4 million

#### **4.0 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?**

- 4.1 The IDP is a valuable evidence base to support the Local Plan. It shows that the Council is aware of what the Infrastructure implications are arising from new development and also how any allocations proposed in the Local Plan will contribute.
- 4.2 For the Local Plan examination it is considered that as a minimum it will be necessary to show how the IDP will be taken forward and managed through time in order that the Inspector has confidence that the proposed development will be supported through the provision of the necessary infrastructure.
- 4.3 However, the IDP has much wider and longer term value as it provides a thorough baseline of what infrastructure might be required moving forward. It provides a starting point for the more detailed development of projects and schemes which can be used to support bids for funding. It is essential therefore, that the IDP be a living document which helps to guide investment decisions by service providers on infrastructure provision in the future.
- 4.4 The consultants were asked to provide advice regarding how the Council might take forward governance arrangements for managing future infrastructure provision. They advised that a 'Local Infrastructure Partnership' could be created, building on existing relationships between the council and key infrastructure partners and the workshops and meetings held to produce the IDP.
- 4.5 The Council's Corporate Leadership Team considered this issue at its meeting on 6 September 2016 and agreed to the establishment of an Infrastructure Partnership. The establishment of a Partnership will have implications in terms of staff resources. A report seeking to address this will be considered by the Corporate Leadership Team in the next few weeks. Once this has been resolved consideration will be given to issues such as the composition of a Partnership and how it will operate.