

Public Document Pack

JOHN WARD

Director of Corporate Services

Contact: Lisa Higenbottam on 01243 534684
Email: lhigenbottam@chichester.gov.uk

East Pallant House
1 East Pallant
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1TY
Tel: 01243 785166
www.chichester.gov.uk



A meeting of the **Cabinet** will be held in Committee Room 2 - East Pallant House on **Tuesday 5 March 2019 at 9.30 am**

MEMBERS: Mr A Dignum (Chairman), Mrs E Lintill (Vice-Chairman), Mr R Barrow, Mr J Connor, Mrs J Kilby, Mrs S Taylor and Mr P Wilding

SUPPLEMENT TO AGENDA

5 **Business Continuity Infrastructure** (Pages 1 - 10)

This agenda supplement contains the Appendix to Agenda Item 5.

7 **Consideration of consultation responses and modifications to the District Council's Infrastructure Business Plan 2019-2024** (Pages 11 - 33)

This agenda supplement contains Appendix 1 and an extract of Appendix 2 relating to Agenda Item 7.

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Documentation**PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT
(PID)****Business Continuity Infrastructure**

Release:	Version 0.1 (draft)
Date:	January 2019
Author:	Andrew Forward
Approved by:	<Name and date>

Document History

Revision Date	Version	Summary of Changes	Reviewer(s)
24.01.2019	0.1	Initial draft	JM
7.02.2019	0.2	Minor changes before wider circulation	

Consideration by the Corporate Improvement Team

Date	Reviewing Officer	Comments for Consideration
04/02/2019	A. Buckley	Reviewed, no comments.

Approvals

Name of person, group or committee
Joe Mildred
John Ward
Cabinet

Distribution

Name	Job Title
John Ward	Director for Corporate Services
Kevin Carter	CCS Divisional Manager
Warren Townsend	Health and Safety Manager

Glossary of Terms

EPH	East Pallant House
BCP	Business Continuity Plan
WAN	Wide Area Network
SAN	Storage Area Network
DR	Disaster Recovery
VPN	Virtual Private Network
GCSX	UK Government Connect Secure Extranet (<i>secure WAN</i>)
PSN	Public Services Network
ARP	Asset Replacement Programme
RAID	Risk – Assumption – Issue - Dependency

1. PURPOSE OF DOCUMENT

This Project Initiation Document (PID) defines the Business Continuity Infrastructure Project. It builds upon the Initial Project Proposal Document and sets out the aims of the project, why the project should go ahead, who is involved and their responsibilities.

This PID will provide the baseline for the project's management and for an assessment of its overall success.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

'To build and commission an offsite disaster recovery solution for Chichester District Council's (CDC) Information, Communications & Technology (ICT) infrastructure. That will provide access to key systems in a business continuity scenario.'

Our project will deliver a major improvement in corporate operational capability and service resilience. Gained through the creation of a CDC 'cloud', and housing a fully functioning duplicate of the East Pallant House (EPH) ICT architecture. Providing, in the event of serious disruption to EPH, hosted system continuity and support as per corporate business continuity planning (BCP) expectations.

Leveraging the new West Sussex County wide area network (gigabit WAN) we will create a mirrored IT environment at the Westhampnett Depot. As our Disaster Recovery Site (DR) this is where we will conduct our regular system backups and hold dormant applications of all major programmes and systems. Ready, in the event of a major outage at EPH, to be brought out of suspension and provide IT support and enable continuity and service delivery.

3. BACKGROUND

Currently, in the event of a major disaster/incident destroying or rendering unusable/inaccessible the current (EPH) IT architecture, recovery of systems, services and technical functionality would require siting from a suitable location, purchase, build and configuration of new hardware, software and the establishment of new network connectivity.

With optimistic estimations ranging from 4 to 6 weeks for hardware purchase and delivery, and service restoration in weeks 7 to 8, the Business Continuity Infrastructure Project has been developed to mitigate these risks to an acceptable level.

Through the creation of an offsite back up facility, with the hosting and scalable capability to enable fast re-establishment of critical council services, we will increase corporate assurance, and service resilience whilst reducing risk to a manageable level - in essence through creation of a fully operational Chichester District Council - 'Cloud'.

4. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

4.1. Outputs

1. Storage Area Network (SAN) server replacement at EPH
2. Provision of server facility within Westhampnett depot (premises): including server cabinets, electrical, network, cooling, security, fire proofing and suppressant systems.
3. 'Kit out' of server facility: provision of network, storage area network, windows, oracle servers, telephony and backup infrastructure.
4. Replication of key council system codes/programmes (software).
5. Replication (backup) of data from the main data centre at EPH.
6. Connectivity and hardware to provide internet access, email and virtual private network (VPN) for essential users (design will include scalability options to enable the facility to be built up quickly to provide full operational capacity).

4.2. Outcomes

A new server located remotely from EPH, with appropriate cooling, security and power facilities from which ICT service will provide

1. Appropriate network, storage and server hardware and systems (to minimise impact on essential operations during a business continuity event).
2. Provide internet connectivity for hosted systems, email and telephony.
3. Ability to undertake (usual) off site backup and restoration of the council's data and systems.
4. Provide resiliency for key council systems in the event of a hardware failure.
5. The ability to scale the solution to allow for additional services and capacity in the event that longer running is required from the DR site.

4.3. Outcome Measures

Existing DR capacity is reliant on external variables: unknown nature of disaster; inability to anticipate accessibility of existing EPH infrastructure; unknown availability of replacement hardware; unknown location for constructing replacement hardware; quality control of existing 'tape' back up unverifiable.

Once our new server location has been commissioned we will;

1. Remove most DR unknowns. Regardless of 'physical' situation at EPH we will have capability to 'switch' instantly to our fail over site remotely.
2. In the event of a BCP emergency ICT service staff will be able to focus immediately on recovery of full system capability and supporting service continuity.
3. Remove the time required to replace and commission hardware: In the event of a disaster we will have a fully operational and available immediately, system capable of supporting the Corporate Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Plans. Additionally the system will offer scalable options should the EPH infrastructure remains out of action in the medium to long term.
4. Quality control: back up will be faster and 100% verifiable, with the option of increased frequency (currently 'snapshots' taken daily, full back up weekly)

4.4. Dis-benefits

None

4.5. Out of Scope

1. Contact Centre Phone system and main external numbers: current DR arrangements have recently been successfully tested. We will consider improvements and options once the new server site has been commissioned.
2. UK Government Connect Secure Extranet (GCSX): connection is currently based at EPH. Central government are currently reviewing the future of both the GCSX and Public Services Network (PSN). Given the uncertainty, consideration of the new server options will be delayed until government have clarified the position / replacement of GCSX and PSN.

5. PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

Additional funding is required to deliver the proposed solution. Although we propose to make more efficient use of existing Asset Replacement Programme funding, an unavoidable shortfall has been identified. Due to the nature of the infrastructure requirements, it is not possible to scale down the proposals and obtain the same assurance.

6. PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

1. The project is dependent on agreement to access ARP funds to replace end of life servers.
2. Corporate insurance company approval. We have approached Zurich and are currently waiting for their comments.
3. SAN replacement at EPH: the existing EPH SAN is due for replacement during the first half of 2019. Initially we considered the viability of using this as the basis of our backup solution. However, having now reached 'end-of-life' the model will not be supported beyond 2019.

Replacement of the EPH SAN will be necessary even if this project does not progress. However, as a major project dependency it has been included as a deliverable within the wider project plan.

4. Clarity/define essential users: we will require early confirmation of both the essential users and services that will be hosted on the fail-over server. Scoping of the users will be necessary in order to inform the accessibility options (specifically VPN/Wi-Fi) early in the project. An exercise in establishing this baseline is now underway and will be completed before this project commences.
5. Gigabit (West Sussex County WAN): delivery of this super-fast fibre network will provide greater capabilities in terms of user access and Wi-Fi options. Initially scoping of the business continuity project was undertaken before this opportunity arose. So, although a dependency, delivery of our project is not reliant on this capability. However, without the network the operational capacity and scale would be adversely impacted.

7. PROJECT COSTS

In arriving at our preferred solution we have considered a number of factors, consolidated a number of opportunities and leveraging greater corporate benefits than those achievable in isolation. Detailed costings have been undertaken to ensure that full benefit is made of a number of Asset Replacement Programme (ARP)

funding pools, and that greater efficiency is delivered through holistically reviewing our infrastructure as defined in the ICT and digital strategy.

Further SAN server replacement costs have substantially reduced over the past few years. We will explore the second hand server market, as there may be some value in our old SAN.

7.1. Project Delivery Costs

To deliver:

1. A replacement SAN server at EPH (this is now 'end-of-life'), and associated connections and oracle boxes.
2. Mirrored replication of EPH servers (1 above) plus connections, hosts and licences at the Westhampnett Depot.
3. New VPN infrastructure to support access to the new platform at the Depot.
4. Connectivity to the new West Sussex County WAN (gigabit).

Costs:

<u>IT Related</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>Building Related</u>	<u>£</u>
SAN Server	63,000	Building works	16,000
SAN Connectivity	20,000*	Generated supply & power works	45,000*
Sun Oracle Boxes	15,000*	Raised floor	2,000
Network Connectivity	40,000*	AC system	6,000
Sundries	25,000	Netbotz security	3,000
<i>(gigabit network cards, cables, cabinets)</i>		Roller shutters	1,800
Consultancy	25,000*	Fire suppressant	8,000
TOTAL:	188,000	Change over switch	5,000
		TOTAL:	86,800
<u>New Capital Requested:</u>	<u>88,000</u>	<u>New Capital Requested:</u>	<u>41,800</u>

(* propose funding from existing ARP capital provision)

7.2. On-going Costs Following Project Completion

Once operational, ongoing impacts on our revenue expenditure will be small are not expected to exceed the £10k as in the draft 19/20 budget, this will include any insurance implications, the additional internet connection for the Depot and minor costs. Economies of scale in terms of staff support, monitoring, licenses etc. will be achieved as a result of the mirrored site approach.

In terms of asset replacement, the current ARP server replacement budget would be sufficient to cover both sites – based on today's wholesale prices.

8. OPTIONS SUMMARY

Alternative options considered included:

1. West Sussex County Council:
Could we make use of County's DR solution?

- a. County use their own data centre (Power Place) which is managed by Capita. Data is backed up to County Hall North, Horsham.
 - b. County's IT strategy is to move to cloud based operations.
 - c. Power Place will no longer be required once (b) has concluded.
2. Arun:
- Could we partner with Arun?
- a. Arun currently use Power Place (as above).
 - b. Viability of Power Place will be questioned once County have affected their cloud strategy.
 - c. They will require an alternative back up data centre and DR solution.
3. Cloud Solution:
- Could a cloud solution work for us?
- a. Running council service applications from a separate cloud location (during a disaster recovery scenario) would require the purchase of duplicate software licences. Recent conversations with Northgate have confirmed this is the case. The last full assessment (undertaken 2017 by Accordant Solutions Ltd) reported that additional costs per year for moving to cloud solutions for just three of our key applications was:
 - i. Civica: additional £60,000 plus one off migration fee £15,000, on top of £15,000 annual licence fee. (additional £75,000 per year)
 - ii. Northgate: additional £120,000 per year licence fee
 - iii. Trent (HR): Additional £6,000 plus one off migration fee of £23,000, on top of annual licence of £28,000. .
 - b. Staff access to cloud based applications would still need to route through a secure 'gateway'.
 - c. We will still need a DR hosting solution for this platform.
4. Duplicate Server Site:
- a. Minimal difference in server specification between requirements (gateway or fully hosted) as per 3 (c).
 - b. Future replacement could be funded from current ARP provision.
 - c. Minimal disruption to IT service availability – switching between the two in seconds with little configuration changes.

9. PROJECT APPROACH

Project has been developed in house. It is a core deliverable highlighted in the new ICT & Digital Strategy.

It is a complex project with a number of external dependencies and stakeholders. A detailed project plan and Risks-Assumptions-Issues-Dependencies (RAID) log has been developed. Consultations with the stakeholder group have been ongoing, and a critical path has been defined.

Critical Path – Key Project Deliverables:

1. Depot Room
2. EPH Infrastructure (SAN)
3. BCP/DR Infrastructure (Back up, VPN, software)
4. Gigabit connectivity

5. User acceptance testing (UAT) & commissioned site

Project governance and delivery structure options have been developed:

Project Board / Sponsoring Group	Business Improvement Board
Senior Responsible Officer (SRO)	Joe Mildred
Project Manager	Andrew Forward
Project Delivery Team	Mike Cannings, Mike Noyce, Daniel Bramley

Stakeholders:

IT (Infrastructure)	Mike Noyce	Facilities Management	Roland Robinson
IT (Operations)	Mike Cannings	Emergency Planning	Michael Rowland
CCS – Depot	Kevin Carter	Health & Safety	Warren Townsend
Building Services	John Bacon	West Sussex WAN (Gigabit)	Sylva Andriova (WSCC)

Systems in Scope:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Civica (financial system) | 11. Exchange (email) |
| 2. Trent (HR & payroll) | 12. Express (elections) |
| 3. Capita–(back office cash system) | 13. ModernGov (Committee system) |
| 4. IDOX Uniform | 14. Car Parks |
| 5. Northgate | 15. Mapping (Astun) |
| 6. CRMDomain Controller | 16. Housing database |
| 7. Sophos (antivirus) | 17. Asset Inventory (TrackIT) |
| 8. Print servers | 18. Microsoft Office |
| 9. Departmental and Home drives | 19. Internet |
| 10. Web servers & iCM database | 20. VPN |

10. PROJECT PLAN

April 2019 – November 2019

Task No.	Task / milestone	Duration	Completion Date	Responsible Owner	Dependency
Stage 1	Depot Room (Network Configuration)				
1.0	Room prepared inc 1 st fix / 2 nd fix	4 weeks	0+6weeks	Roland Robinson	Approval
Stage 2	EPH & Depot Infrastructure (Server Room Built)				
2.0	Network Design	2 weeks	0+2weeks	Mike Noyce	Approval
2.1	Network Install (EPH)	1 week	0+2weeks	Mike Noyce	2.0
2.2	Network Install (DR Site)	2 Weeks	0+7weeks	Mike Noyce	2.0
Stage 3	EPH & Depot Infrastructure (SAN)				
3.0	SAN Replacement (EPH)	3 weeks	0+5 Weeks	Mike Cannings	Approval
3.1	SAN Install (DR)	2 weeks	0+7Weeks	Mike Cannings	3.0
3.2	SAN Install at	2days	0+10Weeks	Mike	1.0

	DR Site			Cannings	
3.3	Replication Test	3days	0+10Weeks	Mike Cannings	3.2
Stage 4	BCP/DR Infrastructure (VMWare Upgrade)				
4.0	Procure licences	2days	0+13Weeks	Mike Cannings	-
4.1	Install	1 Week	0+13Weeks	Mike Cannings	4.0
Stage 5	BCP/DR Infrastructure (Dell Citrix Host Upgrade)				
5.0	Install – Hosts (EPH)	2 Weeks	0+15Weeks	Mike Cannings	4.1
5.1	Install Host at DR Site	3 days	0+16Weeks	Mike Cannings	5.0
Stage 6	BCP/DR Infrastructure (Oracle Server Replacement)				
6.0	Oracle Server Install (EPH)	1 Week	0+18Weeks	Mike Noyce	-
6.1	Oracle Server Install (Depot)	1 Week	0+20Weeks	Mike Noyce	6.0
Stage 7	BCP/DR Infrastructure (VPN / WIFI / DMZ)				
7.0	DMZ - Network	3 Weeks	0+23Weeks	Mike Noyce	-
7.1	WiFi	2 Weeks	0+25Weeks	Mike Noyce	7.0
7.2	VPN	2 Weeks	0+27Weeks	Mike Noyce	7.1
7.3	Migrate users to new VPN Inc. 2FA	1 Week	0+30Weeks	Mike Noyce	7.2
Stage 8	BCP/DR Infrastructure (Backup Circuit Install*)				
8.0	Procure FTTC	1 Day		Mike Noyce	2.0
8.1	Install	1 Day		Mike Noyce	9.0
Stage 9	Gigabit Connectivity (Gigabit Install)				
9.0	Ground Works				
9.1	Commissioning Phase	1 Week	0+30Weeks?	Mike Noyce	8.0
9.2	Go Live (all sites)	1 Week	0+31Weeks?	Mike Noyce	8.1
Stage 10	UAT & Commissioned Site (Full Site Test)				
10.0	Test Shut down at EPH	1 Day	0+33 Weeks	Mike Cannings	8.1
10.1	Power up at Depot	1 Day	0+33 Weeks	Mike Cannings	10.1
10.2	Run UAT	1 Day	0+33 Weeks	Mike Cannings	10.2
10.3	Return to steady state	1 Day	0+33 Weeks	Mike Cannings	10.3
Stage 11	UAT & Commissioned Site (Sign Off)				
11.0	Evaluate UAT	1 Day	0+34 Weeks		10.3
11.1	Issue Complete Certificate	1 Day	0+34 Weeks		11.1

11. PROJECT TEAM

CF Section 9

12. COMMUNICATION

Project team meetings: Weekly / Monday morning
 SRO: Monthly 1:1's
 Performance/ Highlight Report: Monthly (Covalent)
 Project Board: Quarterly (exception)

13. RISK LOG

The following risks have been identified together with an assessment of their severity and actions that can be taken to mitigate/reduce the risk. Details of all project risks will be recorded as and when they are identified.

Risk No	Risk Description	Likelihood Unlikely Possible Probable Certain	Impact Minor Significant Serious Major	Planned Actions to Reduce Risk	Responsible Officer
01	Resources: that 'people' and time resourcing is sufficient to deliver the project to specification and on time.	Possible	Significant	Undertake weekly project and ICT service workload prioritisation reviews – being better informed aids proactive management and reduces impact of conflicting prioritisations.	A Forward
02	Finances: insufficient funding to deliver project to desired quality standards – compromised outcomes as a result of financial restraints.	Possible	Significant	Detailed costings undertaken as part of business case development. Ongoing budget management as a key project deliverable – weekly checked.	A Forward
03	West Sussex County WAN: the gigabit project fails to deliver a full fibre network (linking EPH and Depot)	Unlikely	Serious	Continue to monitor project delivery (as a stakeholder attend regular update meeting).	A Forward

<i>Authority/organisation</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Recommended changes following consultation</i>
WSSCC	<p><u>HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT</u></p> <p>Chichester Road Space Audit IBP 654, IBP 655, IBP 665 West Sussex County Council has recently reviewed how it develops parking schemes across the county and a pilot study has been undertaken in Chichester. This more progressive approach towards parking management, known as a Road Space Audit (RSA) has tried to determine if there are other ways for the County Council and its partners to consider existing and future parking demands.</p> <p>The pilot RSA looks beyond parking measures alone in order to meet current and future demands on the road network. In order to ensure that local parking policies take into account the whole place both now and in the future, the RSA aims to be a strategic blueprint that defines how parking, various alternative travel solutions (bus, rail, cycle, walk), infrastructure improvements, safety considerations and future development (e.g. housing) can be integrated across Chichester so that the road network is used and managed in the most efficient way possible. This blueprint will allow the County Council and its partners such as Chichester District Council to understand what resources and funding is required to carry out sustainable transport related improvements (not just parking) in the city.</p> <p>The pilot RSA provides essential technical data and enables officers to identify and assess the current demands upon the road network and parking supply in Chichester (i.e. how it is currently being used), whether these demands are actually being met by the existing infrastructure as well as how users actually feel about that road network. Furthermore, by identifying potential future demands/pressures on the road network and parking supply and making recommendations for improvement, the audit enables officers to assess what measures and resources might be required in order to meet these challenges, adjust supply and ultimately optimise the efficiency of the road network and parking supply.</p> <p>The pilot RSA is designed to be advisory and an enabling document that complements existing statutory plans and emerging studies in respect of transport infrastructure, parking policy and spatial planning. It does feed into studies such as the District Council's 'A Vision for Chichester' but it should be stressed that it does not lead or have primacy over them. Indeed, some of the suggestions within the RSA may seem at odds with some raised in other studies but not all of these suggestions need be enacted</p> <p>As with many towns and cities across the UK, Chichester faces a number of challenges, including the need to accommodate significant new development, both residential and commercial, whilst still preserving its historic character. Parking is particularly problematic, with increasing demand for both on and off-street parking and constraints in meeting supply in the areas of greatest demand.</p>	

The role of the high street is also changing rapidly, with people no longer having to make as many trips into the city centre for essential items or services with the growth of out of town shopping centres and supermarkets, internet shopping, home delivery and click and collect. It is therefore becoming increasingly important for Chichester to be a place people want to visit for its quality and character.

Our transport inheritance is typically highway dominated, built for and around car use. But it is increasingly recognised that this is not always the best approach, especially in cities such as Chichester where public transport, walking and cycling are becoming increasingly critical for it to thrive.

Significant growth is planned in Chichester District, much of which is focused in and around the city itself with a 32% increase to city households and a 31% increase in population by 2029. The Chichester Transport Study (2013) indicated that even without additional new development, there is likely to be just over a 20% growth in trips by 2031. Proposed improvements to the transport infrastructure, coupled with measures to control travel demand are currently considered sufficient to accommodate the levels of development being proposed.

However, it is clear that promotion of more sustainable means of travel (i.e. the 'Smarter Choices' package) will also play a significant part in mitigating the effects of the new development. A switch to other forms of transport is achievable, but this kind of step change will require a bold new approach to transport and parking provision within the city. There is always the possibility that measures which reduce traffic congestion have the potential to enable traffic to move faster, and therefore can induce more traffic which will reduce the benefits. As such, some complementary measures designed to 'lock in' the benefits, such as a reallocation and reduction of road capacity may also be necessary.

In the summer of 2015, the County Council appointed transport consultants WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff to take forward the pilot Chichester RSA. Based on the findings of early work, which included a series of workshops bringing together a range of technical interests, a number of concepts, in support of integrating sustainable transport infrastructure and future development in Chichester, have been identified and can be broadly be grouped under the following core themes:

- Tackling Parking Issues (On-Street)
- Parking Supply and Traffic Management
- Reallocating Road Space: Improved Places and Sustainable Transport Corridors
- Reallocating Road Space: "To, Not Through"

With the agreement of the South Chichester County Local Committee, a public consultation on the Chichester Road Space Audit took place from the 15th August until the 31st October 2017.

Taking the consultation responses received into account, County Councillors and officers are of the view that further development of the RSA is justified, specifically design work relating to the first concept outlined in the RSA Tackling Parking Issues (On-Street). In essence, this design work takes the form of a proposal for a city wide parking management plan.

- It is clear that in many parts of the city, un-managed on-street parking continues to cause congestion and safety/access issues as well as limiting the ability of residents and their visitors to park (as well as tradespeople and healthcare providers etc). Traditional policy responses such as localised parking scheme extensions are typically reactive and thus compound this impression of action being a response to a problem. Such responses can also lead to parking being moved from place to place. A single parking management plan, covering the whole urban area of Chichester, could not only deal with parking problems in unrestricted areas but could also limit the amount of displacement.
- With Chichester's new housing allocations and redevelopment, business and retail expansion, the growth in the visitor economy and the associated growth in car use, the parking problems highlighted above will only intensify and could also begin to have an impact in currently unaffected areas. Officers would like to be proactive and plan for this now rather than wait and possibly be forced to react when it is too late.
- A comprehensive city wide approach could also enable a more strategic review of the existing parking scheme. Consideration could be given to Sunday/Evening restrictions and to maximising the parking opportunities for residents, visitors, tourists and local workers now and in the future from planned development.
- Having a detailed design would enable all parties (officers, councillors, stakeholders, residents and businesses) to get a clearer picture of current parking capacity, what the different parking demands are across the city, the nature and cost of any potential measures and the impact that these might have upon off-street parking facilities and traffic management in general. In turn, a detailed design could facilitate closer working between the County/District Council and even the preparation of a joint parking strategy that ensured that the road network and car parks were used and managed in the most efficient way possible.
- Having a detailed design will allow for further engagement/consultation and enable all parties to comment and potentially help shape the future of parking in Chichester.

All feasibility costs to date (£60K), as well as current costs of designing proposals (£50K) have been met in full by the County Council. Should a design for a city wide parking management plan be approved, it is proposed that the costs of implementing the plan (the cost of putting in signs and lines) be part funded by the County Council, in appreciation of the fact that some of the parking issues across the city have been evident for some time. The figure for this will be assessed once an initial design has been completed. However, in recognition of the fact that a significant amount of additional parking infrastructure will be needed to support the development growth identified in the adopted Local Plan to 2029, CIL funding is also sought. Again, the final figure to be requested will be assessed once an initial design has been agreed the overall cost estimate for the work at the moment is £750k as identified in IBP 654, 655 and 665. Any additional enforcement costs, associated with the city wide plan, will be met by the County Council.

The current programme shows potential implementation of the parking management plan taking place in April 2020 and so CIL funding will not be required until the financial year 2020/21. Therefore, it is requested that table 3 and table 7 of the IBP are updated to reflect the request for funding towards the project in 2020/21. The amount to be secured from CIL will be identified through the initial design work.

	<p>Real Time Passenger Information IBP 355 No changes requested. The West Sussex RTPi system was first introduced in 2006, following a bid for government funds to help alleviate congestion caused by A27 at Worthing and to encourage modal shift from private cars to public transport. Initially 12 displays were installed.</p> <p>The RTPi System (provided by VIX Technology Ltd) tracks the location of equipped buses and compares their location to the scheduled time of arrival. The resulting predicted time of arrival is then shown on displays at bus stops, on displays at off-street locations, and via other information dissemination systems including text messaging, mobile internet and apps.</p> <p>The RTPi system consists of a central control system, on-street displays, off-street displays, and various data feeds (to/from bus operators, neighbouring authorities and other third parties).</p> <p>Working in partnership with WSCC, the local bus operators provide data to the WSCC RTPi System. These are Stagecoach South, Compass Travel, Metrobus, Brighton & Hove Buses and Arriva.</p> <p>Current and future funding (all from s106) is being used to expand the number of RTPi displays at bus stops and other locations.</p> <p>Regular requests for RTPi displays are still received from parish and town councils and members of the public.</p> <p><u>RTPi in Chichester and surrounding areas</u> The first RTPi display in Chichester was installed at Chichester Rail Station in 2012 showing the departures from the bus stops at the bus station. This display was funded by Southern Rail.</p> <p>Local Sustainable Transport Fund funding in 2015 enabled displays to be installed in the main entrance of Chichester College and at the bus stop on the Chichester Campus of the University of Chichester.</p> <p>S106 funding from the Roussillon Barracks and Graylingwell Park developments enabled RTPi displays to be installed at a further 13 locations in the Chichester City Centre and at bus stops adjacent to the two developments. A further 6 displays are due to be installed before the end of March 2019.</p>	<p>IBP/654, IBP/655, IBP/665 The funding for these projects will be moved back from 2019/20 to 2020/21</p> <p>IBP/355 Noted, no changes required</p>
--	--	---

WSSC is also working with Chichester City Council to deliver a number of new bus shelters as part of the RTPI project. The City Council will be delivering the shelters and taking on the long term cleansing and maintenance of these shelters.

RTPI Strategy for Chichester

New strategic sites in and around Chichester mean that it is even more important to encourage modal shift and increased bus patronage. Installing RTPI displays at key locations and/or corridors supports this by helping people change their travel behaviour towards more sustainable transport modes.

A long term plan for the deployment of RTPI displays in Chichester will ensure that any developer contributions from the strategic sites in Chichester (S106 and CIL) are spent in a co-ordinated manner and ensure suitable coverage of RTPI displays across the Chichester City and surrounding area.

The aim is to provide RTPI displays at locations that enable people to complete two-way journeys (i.e. RTPI display at the bus stop nearest their home for journeys into the city centre and then access to RTPI displays in city centre to get back home) or at other key stops to access local facilities, such as hospitals.

WSSC has been working closely with Stagecoach South (the main bus operator in Chichester) to compile a list of proposed locations for new RTPI displays in Chichester. These are currently:

- The Hornet near the new retirement homes (towards Bognor Regis/Selsey)
- Barnfield Drive near the Harvester (both directions)
- Bognor Road near The Peacheries (both directions)
- Avenue de Chartres (Westgate Stop U)
- Grosvenor Road, Stockbridge (towards Chichester)
- Whyke Road near Willowbed Drive (both directions)
- Hunston Road at Chichester Free School (both directions)

Benefits of RTPI

The benefits of RTPI displays fall into two main categories – benefits to bus passengers and benefits to bus operators. Most of the direct benefits to bus operations ultimately lead to benefits to passengers, such as more reliable bus services.

Benefits to bus passengers include:

- Accessible for the all the community (including visually impaired via audio announcement facility)
- Increased confidence that their bus will arrive and when
- Reduced anxiety associated with waiting for bus as well as uncertainty and frustration
- Improved waiting facilities
- Reduced waiting times (information is available via various sources so bus users don't have to be at the bus stop to get the information)
- Helps people to make informed decision about their travel
- Encourages people to use public transport rather than private car

- Improved integration between modes (i.e. displays at rail station encourage onward travel by bus)

The bus operators benefit from:

- Increased passenger patronage
- Improved image of bus services
- Knowing exactly where their buses are at any time
- Ability to deal with delays and incidents more quickly
- Detailed reporting (for example if know consistently leaving early or late from particular stops, they can alter their timetables accordingly)

Working in partnership with WSCC, the local bus operators provide data to the WSCC RTPI System. These currently are Stagecoach South, Compass Travel, Metrobus, Brighton & Hove Buses and Arriva. The County Council is also open to working with other bus operators in the future.

Costs

Funding via CIL (IBP 355 RTPI screens) will be used to complement the existing s106 funding (current and future) and provide further RTPI displays.

£120,000 funding will be split over two years: £60,000 in 2019/20 and £60,000 in 2020/21.

This will enable approximately 12 new RTPI displays to be installed, 6 in 2019/20 and 6 in 2020/21. Details of the proposed locations for 11 of the displays are listed above and on the location plan attached.

Maintenance costs vary depending on the type of display installed but on average it costs £250 per display per year. West Sussex County Council currently funds the maintenance of RTPI screens from its Revenue Works Budget.

IBP 349 - A286 Birdham Road/B2201 Selsey Tram Roundabout junction improvement – No changes requested. The County Council has in the region of £3.7m p.a. to deliver all improvement works across West Sussex. The demand far outstrips both resourcing and funding. The result is that the County Council has to prioritise delivery and this is achieved via the Local Transport Improvement Programme (LTIP). This is a Member approved process. LTIP schemes are made up of the following scheme types:

- Cycling
- Walking
- Passenger transport
- Safety (road casualty reduction)
- Schools access
- General access / junction improvements
- Countryside access (Public Rights of Way / Bridleway) and countryside management – including footway bridges / structures
- Traffic Management

IBP/349 Noted,
no changes
required

	<p>The County Council also funds community led schemes and pedestrian crossings etc. from this one funding source. Very often developer contributions are added to increase the total amount available as is the case with a number of schemes in the IBP.</p> <p>The LTIP considers each scheme on its own merits against WSCC priorities, value for money, feasibility etc. Each scheme is therefore allocated a score and this allows us to compare the relative merits of different scheme types, all providing different outcomes against each other. Every year a programme of the highest scoring schemes is recommended to the Cabinet Member for delivery for a given level of resources and funding. At this time we have provisionally added this to the 2020/21 programme for design and consultation.</p> <p>IBP 634 (footpaths, bridle paths and local roads, Oving Parish) – The reference to ‘Maintenance no longer carried out by WSCC’ should be removed as WSCC continue maintain the footpath.</p> <p>IBP 667 (Green Links across the Manhood) - Is presently subject to a bid for European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development funding, yet to hear if bid has been successful. If this scheme can be delivered it will likely become part of a Selsey – Chichester cycle link, so contribute to IBP 361.</p> <p><u>BROADBAND</u></p> <p>Project IBP 580 (Broadband roll out) - Wording for the scheme should be updated. Replace existing wording with ‘Ensure ‘superfast’ broadband coverage of 95% of the area, and basic broadband coverage of 100% of the area in line with government targets.’</p> <p><u>EDUCATION</u></p> <p>IBP 329 (Site for new primary school Graylingwell SDL) – This project should be removed from the IBP.</p> <p>IBP 333 (school expansions Billingshurst locality) - change scheme wording to ‘Further expansion of existing primary schools across the Billingshurst Locality by up to ½ Form Entry. Wisborough Green expanded to become a 1FE primary school 2017. Loxwood increased their published admission numbers to become a 1FE primary school in 2017.’</p>	<p>IBP/634 will be amended as suggested</p> <p>IBP/667 Noted, no changes required</p> <p>IBP/580 will be amended as suggested.</p> <p>IBP/329 will be removed</p> <p>IBP/333 will be amended as suggested.</p>
--	---	--

Chichester DC Economic Development Team	Page 123 Business rate retention and Tax Increment Financing section needs updating	The Economic Development team has been requested to provide updated text.
South Downs National Park Authority	<p>Thank you for sending us a copy of your IBP. We have gone through the key parts as set out in your e-mail. We have no views on how you prioritise the projects but we have taken the opportunity to go through both yours and ours and have identified the following which are on our list but not yours, or one for which we have more information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Boxgrove – Renovate children’s play area on Boxgrove Recreation Ground – no information on costs, delivery, funding sources etc. · Lavant – Community hub (IBP 648) – the EOI to us quoted £100,000 · <p>We note the spending on:</p> <p>Project 194 - Enhancements to the Lavant Biodiversity Opportunity Area -the stretch of the Lavant north of the Westhampnett SDL.</p> <p>Project 353 - Sustainable transport corridor – City Centre to Westhampnett.</p>	<p>Boxgrove PC will be asked if they wish to include the play area project within the IBP.</p> <p>IBP/648 will be updated to include the cost provided.</p>
Parish Councils		
Chichester City Council	<p>Please add new projects: Replacement of cycle racks in order to improve the condition of cycle racks in the City during 2018. Total cost £40,000, £7,500 from Chichester District (City Vision budget) and £32,500 from Chichester City Council. To be led by Chichester City Council with Chichester District Council.</p> <p>Lighting Littern Gardens in order to improve the lighting and security. Also 8 Heritage Columns at the war memorial during 2018. Total cost £28,578.91 from Chichester City Council CIL. To be led by Chichester City Council.</p>	These projects will be added to Appendix A as requested. The cycle racks as IBP/738, and lighting columns as IBP/739
Chidham & Hambrook	<p>IBP/735 Hearing loop for village hall has been secured through new Homes Bonus</p> <p>IBP/603 (Improvement to residents parking, Chidham & Hambrook) Scheme description to include: CHPC in discussion with CDC re S106 agreement for an area on the east side of Flat Rd to be developed as a car parking</p>	<p>IBP/735 will be noted as completed in the IBP and removed from Appendix A</p> <p>IBP/603 will be updated as</p>

	<p>space</p> <p>BP/598 (speed restrictions of 30mph on the peninsula and along A259 through the parish) Scheme description to include: Linked with CHEMROUTE and cycle routes IBP/676. Funding sources to include: Discussions to be undertaken with WSCC and the possibility of the PC funding some of this work.</p> <p>IBP/601 (resurface/improve pedestrian routes) change scheme description to: Improve public footpaths to give residents better access to the countryside, particularly in Hambrook.</p> <p>IBP/605 (works to sustain Chidham Parochial Primary School to accommodate expanding capacity) Parish state that school is at full capacity.</p> <p>IBP/612 (Create a Community Recreation Centre with outdoor facilities for all ages) Initial phase to include legal fees incurred with open space acquisition</p> <p>IBP/713 (Improvements to St Wilfrid's Church Hall) Project cost £57,368 to be funded from S106 – project underway</p> <p>IBP/699 (Reduce light pollution where possible Maybush Copse) is underway</p> <p>IBP/614 (Public Open Space – The Dell, Chidham Lane maintenance) has been achieved</p> <p>IBP/737 (Maybush Copse – wheelchair access) work to be undertaken soon</p> <p>IBP/624 (Install WiFi to village) and IBP/709 (extension to St. Mary's Graveyard) are underway</p>	<p>suggested</p> <p>IBP/598 will be updated as suggested</p> <p>IBP/601 will be updated as suggested</p> <p>IBP/605 Noted. No change required</p> <p>IBP/612 Noted. No change required</p> <p>IBP/713 will be updated as suggested.</p> <p>IBP/699 Noted. No change required</p> <p>IBP/614 will be recorded as achieved and removed from Appendix A</p> <p>IBP/737 Noted. No change required</p> <p>IBP/624 and</p>
--	---	--

Add new projects:

Infrastructure Category (from above list)	Scheme (description) With IBP reference number if an update for an existing project	Justification/ rationale	Phasing (when)	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls	Delivery lead (who/how)
Transport New IBP/741	Resurface/improve walking and pavement routes		High priority		Local Transport Improvement Programme - £160k S106 towards sustainable transport	
Transport New IBP/742	Provision of pedestrian refuges/crossings on A259/Broad Road		High priority		As above	
Social infrastructure New IBP/743	A community centre of a modular design that can be expanded in size as developing needs arise		Essential infrastructure – pre-eminent priority			
Green infrastructure New IBP/744	Preparation of allotments		High priority			
Transport	Greater frequency					

IBP/709 Noted.
No change required

The Parish Council has been contacted to check whether these projects are their CIL Spending plans and they have confirmed that they are. The projects will therefore be added to Appendix A.

	New IBP/745	of trains stopping at Nutbourne station during busy periods							
	Social infrastructure New IBP/746	Placement of additional litter/dog waste bins in appropriate areas of the parish		High priority					
	Social infrastructure New IBP/747	Historical/wildlife information board to be sited along Catch Pond.		High priority					
	Social infrastructure New IBP/748	Improved broadband for parish	This work is underway.	Medium priority					
	Health New IBP/749	Provision of medical/dentist surgery.	Initial discussions with South Coast Commissioning GP service, with appropriate building possibly provided by developers or integrated into the pre-eminent priority Community Centre.	Low priority					
Earnley Parish Council	I am writing to you on behalf of Earnley Parish Council to urge that the delivery of item IBP/349 A286 Birdham Road/B2201 Selsey Tram Roundabout junction improvement be brought forward from the proposed								IBP/349 Noted. No change

	<p>commencement year of 2021/22. The Selsey Tram roundabout is the last major junction on the Manhood Peninsula section of the A286, some 400 metres south of the Stockbridge Road roundabout where the A286 meets the A27. The additional housing development that this upgrade is planned to accommodate has already been built or is currently in the process of being built. Indeed, the development numbers exceed existing Local Plan allocations and, in many cases, developers have paid over contributions towards highway improvements. Furthermore, West Sussex Highways have officially conceded that traffic conditions on this section of the A286 are already at "severe" levels, with peak hour morning tailbacks extending south from the Stockbridge roundabout some 1.5 km and therefore blocking the Selsey Tram roundabout. Earnley Parish Council recognise that there are bigger issues to be addressed in order to fully resolve the transport problems on the Manhood Peninsula but, until these longer term issues are addressed, we should as soon as possible implement the upgrade of the Selsey Tram roundabout</p>	<p>required as it is reliant on delivery by WSCC who has confirmed that it is not going to bring this project forward.</p>																					
<p>East Wittering & Bracklesham</p>	<p>The Parish council would like to request that the phasing of the works to improve the junction of the A286/B2201 at the Donnington roundabout is brought forward. At present this work is scheduled for completion in 2020/21. This work is due to be completed as mitigation for new housing developments in Selsey and the Witterings that have already been completed or are well on the way to completion The adverse impacts on traffic are already being felt by residents and the S106/CIL monies to fund the improvements are in place. As such it is completely unacceptable to make the communities of the Manhood wait any longer than is strictly necessary for the work to be carried out and we would urge that it brought forward as swiftly as possible.</p> <p>Add new projects:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Infrastructure Category (from above list)</th> <th>Scheme (description)</th> <th>Justification/ rationale</th> <th>Phasing (when)</th> <th>Total estimated infrastructure cost</th> <th>Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls</th> <th>Delivery lead (who/how)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Transport/Green Infrastructure New IBP/750</p> </td> <td> <p>Development of new cycle routes to link key sites in the community and improve links across the peninsula and in to Chichester</p> </td> <td> <p>To encourage sustainable transport and improve safety</p> </td> <td> <p>Short-medium term</p> </td> <td></td> <td> <p>CIL</p> </td> <td> <p>WSCC</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Social</p> </td> <td> <p>Development</p> </td> <td> <p>To allow</p> </td> <td> <p>Short-</p> </td> <td> <p>£150K</p> </td> <td> <p>CIL</p> </td> <td> <p>WSCC/CDC</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Infrastructure Category (from above list)	Scheme (description)	Justification/ rationale	Phasing (when)	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls	Delivery lead (who/how)	<p>Transport/Green Infrastructure New IBP/750</p>	<p>Development of new cycle routes to link key sites in the community and improve links across the peninsula and in to Chichester</p>	<p>To encourage sustainable transport and improve safety</p>	<p>Short-medium term</p>		<p>CIL</p>	<p>WSCC</p>	<p>Social</p>	<p>Development</p>	<p>To allow</p>	<p>Short-</p>	<p>£150K</p>	<p>CIL</p>	<p>WSCC/CDC</p>	<p>IBP/349 Noted. No change required as it is reliant on delivery by WSCC who has confirmed that it is not going to bring this project forward.</p> <p>The new projects will be added to the IBP</p>
Infrastructure Category (from above list)	Scheme (description)	Justification/ rationale	Phasing (when)	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls	Delivery lead (who/how)																	
<p>Transport/Green Infrastructure New IBP/750</p>	<p>Development of new cycle routes to link key sites in the community and improve links across the peninsula and in to Chichester</p>	<p>To encourage sustainable transport and improve safety</p>	<p>Short-medium term</p>		<p>CIL</p>	<p>WSCC</p>																	
<p>Social</p>	<p>Development</p>	<p>To allow</p>	<p>Short-</p>	<p>£150K</p>	<p>CIL</p>	<p>WSCC/CDC</p>																	

	Infrastructure New IBP/751	of community services support hub	residents access to essential services without the need to travel to Chichester	medium term			/EWBPC	
	Transport/Social Infrastructure New IBP/752	Improvements to bus stops/ creation of laybys, additional street lighting and pavement improvements	To improve public safety and the built environment	Short-medium term		CIL	WSCC/EWBPC	
Fishbourne	Fishbourne Parish Council reviewed the Chichester IBP and request that IBP/65 Allotments is removed.							IBP/65 will be removed from appendix A as requested
Hunston PC	Please add new project which has two elements to it: Part 1 Provide new light controlled crossing outside Hunston Village Hall to facilitate safer access to the playing field and proposed new playground/MUGA facilities on the field. Part 2 Provide a short footpath from the bus stop opposite 10 Oakview to a point either north or south of the stop to aid safe crossing for people using the bus stop.							This new project will be added to Appendix A as requested as new IBP/753
Loxwood PC	Last night at the Loxwood Parish Council meeting the Councillors discussed the CDC IBP. They were wondering if they could put forward projects to be included in the CDC Strategic Projects section and how they could go about doing this. One such project they have in mind is flood alleviation for the Loxwood area community at a cost of £150,000.							This project is not as a result of new development , but as a result of an existing deficiency, so CDC could not put it forward as one of its projects as it would not meet the CIL spending regulations.
	We intend to spend the Parish CIL on an additional project: £6000 for a safe entry gate for North Hall. This would be under the Community facilities section. Also the VAS poles IBP/697 have now been purchased and can be taken out of Loxwood Projects.							This new project will be added to Appendix A as

								<p>requested as new IBP/754, and the completed project will be recorded as having been delivered and removed for Appendix A..</p>
<p>Selsey TC</p>	<p>Please add the following new projects:</p>							<p>These new projects will be added to Appendix A as requested. Selsey Town Council has been asked to provide further information to demonstrate that a Selsey to Chichester tramway has a realistic prospect of being delivered from the Town Council's CIL</p>
<p>Infrastructure Category (from above list)</p>	<p>Scheme (description)</p>	<p>Justification/ rationale</p>	<p>Phasing (when)</p>	<p>Total estimated infrastructure cost</p>	<p>Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls</p>	<p>Delivery lead (who/how)</p>		
<p>Transport New IBP/755</p>	<p>Electric vehicle charging points at Warners Yard, East Beach & East Street car parks</p>	<p>Lack of current facility and distance to nearest option.</p>	<p>Short term 2019-2024</p>		<p>CIL</p>	<p>STC</p>		
<p>Transport New IBP/756</p>	<p>Selsey to Chichester tramway</p>	<p>High speed, traffic free, sustainable link offering alternative route to town</p>						
<p>Social infrastructure New IBP/757</p>	<p>Wayfinding scheme</p>	<p>To enhance visitor attraction and tourism product, linking up different areas of the town.</p>			<p>CIL</p>	<p>STC</p>		
<p>Social infrastructure New</p>	<p>Public space enhancements at the Recreation Ground – play and wellbeing</p>	<p>To enhance residents wellbeing and visitor attraction.</p>			<p>CIL</p>	<p>STC</p>		

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>IBP/758</td> <td>equipment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social infrastructure</td> <td>Public space enhancements at Manor Green Park – play and wellbeing equipment</td> <td>To enhance residents wellbeing and visitor attraction.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>CIL</td> <td>STC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New IBP/759</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Please remove amend the following projects:</p> <p>IBP/106 (Community Car Club) – Remove – no current evidence base for community car club.</p> <p>IBP/107 (Cinema/Theatre refurbishment) – Amend – Show delivery lead as STC IBP/117 (Public Realm Enhancement – East Beach shops) – Remove – almost identical to IBP/111 – duplication IBP/105 (Layout changes to Selsey High Street) – Amend scheme to read “Pedestrianisation of section of High Street to provide central community/pedestrian space”</p>	IBP/758	equipment						Social infrastructure	Public space enhancements at Manor Green Park – play and wellbeing equipment	To enhance residents wellbeing and visitor attraction.			CIL	STC	New IBP/759							<p>IBP/106 and IBP/117 will be removed as requested from Appendix A.</p> <p>IBP/107 and IBP/105 will be amended as suggested.</p>
IBP/758	equipment																						
Social infrastructure	Public space enhancements at Manor Green Park – play and wellbeing equipment	To enhance residents wellbeing and visitor attraction.			CIL	STC																	
New IBP/759																							
Tangmere PC	<p>Please amend IBP as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>IBP ID</th> <th>Where/What</th> <th>Suggested amendment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>IBP/328</td> <td>New Primary School</td> <td>Suggest provide two form entry school expandable to three form entry (<i>reference additional housing numbers emerging from Local Plan review</i>).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/150</td> <td>Upgrade Village Centre Car Park</td> <td>Need to revise cost and add “Pre Application advice sought” in planning ref column. Planning ref. add “14/00797/FUL, 17/00540/FUL.”</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/145</td> <td>Improve safety and increase parking around One Stop</td> <td>Delete due planned closure in Feb? Note traffic calming covered by IBP 160</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/161</td> <td>Sports hall</td> <td>Add “S106” in CIL S106 Other column. Planning ref column replace with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL.”</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/143</td> <td>Village Centre improvements</td> <td>Replace planning refs with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL, 11/04058/FUL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/149</td> <td>Tangmere Aviation Museum</td> <td>Add “SDL S106” in funding sources column.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	IBP ID	Where/What	Suggested amendment	IBP/328	New Primary School	Suggest provide two form entry school expandable to three form entry (<i>reference additional housing numbers emerging from Local Plan review</i>).	IBP/150	Upgrade Village Centre Car Park	Need to revise cost and add “Pre Application advice sought” in planning ref column. Planning ref. add “14/00797/FUL, 17/00540/FUL.”	IBP/145	Improve safety and increase parking around One Stop	Delete due planned closure in Feb? Note traffic calming covered by IBP 160	IBP/161	Sports hall	Add “S106” in CIL S106 Other column. Planning ref column replace with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL.”	IBP/143	Village Centre improvements	Replace planning refs with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL, 11/04058/FUL	IBP/149	Tangmere Aviation Museum	Add “SDL S106” in funding sources column.	<p>IBP/328. Noted, no change required as the change relates to the Local Plan Review not the current Local Plan. The change will be picked up when the Local Plan Review becomes adopted and replaces the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>All other changes requested will be made. However, it will be made clear that IBP/149 S106</p>
IBP ID	Where/What	Suggested amendment																					
IBP/328	New Primary School	Suggest provide two form entry school expandable to three form entry (<i>reference additional housing numbers emerging from Local Plan review</i>).																					
IBP/150	Upgrade Village Centre Car Park	Need to revise cost and add “Pre Application advice sought” in planning ref column. Planning ref. add “14/00797/FUL, 17/00540/FUL.”																					
IBP/145	Improve safety and increase parking around One Stop	Delete due planned closure in Feb? Note traffic calming covered by IBP 160																					
IBP/161	Sports hall	Add “S106” in CIL S106 Other column. Planning ref column replace with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL.”																					
IBP/143	Village Centre improvements	Replace planning refs with “17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL, 11/04058/FUL																					
IBP/149	Tangmere Aviation Museum	Add “SDL S106” in funding sources column.																					

		extension into existing allotments which will relocate to SDL.					refers to the relocation of the allotments, not the expansion of the museum.												
	IBP/153	New Community centre	Replace planning refs with "17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL, 11/04058/FUL.																
	IBP/720	Garland Sq new soakaways	Amend justification to read "Reline surface water drain to connect Garland Square system to new soakaways on Bishops Road." Cost "3300". Funding source/delivery lead replace with/add "Hyde Group".																
	IBP/715	New & replacement trees	Add "hedgerows" in scheme column.																
	IBP/157	Malcolm Road Rec Field improvements to drainage	Scheme – amend to "Malcolm Rd Rec. field sports pitch area – land drainage." Drainage Justification – amend to "Current poor land drainage leading to poor quality playing surfaces, match cancellations, maintenance difficulties and surface water run-off. Cost range entry amend to read "Verti-drain/sandfill @10k. Topo survey @700. New land drainage system >30k." Replace planning refs with "17/00540/FUL, 14/00797/FUL.																
West Wittering PC	<p>WWPC is concerned about the timeframe for - IBP 349 (Selsey tram roundabout improvements) scheduled for delivery 2021/22. Having already made representation regarding the works to the Selsey Tram roundabout to WSCC the Parish Council is disappointed that the improvements haven't been made as the developments have been delivered and the traffic has of course increased. It seems this project was underfunded from the very beginning. The Parish Council therefore asks that this should be brought forward to 2019/20 or 2020/21 as all the house building this was meant to mitigate is complete and the community has an expectation that such improvements be delivered on time.</p>						IBP/349 Noted. No change required as it is reliant on delivery by WSCC who has confirmed that it is not going to re-phase this project to bring it forward.												
Westbourne	<p>Please amend the following projects:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>IBP Ref No.</th> <th>Scheme</th> <th>Justification</th> <th>Total £</th> <th>When</th> <th>Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						IBP Ref No.	Scheme	Justification	Total £	When	Comments							IBP/640,554,558, 555,559 will be amended as requested.
IBP Ref No.	Scheme	Justification	Total £	When	Comments														

	IBP/640	A car park that can be used by residents/visitors	To ease congestion on the roads, help shoppers use the local facilities.	As yet unknown	2019/20	This remains a key proposal and is incorporated into the WPC Business Plan.	
	IBP/554	Development of the cemetery's new two-acre field to make it suitable for burials. Includes plot structure and layout of pathways.	The existing cemetery will be full in 2-5 years. A new field has been purchased and needs to be made ready.	As yet unknown	Needs to be used in 2-5 years.	Feasibility work needs to be undertaken in the next two years.	
	IBP/558	Street lighting, some need replacing		£0.00		In good condition. We have a contract with SSE to maintain them and they carry out inspections yearly The last time we inspected them, they were relatively newish. We have also added the one in the twitten off North Street to the list.	
	IBP/555	The Cub Scout Hall needs a good face-lift.	It is a WW2 army building with agricultural asbestos in the roof. The hut is used by the scouts and by other community groups/events.	As yet unknown		Work needed: replacement of the asbestos roof and maybe external insulation and cladding. Our GSL and Scout leader do most of the everyday maintenance. The Hut is owned by CDC but is on a long-term lease to the Scouts.	
	IBP/559	The Meeting Place - The hall would benefit from refurbishment to make it a better, more sophisticated community facility.		£28,675	2018/19	Some work completed (e.g. broadband installed). Further work to be specified using agreed allocation of s.106 funding	
Highways England	There remain a few matters which need updating as follows:						An additional point will be

- On page 3, the text ‘Planning obligations – S106 (infrastructure that provides site specific mitigation).’ In referring to *site specific mitigation* this does not describe the use of S278 agreements with Highways England to fund the improvements to the Chichester Bypass agreed as part of the Local Plan (and current review underway). It is suggested that this is set down as a separate bullet referencing the Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing SPD.
- Para 2.4 refers to project costs being based on 2018 figures. However the cost of IBP/339 at least does not appear to have been adjusted, the quoted costs for each junction appear to be the original (2012 prices) works cost. CDC with PBA and HE are currently assessing the revised works costs which will need inserting when available.
- On page 86, in relation to IBP/339 (A27 junction improvements), as stated above, costs should be updated when revised figures become available.
- IBP/345 (Shopwyke Road diversion), and IBP/538 (Oving Road crossroads) (see also page 80) – funding is through S278 with Highways England. The delivery lead is Highways England.

Additional mitigation works agreed to the A27 Chichester Bypass

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL S106 Other	Planning app.	Scheme	Funding Sources	Delivery Lead	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £

added to the examples on page 3 to include

Where development requires work to be carried out on the existing adopted highway, A section 278 Agreement will need to be completed between the developer and relevant highways authority as set out in the Chichester Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD.

IBP/339 will be updated to reflect the most recent cost of the Whyke Junction of £4,820,000, and for the A27 Bognor Road Roundabout including Vinnetrow Road Junction improvement the most recent cost

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>IBP/339</td> <td>A27 Whyke Junction</td> <td>Transport</td> <td>S278</td> <td>HN/15/03489/FUL</td> <td>Chichester Free School</td> <td>S278 Sussex Education Trust</td> <td>Highways England</td> <td>76,000 - £86,565</td> <td>£86,565</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/339</td> <td>Whyke Junction</td> <td>Transport</td> <td>S278</td> <td>Arun Planning applications P/140/16/OUT P/6/17/OUT P/6/17/OUT</td> <td>Arun Strategic Housing sites at Pagham</td> <td>S278 Private Developers</td> <td>Highways England</td> <td>£580,710 - £883,150</td> <td>£883,150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBP/339</td> <td>A27 Bognor Road Roundabout</td> <td>Transport</td> <td>S278</td> <td>14/04284/OUT</td> <td>Bognor Road Former Fuel Depot</td> <td>S278 Private Developers</td> <td>Highways England</td> <td>Tbc</td> <td>Tbc</td> </tr> </table>	IBP/339	A27 Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	HN/15/03489/FUL	Chichester Free School	S278 Sussex Education Trust	Highways England	76,000 - £86,565	£86,565	IBP/339	Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	Arun Planning applications P/140/16/OUT P/6/17/OUT P/6/17/OUT	Arun Strategic Housing sites at Pagham	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	£580,710 - £883,150	£883,150	IBP/339	A27 Bognor Road Roundabout	Transport	S278	14/04284/OUT	Bognor Road Former Fuel Depot	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	Tbc	Tbc	<p>is £16,100,000.</p> <p>IBP/345 and IBP/538 will be changes as suggested.</p>
IBP/339	A27 Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	HN/15/03489/FUL	Chichester Free School	S278 Sussex Education Trust	Highways England	76,000 - £86,565	£86,565																							
IBP/339	Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	Arun Planning applications P/140/16/OUT P/6/17/OUT P/6/17/OUT	Arun Strategic Housing sites at Pagham	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	£580,710 - £883,150	£883,150																							
IBP/339	A27 Bognor Road Roundabout	Transport	S278	14/04284/OUT	Bognor Road Former Fuel Depot	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	Tbc	Tbc																							
RSPB	<p>IBP/667 (Green Links across the Manhood. North Selsey to Medmerry Trail) appears to be duplicated. We are aware that there are plans to look at a cycle link from north Selsey into Medmerry, but we weren't aware it would be a bridleway. It doesn't cause us huge concern though as the route around Medmerry is allocated for horses, bikes and foot traffic. We are not however sure on the timescale for delivery of this, or the exact route on the ground.</p>	<p>IBP/667 No change required. The project is not duplicated.</p> <p>WSSC discussed bridleway status at GLAM meetings several years ago and believe that it is the most appropriate status to maximise access opportunities in the local area. When the project is scheduled to be delivered its cost is likely to be around £160,000. IBP/667 will be updated to reflect</p>																														

	<p>IBP/666 (Green Links across the Manhood. Bracklesham to Medmerry Trail. We weren't aware it would be a bridleway.and we are unaware of the proposed route.</p> <p>IBP/586 (New visitor centre at Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve). This project has been deferred pending further discussions with West Sussex County Council.</p> <p>IBP/315 (Access improvements to and establishment of a coastal path with wayfinding Manhood Peninsula) We don't have any real concerns although local residents around Ham (Medmerry) are challenging the route proposed by Natural England in that vicinity.</p>	<p>this cost increase</p> <p>IBP/666. No change required. WSCC discussed bridleway status at GLAM meetings several years ago and believe that it is the most appropriate status to maximise access opportunities in the local area. The route has not been identified yet.</p> <p>IBP/586. No change required.</p> <p>IBP/315. No change required.</p>
--	--	--

Draft CIL Spending Plan (Table 11 extracted from IBP)

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
1st April b/fwd	-	609,148.27	2,744,498.36	4,510,866.68	3,919,790.68	3,125,686.68	2,055,986.68	3,328,986.68	7,547,338.68
INCOME									
Gross Income	775,847.84	2,852,376.37	2,473,958.85	1,741,320.00	2,681,280.00	2,079,000.00	1,890,000.00	6,633,360.00	3,213,000.00
Parish Share	120,392.28	564,407.46	533,892.59	435,330.00	670,320.00	519,750.00	472,500.00	1,658,340.00	803,250.00
Admin	38,792.39	142,618.82	123,697.94	87,066.00	134,064.00	103,950.00	94,500.00	331,668.00	160,650.00
CDC Net Income	616,663.17	2,145,350.09	1,816,368.32	1,218,924.00	1,876,896.00	1,455,300.00	1,323,000.00	4,643,352.00	2,249,100.00
Interest to 31st March	10,854.00								
Funds Available	627,517.17	2,754,498.36	4,560,866.68	5,729,790.68	5,796,686.68	4,580,986.68	3,378,986.68	7,972,338.68	9,796,438.68
EXPENDITURE	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Ambulance response Post Chichester South Project 533	18,368.90								
Enhancements to the Lavant Biodiversity Opportunity Area -the stretch of the Lavant north of the Westhampnett SDL. Project 194		10,000.00	40,000.00						
Brandy Hole Copse Project 196			10,000.00						
Primary School places E-W project 330 Chichester (subject to further detail and evaluation)						1,200,000.00			
School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Chichester.						50,000.00			

Project 657									
Sustainable transport corridor – City Centre to Portfield part of project 656 (subject to further detail and evaluation)						25,000.00	50,000.00	425,000.00	
RTPI screens at Chichester City Project 355				60,000.00	60,000.00				
Sustainable transport corridor – City Centre to Westhampnett. Project 353 (subject to further detail and evaluation)				500,000.00					
Medical Centre W of Chichester. Project 398 (Subject to further detail and evaluation)					1,750,000.00				
Primary School places Bournes. Project 331 (subject to further detail & evaluation)						1,200,000.00			
School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Bournes. Project 660						50,000.00			
Primary School places Manhood Peninsula. Project 332 (subject to further detail & evaluation)				1,200,000.00					

School access improvements at expanded primary school(s) Manhood. Project 659				50,000.00					
A286 Birdham Rd/B2201 (Selsey Rd Roundabout) Junction Improvement Project 349					111,000.00				
Area-wide parking management North East Chichester. Project 654 (subject to further detail and evaluation)					250,000.00				
Area -wide parking management West Chichester. Project 655 (subject to further detail and evaluation)					250,000.00				
Area-wide parking mangement Chichester City. Project 665(subject to further detail and evaluation)					250,000.00				
Total expenditure	18,368.90	10,000.00	50,000.00	1,810,000.00	2,671,000.00	2,525,000.00	50,000.00	425,000.00	-
31st March c/fwd	609,148.27	2,744,498.36	4,510,866.68	3,919,790.68	3,125,686.68	2,055,986.68	3,328,986.68	7,547,338.68	9,796,438.68

This page is intentionally left blank