

Authority/ organisation	Name of Contact	Email address	Representations	Recommended changes following consultation
WSSCC	Nathan Elvery, Chief Executive Officer	Nathan.elvery@westsussex.gov.uk Darryl Hemmings, Caroline West	<p><u>Waste</u> There are currently no waste infrastructure projects in the 'list of all projects from all funding sources'. The existing waste infrastructure, its current and future capacities, usage, operation and configuration, is an integral part of the Waste Infrastructure Review being carried out by West Sussex County Council. An initial outcome from this work, for Chichester District, is the need for the reconfiguration of Westhampnett transfer station/Household waste recycling site in order to increase capacity to meet future demands from planned housing delivery across the area.</p> <p>Considering the type and source of waste that enters and is sorted at the site, as well as the planned housing delivery in the wider area, Chichester District Council is requested to identify 50% of the overall project cost estimate of £5m in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for future CIL funding and subsequent consideration for prioritisation. The works are expected to take place in the medium to long term (2024-2029).</p> <p><u>Flooding and Drainage</u> The flood risk management schemes are consistent and in line with what is expected, however costs and details may require further refinement in future. The list reflects, at this current time and detail of knowledge, what would be potentially suitable to attract CIL funding, with one further project suggested to be included in the short term. As Lead Local Flood Authority the County Council would encourage early collaboration and engagement on any future scheme development brought forward from the IBP.</p> <p>The further project to be included in the Infrastructure Business Plan, is the Parklands Chichester daylighting of culvert with landscaping to create the primary benefit of natural flood attenuation / reduced downstream flood risk, additional benefits include improved amenity and biodiversity. An outline scheme is recommended in the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for the Whitehouse Farm development at a provisional cost of £500k. There is a drainage connection (300mm culvert) between the proposed Whitehouse Farm development and the Parklands Estate. Insufficient is known about the exact nature of the drainage network to fully assess the degree of connectivity between Whitehouse Farm and Parklands. However, the proposal has the scope to reduce surface water flooding as occurred in 2013 as well as providing significant improvements in public amenity and biodiversity in the area.</p>	<p>This new infrastructure project will be added to the IBP/710.</p> <p>The scheme is primarily driven by the need for flood risk alleviation of the lower Parklands Estate, a key driver is habitat compensation for loss of open watercourse resulting from culverting for crossover accesses throughout the Whitehouse Farm SDL. On this basis S106 rather than CIL may be the appropriate funding Mechanism. This project will therefore be included within the IBP/711 but the funding source is not yet clear.</p>

			<p><u>Highways</u> IBP 353 - The National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF) bid the County Council put forward for IBP 353 was unsuccessful. The County Council are considering the scope and timescales, as well as alternative sources for funding in order to progress this project. At this time we request that the funding profile remains as in the IBP 2018/2023 document. We will update the District Council as further feasibility work is progressed.</p> <p>IBP 339 - Further work undertaken by Arun District Council indicates the following cost estimates for the following junctions:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction 7 A27/A29 Fontwell Eastern Roundabout – remains £380,000 - £595,000 • Junction 17 A29/A259 Rowan Way junction improvement - £416,000 – 620,000; and • Junction 18 A29/A259 Felpham Relief Road Roundabout improvement) - £428,000 - £638,000 <p>The Enterprise Bognor Regis Transport Review (September 2017) builds on the Arun Transport Study 2016 and covers many if not all of the same junctions. The Enterprise Bognor Regis Transport Review (September 2017) has also resulted in updated recommendations and costs for two junctions in Chichester District; these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A27/A259 Bognor Road Roundabout £595,000-£915,000 • B2166/B2145 roundabout at Hunston £76,000-£113,000 <p>It also references an updated design at A27/B2145 Whyke junction from Pagham developers without quoting costs.</p>	<p>IBP/353 Comments noted, no changes required to IBP</p> <p>IBP/339 The IBP will be amended following advice from WSCC as follows:</p> <p>Two further mitigation requirements that affect the A27 junctions listed in IBP 339 are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A27/A259 Bognor Road Roundabout £595,000-£915,000 • updated design at A27/B2145 Whyke junction from Pagham developers without quoting costs. These will be added to the IBP <p>Two further mitigation schemes within the Chichester District required from development in Arun District are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A27/B2233 Nyton Road junction improvement £202,000-£300,000 – IBP/724 and • B2166/B2145 roundabout at Hunston £76,000-£113,000 – IBP/339 this project would not have Highways England as the delivery lead. These will
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

			<p><u>Education</u> IBP 536 and linked project IBP 661 can be removed from the IBP as this part expansion project has been brought forward and is currently under construction. CIL funding is not being sought for this project.</p> <p><u>Public Rights of Way</u> IBP 666 is underway with a current budget of £300k, this project currently states £190,000 in the IBP</p>	<p>be added as new projects to the IBP.</p> <p>IBP/536 and IBP/661 will be removed from the list of CIL projects and the CIL spending plan. They will be recorded in the IBP as having being delivered from S106 within the educational locality in Horsham District.</p> <p>IBP/666 will be removed as a CIL project, and be listed as a project to be funded from S106 and capital funding.</p>
Arun DC	Nigel Lynn CEO	<p>Nigel.lynn@arun.gov.uk</p> <p>Tel: 01903 737600</p> <p>Roger Spencer Karl Roberts Donna Moles</p>	<p>IBP/334 In the justification this refers to also being dependent upon development in Arun. ADC wants to know why it is dependent upon development in Arun.</p> <p>IBP/339 Ensure that CDC’s development trajectory ties in with this level of funding and that this is read with ADC’s Transport study and IDP particularly for Bognor Road.</p> <p>IBP/354 This could have a positive impact on ADC but timing is essential. The project should be changed to short term (2016-2021)</p> <p>IBP/629 This project would be of benefit to both areas. Has network rail confirmed barrier</p>	<p>IBP/334 WSCC has confirmed that based on the current housing allocations, updated education position and requirements in the wider area, this project can be removed.</p> <p>See changes relating to IBP/339 to WSCC comments above.</p> <p>Comments noted, no changes required to IBP/354 as it unlikely that the project would be achievable in the short term following advice from WSCC.</p> <p>IBP/629 Network Rail has</p>

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

			times for this?							been asked about their intentions for this project.									
Chichester DC	Dominic Henly	dhenly@chichester.gov.uk	<p>IBP/293. The total cost is estimated to be between £100k-£150k (not £250k) with £100k requested, and I believed approved from CIL. I suggest the table is updated as below</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>3. Policy High IBP/293</td> <td>Manhood Peninsula</td> <td>Flood and coastal erosion risk management</td> <td>Local land Drainage - East Beach Sea Outfall Policy 10 of Draft Local Plan "Mitigating and adapting to climate change" West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015</td> <td>Select for CIL funding if the majority of money is match funded. This project can demonstrate it can assist the growth of the area.</td> <td>£250k FDGIA /LA contributions £100k-£150k</td> <td>£100,000.00</td> <td>£100,000 in year 2020-2021</td> <td>2018-2019</td> </tr> </table>							3. Policy High IBP/293	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Local land Drainage - East Beach Sea Outfall Policy 10 of Draft Local Plan "Mitigating and adapting to climate change" West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015	Select for CIL funding if the majority of money is match funded. This project can demonstrate it can assist the growth of the area.	£250k FDGIA /LA contributions £100k-£150k	£100,000.00	£100,000 in year 2020-2021	2018-2019	The table will be updated as suggested, and the project will be brought forward in the CIL Spending Plan to 2018/2019.
3. Policy High IBP/293	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Local land Drainage - East Beach Sea Outfall Policy 10 of Draft Local Plan "Mitigating and adapting to climate change" West Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2015	Select for CIL funding if the majority of money is match funded. This project can demonstrate it can assist the growth of the area.	£250k FDGIA /LA contributions £100k-£150k	£100,000.00	£100,000 in year 2020-2021	2018-2019											
Chichester DC	Stephanie Evans	sevans@chichester.gov.uk	IBP/197 – FLOW Project – funding was secured for the project under the Heritage Lottery Fund and the final amount was £545,300.							IBP/197 will be amended to reflect this change.									
Parish Councils																			

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

Boxgrove	Imogen Whitaker	Boxgrovepc1@gmail.com	<p>Boxgrove Parish Council would like the following items removed from the CDC IBP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDP 419 - transport and verge hardening St Blaises and St Mary's road • IDP 214 - Street scene and built environment in Halnaker • IDP 259 - Halnaker General Public realm improvements <p>The council would like the following to figure for Boxgrove Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDP 324 - renovation to Boxgrove Sports Pavilion • IDP 213 - Halnaker improvements to pedestrian safety and reducing traffic speeds in Halnaker particularly along the A285 • IDP 199 - Boxgrove improvements to pedestrian safety and reducing traffic speeds in Boxgrove, whilst protecting the special character of the conservation area • IDP 649 - Traffic calming at Halnaker crossroads 	<p>IBP/419, IBP/214 & IBP/259 will be removed from the IBP as these are no longer required.</p> <p>IBP/324, IBP/213, IBP/199 & IBP/649 will be retained in the IBP</p>
Chichester City Council	Mr R Duggua, Clerk	clerk@chichestercity.gov.uk 01243 788502	<p>We would also like to add 'improvements to City signage' for 2017/18 for £20,000 to our list of projects please.</p>	<p>The IBP/712 will be amended to include this additional project according to the details provided in the project proforma.</p> <p>Informal comments were submitted by an individual Chichester City Councillor. The City Council confirmed that these were not their official views, as such they have not been recorded in this document</p>
Chidham and Hambrook	Caroline Davison	clerk@chidhamandhambrook.com	<p>New projects –see text at end of table</p>	<p>The new projects IBP/709 & IBP/713 will be added to the IBP as requested.</p>
Fishbourne	Lucy Clerk	fishbourneparishcouncil@gmail.com 01243	<p>The chart on page 116 showing the 4 categories for prioritisation (Critical/ Essential/ High/ Desirable) is supported but we would like to see greater recognition of the need for road improvements to be made concurrently with major development work rather than as a later addition. This is highlighted by Highways England who predict total gridlock in and around</p>	<p>Comments noted, no changes required to IBP</p>

		<p>888506 01243 788563</p>	<p>Chichester by 2025 unless road improvements are completed by then.</p> <p>Please find attached update on Fishbourne’s CIL projects in yellow highlighting</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="696 323 1494 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="696 323 813 619">Infrastructure Strategy</th> <th data-bbox="813 323 922 619">Scheme (description)</th> <th data-bbox="922 323 1037 619">Justification/rational e</th> <th data-bbox="1037 323 1151 619">Phasing (when)</th> <th data-bbox="1151 323 1265 619">Total estimated infrastructure cost</th> <th data-bbox="1265 323 1379 619">Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls</th> <th data-bbox="1379 323 1494 619">Delivery lead (who/how)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 619 813 722">Transport IBP/58</td> <td data-bbox="813 619 922 722">SIDs in 5 sites</td> <td data-bbox="922 619 1037 722"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 619 1151 722">Installed 09/17</td> <td data-bbox="1151 619 1265 722"></td> <td data-bbox="1265 619 1379 722">NHB 2014 (see below)</td> <td data-bbox="1379 619 1494 722">Parish Clerk</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 722 813 1013">Transport IBP/56</td> <td data-bbox="813 722 922 1013">Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs</td> <td data-bbox="922 722 1037 1013"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 722 1151 1013">Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs</td> <td data-bbox="1151 722 1265 1013"></td> <td data-bbox="1265 722 1379 1013">NHB 2014 £12,239 (split between SIDs and signs)</td> <td data-bbox="1379 722 1494 1013">Parish Clerk</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1013 813 1198">Transport IBP/69</td> <td data-bbox="813 1013 922 1198">Lighting in Blackboy Lane south of level crossing</td> <td data-bbox="922 1013 1037 1198"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 1013 1151 1198">Sept 2019</td> <td data-bbox="1151 1013 1265 1198"></td> <td data-bbox="1265 1013 1379 1198"></td> <td data-bbox="1379 1013 1494 1198">tba</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1198 813 1276">Transport IBP/57</td> <td data-bbox="813 1198 922 1276">Bus shelters</td> <td data-bbox="922 1198 1037 1276"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 1198 1151 1276">Sept 2019</td> <td data-bbox="1151 1198 1265 1276"></td> <td data-bbox="1265 1198 1379 1276"></td> <td data-bbox="1379 1198 1494 1276">tba</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1276 813 1398">Social Infrastructure IBP/66</td> <td data-bbox="813 1276 922 1398">Seating around village & Playing</td> <td data-bbox="922 1276 1037 1398"></td> <td data-bbox="1037 1276 1151 1398">Installed in Playing Field 06/17;</td> <td data-bbox="1151 1276 1265 1398">£3,000</td> <td data-bbox="1265 1276 1379 1398"></td> <td data-bbox="1379 1276 1494 1398">tba</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Infrastructure Strategy	Scheme (description)	Justification/rational e	Phasing (when)	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls	Delivery lead (who/how)	Transport IBP/58	SIDs in 5 sites		Installed 09/17		NHB 2014 (see below)	Parish Clerk	Transport IBP/56	Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs		Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs		NHB 2014 £12,239 (split between SIDs and signs)	Parish Clerk	Transport IBP/69	Lighting in Blackboy Lane south of level crossing		Sept 2019			tba	Transport IBP/57	Bus shelters		Sept 2019			tba	Social Infrastructure IBP/66	Seating around village & Playing		Installed in Playing Field 06/17;	£3,000		tba	<p>IBP/56, IBP/58 and IBP/66 will be removed from the list of CIL projects and recorded as having been delivered by NHB, and for IBP/66 the final cost will be recorded.</p> <p>The updated information to IBP/69, IBP/57 will be included in the IBP</p>
Infrastructure Strategy	Scheme (description)	Justification/rational e	Phasing (when)	Total estimated infrastructure cost	Sources of funding, showing amounts from each source & any shortfalls	Delivery lead (who/how)																																								
Transport IBP/58	SIDs in 5 sites		Installed 09/17		NHB 2014 (see below)	Parish Clerk																																								
Transport IBP/56	Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs		Road colouring and roundels dropped with money spent on new village signs		NHB 2014 £12,239 (split between SIDs and signs)	Parish Clerk																																								
Transport IBP/69	Lighting in Blackboy Lane south of level crossing		Sept 2019			tba																																								
Transport IBP/57	Bus shelters		Sept 2019			tba																																								
Social Infrastructure IBP/66	Seating around village & Playing		Installed in Playing Field 06/17;	£3,000		tba																																								

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

			Field	In village: Sept 2018					
Loxwood	Jane Bromley, Clerk	clerk@loxwoodparishcouncil.co.uk	With regard to projects put forward by Loxwood Parish Council the following amendments are required: Extension to storage facility at North Hall increase to £50,000 Take out PA & AV system allocation as this had already been achieved. Reduce cost of resurfacing playground at North Hall to £20,000						These amendments will be made to IBP projects IBP/573 and IBP/698 IBP/664 will be removed from the list and recorded as having been delivered in the IBP
North Mundham	Louise Chater	clerk@northmundham.org	IBP/92 I would like to confirm that North Mundham Parish Council have completed the project and made payment in full to B&M Plant Hire (Sussex) Ltd for the above project. This project was included in the infrastructure business plan IBP/92 and I would be very grateful if you could advise the relevant officer of the completion of this project.						IBP/92 will be removed from the list of projects and recorded as having been delivered in the IBP
Southbourne	Robin Davison	clerk@southbourneparishcouncil.com	Southbourne has prioritised its projects as follows: IBP/307 IBP/691 IBP/662 IBP/663 IBP/693 IBP/692 IBP/306 IBP/700 IBP/521 IBP/305 IBP/694 IBP/192 And want a new transport project added to be funded from the CIL & Council Tax						The new project IBP/714 will be added to the IBP as requested.
Tangmere	Natalie Atherton	clerk@tangmereonline.co.uk	IBP/145 (Parking-One Stop Shop – justification – delete last sentence relating to Perrymead. IBP/148 (Cycle Routes) – justification – delete second sentence (see new projects below). Planning Ref – add TNPP 8 & 9, WSCC Walking and Cycling Strategy App 1 Scheme IDs 192, 145, 291, 194 & 292. IBP/154 (Pedestrian Crossing) – delete as undeliverable due to non-compliance with highway design regulations. IBP/155 (Bus shelters) – Project Status – NHB funding for Hawker Close stop shelter						These amendments will be made to IBP projects IBP/145, IBP/148, IBP 192, IBP 145, IBP291, IBP/194, IBP/292, IBP/149, IBP/147, IBP/159, IBP/592, IBP/244. IBP/154 & IBP/162 will be

		<p>approved Oct 2017. IBP/162 (Scout Hut/Church Hall..) –delete references to Scouts as no longer operating in Tangmere. IBP/149 (Museum) – Planning ref – add LPP18 & TNPP2&6. IBP/147 (Allotments) – justification – delete ref to fencing as being funded by S106. IBP/159 (Outdoor Recreation areas (add s)) – justification – replace with “Overall provision of outdoor recreation areas below that required for existing and permitted village size – see TPC response to latest CDC LPR related Open Space Study consultation”. IBP/592 (Tangmere SDL) – justification – add TNPP9. IBP/635 (Churchwood Drive fencing) – delete, project completed. Note ref in justification to IBP/244 – dropped kerbs intended for installation by WSCC this FY.</p> <p>Planning references need updating for Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan (TNP).</p> <p>TNP Policy 9 add to IBP/638, IBP/637 & IBP/153.</p> <p>TNP Policy 2 (& Local Plan Policy 18) add to IBP/153</p> <p>TNP Section 5.9 add to IBP/141, IBP/140, IBP/160, IBP/144, IBP/143, IBP/162 & IBP/142.</p> <p>New Projects:</p> <p><u>Green Infrastructure</u> – New & replacement trees throughout Parish. Justification – Amenity, biodiversity & drainage management improvements. Note requirement to include this in IBP to support future NHB grant applications. Funding - “NHB/CIL/S106”.</p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Cycle/pedestrian infrastructure. Scheme – “Tangmere Airfield orbital cycle/bridleway/pedestrian PROW with links to Chichester & Barnham. Justification – “improve sustainable & green transport network utilising existing PROW, desire lines, Church Lane (S of airfield) & perimeter track.” Phasing – “enable through HDA/SDL development”. Funding – HDA development Conditions/S106”. Delivery lead – “developer/WSCC.” Planning ref – “LPP18, TNPP8&9, WSCC Walking & Cycling Strategy App 1 Scheme IDs 192, 145, 291 & 292.” Project status – “Permissive path secured around WSCC Solar Farm. New permissive section being sought as part of HDA application 17/01699/FUL.”</p> <p><u>Transport</u>. Pedestrian infrastructure. Scheme – “Extend footway on N side of Church Lane o/s Tangmere House.”</p>	<p>deleted from the IBP.</p> <p>IBP/155 & IBP/635 will be recorded as having been delivered in the IBP.</p> <p>These amendments will be made to IBP/638, IBP/637, IBP/153, IBP/140, IBP/160, IBP/144, IBP/143, IBP/162 & IBP/142.</p> <p>These new projects will be added to the IBP.</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Justification – “required as part of (refused) 50 dwelling proposal on Church Lane (12/02378/OUT), therefore carry over to SDL. Funding – SDL S106. Delivery lead – SDL developer/WSCC.</p> <p><u>Drainage infrastructure.</u> As a result of the 2016/17 Operation Watershed funded OPUS drainage study (which highlighted a number of drainage infrastructure issues within village, including the inadequate capacity of the existing pipework on Tangmere Rd to serve its drainage catchment (ref OPUS Final report para 4.10), the following projects arise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Malcolm Road. Diversion of surplus flows from recreation field ditch to existing soakaways within rec. field. Justification – dues to loss of drainage line to & along Chestnut Walk, surcharging of gullies on Malcolm Rd leads to carriageway & domestic curtilage inundation on Malcolm Road & in extremis surface flows onto Tangmere Rd. Ref OPUS para 4.6 (though note the OPUS recommendation was for a new channel to discharge West of Cheshire Crescent estate). 2. Church Lane. Diversion of Church lane/Bayley Road flows. These currently discharge via a virtually no gradient link, to the Tangmere Rd/Church Lane junction which results in inundation of Church Lane due to slow flow rates. New drainage line proposed via fields to S of Church Lane to link with existing ditch crossing the Tangmere Straight W of the Museum bend (see OPUS para 5.3). 3. Garland Square. New soakaways (within Hyde owned land to SW of No.25) to replace lost discharge to South through Middleton Gardens. Current slow discharge to ground via pipe ends/breaks leads to inundation of SW part of Garland Square. See OPUS paras 4.4/5.4. 4. Cheshire Crescent. New soakaway at SW corner (within land owned by No. 100 Mannock Rd). Due to degradation/loss of original soakaways on Cheshire Crescent/Mannock Road, increased flows to estate low point result in inundation of carriageway, footways and domestic curtilages and in extremis flooding of dwellings and sewage pumping station. See OPUS para 3.1.1. 5. Tangmere Road (Jerrard Rd to Chestnut Walk). Numerous defects and blockages within pipework on both sides of Tangmere Rd resulting in surface flows along/across carriageways and junctions. Requires relaying of defective pipework. See OPUS paras 3.7.11/4.7/5.6. 6. Nettleton Avenue. New soakaway within recreation field to serve existing and new road gullies, utilising redundant foul sewer lines and access pits for conveyance and storage. This would provide a diversion of flows from existing system arrangements which discharge onto Tangmere Rd. See OPUS Sections 4 and 5. <p>Funding for the above drainage projects could be from WSCC (Highways/Op Watershed),</p>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>NHB, Parish CIL and (for Nos. 1&2) as part of the SDLs drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>Overall comments on IBP: TPC has concerns over the degree to which CIL (particularly Parish controlled CIL) maybe required to cover funding shortfalls for projects which are the responsibility of specific delivery authorities which have their own funding sources. For example have the CIL contributions to ambulance, medical, education and transport infrastructure projects been fully justified and alternative funding sources identified/secured? There is potential for the limited CIL fund to be consumed by projects listed as essential, leaving little for those given a lower priority (e.g. green and community infrastructure) in the IBP but which Parishes may consider essential in the context of their community’s needs.</p> <p>It is felt that the comprehensive nature of App A is appropriate as it lists all identified projects by all sources, regardless of current deliverability. The visibility it provides enables the potential for delivery via either existing funding sources (e.g. S106 TAD) and/or windfall development and funding and demonstrates infrastructure needs that maybe cited during consideration of planning applications (e.g. in order to justify site specific S106 transport contributions and measures). This comprehensive visibility also allows proposers of new projects to see, in one document, whether their proposal would complement or duplicate an existing project. It should be left to the relevant promoter to assess whether a project has sufficient credibility to warrant inclusion on this list, noting only projects submitted by elected local authorities or statutory undertakers should be included.</p> <p>TPC has a clear preference for hard sustainable transport infrastructure projects over soft “behaviour change” measures as well as RTPi screens at bus stops. “Soft” measures require continuous revenue funding to maintain currency within changing populations and RTPi screens require considerable revenue funding to operate, repair and maintain as well as regular capital investment to replace due to relatively short life. TPC does not therefore support use of CIL funds for “soft” measures nor RTPi screens.</p>	<p>The District Council has not asked the City, Town and Parish Councils to cover funding shortfalls for projects which are the responsibility of specific delivery authorities which have their own funding sources.</p> <p>It is inevitable that some projects will not be funded, which is why the IBP sets out a methodology for prioritisation. The parishes can spend their CIL money as they see fit, provided it meets the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>Comments noted, no changes required to IBP.</p> <p>Comments noted, no changes required to IBP.</p>
Infrastructure Commissioners				
Environm	Hannah	Hannah.hyla	Thank you for the opportunity to review the Infrastructure Business Plan.	Comments noted, no

ent Agency	Hyland	nd@environment-agency.gov.uk	At this stage we have no further updates to provide in relation to the projects highlighted for the Environment Agency’s input. We will continue to input to future consultations where necessary.	changes required to IBP
Highways England	Elizabeth Cleaver Paul Harwood	Elizabeth.cleaver@highwaysengland.co.uk Paul.harwood@highwaysengland.co.uk	<p>Highways England is concerned with proposals and policy documents that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A27.</p> <p><u>General Comments</u> Following the public Consultation on the Road Investment Strategy (RIS) options for the Chichester Bypass improvements and subsequent cancellation of the scheme from RIS (Period 1 - 2015/20) by the Secretary of State early this year the listing of the A27 Chichester Bypass Local Plan mitigation schemes given under identification IBP/339 in the draft document is no longer correct. For the purposes of the IBP we must assume that the only schemes to be delivered on the A27 Chichester Bypass are those 6 mitigation schemes that we have jointly agreed as part of your Local Plan proposals.</p> <p>Since the Local Plan was drawn up other development either in Chichester or Arun districts has received planning permission or has been identified for allocation in Arun’s draft Local Plan. As a result amendments, to be funded by developers, have been agreed to the Chichester Bypass Local Plan mitigation schemes originally identified. These are set out further down this email. We will need to agree with you the methodology for making project costs consistent across the IBP.</p> <p><u>Detail</u> On page 3 the text ‘Planning obligations – S106/S278 (infrastructure that provides site specific mitigation).’ In referring to <i>site specific mitigation</i> does not accurately describe the use of S278 agreements with Highways England to fund the improvements to the Chichester Bypass agreed as part of the Local Plan. It is suggested that these are set down as a separate bullet referencing the Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing SPD.</p> <p>Para 2.4 refers to project costs being based on 2017 figures. However the cost of IBP/339 at least does not appear to have been adjusted, the £12.8m quoted appears to be the original (2012 prices) works cost.</p> <p>On page 95 IBP/339 states “2015 – 2020 Dependent on preparation of major scheme,</p>	<p>The text on page 3 will be amended as follows: The reference to S278 will be removed.</p> <p>IBP/339 will be amended to reflect the most up to date information provided by HE & WSCC and revised phasing</p> <p>The text accompanying</p>

		<p>which may replace these improvements; currently undertaking work to establish contributions methodology.” This should be updated, we suggest “2020 – 2023 Dependent on status of major scheme, which may replace these improvements.” As stated above, costs should be updated.</p> <p>On pages 125 – 127 the section Transport needs updating, we suggest</p> <p>Other sources of funding Transport</p> <p><i>“There are currently five roundabouts and one traffic controlled junction along the A27 near Chichester. Congestion regularly occurs at these locations and will worsen unless traffic is managed more effectively. On this part of the A27 local commuter traffic competes with the through traffic and because of these conflicts, congestion occurs regularly. The congestion is particularly disruptive as it affects the flow of public transport into the city.</i></p> <p><i>In July 1998, the Transport White Paper 'A New Deal for Trunk Roads in England' initiated several comprehensive studies to improve transportation in various regions of England. The study carried out for the South East region of England was called the South Coast Multi Modal Study (SoCoMMS). In September 2002, the Study recommended a range of transport improvements. For the Chichester Bypass section, the Study recommended the provision of two - level junctions and/or junction closures, in association with a range of complementary measures including improvements to public transport. In 2003, the Secretary of State for Transport rejected all the proposed improvements identified for the bypass at that time by the study. As a result, he asked Highways England to work with the Local Authorities and Statutory Environmental Bodies to develop less environmentally damaging options that addressed local issues and included public transport solutions where considered appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>The Government Spending Review announcement in October 2013 listed the A27 Chichester Improvement Scheme for potential construction. In 2015 a scheme to upgrade to four junctions on the Chichester bypass was included in the Road Investment Strategy for the 2015/16 – 2019/20 Road Period but in 2017 the scheme was cancelled due to there being no clear consensus on a preferred option solution.</i></p> <p><i>Government is currently in the research phase for the Road Investment Strategy for the 2020/21 – 2024/25 Road Period (RIS2). It is not known whether a scheme to improve the Chichester Bypass will be included in RIS2.</i></p>	<p>IBP/339 will be amended as suggested. Cost updates were not provided and have been requested.</p> <p>The text on pages 125 to 127 of the IBP will be amended as suggested.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p><i>Highways England also has plans to make the section of the A27 through Chichester into an Expressway by 2040. Expressways are A-roads that can be relied upon to be as well-designed as motorways and which are able to offer the same standard of journey to users. At a minimum, this means:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Largely or entirely dual carriageway roads that are safe, well-built and resilient to delay;</i> <i>• Junctions which are largely or entirely grade separated, so traffic on the main road can pass over or under roundabouts without stopping;</i> <i>• Modern safety measures and construction standards;</i> <i>• Technology to manage traffic and provide better information to drivers.</i> <p><i>This means an Expressway will be able to provide a high-quality journey to its users. Most Expressways should be able to offer a mile a minute journeys throughout the day, particularly outside of urban areas. Safety levels should match the highest standards of the network and, for many parts of the country, an Expressway will be able to provide a motorway-quality journey for drivers.</i></p> <p><i>While this standard is already met at many points on the network, certain routes that may justify Expressway status are inconsistent, repeatedly switching from dual to single carriageway and back again, or suffering serious congestion at a particular roundabout. Highways England will prioritise fixing these problems to provide better journeys.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England recognises that serving the needs of the motorist does not come at the expense of others. Instead, the network should account for the needs of walkers and cyclists, and not act as a deterrent to active travel options. The network must be easier to get over, under or around to ensure that roads do not divide communities, and that the associated health and wellbeing benefits of walking and cycling are felt as widely as possible.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England will also embrace new technology and aim to communicate through smart phones and in-car technology. This will increase the quality, and speed up the flow of information. Control will be returned to drivers, with personalised, predictive travel information helping plan alternative routes to avoid roadworks or unexpected disruption, leading to improved journeys at a more reliable speed.</i></p> <p><i>Highways England has created a series of ring-fenced funds, worth £900 m up to 2020/21 to address a range of specific issues over and above the traditional focus of road</i></p>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

investment. These five funds allow for actions beyond business as usual and will help the Company invest in retrofitting measures to improve the existing road network as well as maximising the opportunities offered by new road schemes to deliver additional improvements at the same time. The funds are:

- Environment (£300m to mitigate noise, low carbon road transport, improve water quality & resilience to flooding, landscaping & work to halt the loss of biodiversity)
- Cycling, safety and Integration (£250m segregated cycleways alongside trunk roads & safer junctions & crossings).
- Innovation (£150m for the development of new technologies)
- Air Quality (£100m to target improvements in air quality)
- Growth and Housing (£100m to provide leverage and flexibility for the Company to engage in progressing schemes on the SRN required to unlock strategic growth. It is a supplement – not substitute for developer contributions and other existing sources of funding. The fund will normally only be applicable to investment on the SRN that: Unlocks major housing development (for example, in the order of 5,000 new homes or more); or key economic growth; and Involves multiple developers; and Is funded – at least in part by developer contributions.”

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 £
IBP/339	A27 Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	HN/15/03489/FUL	Chichester free School	S278 Sussex Education Trust	Highways England	Tbc	Tbc
IBP/339	Whyke Junction	Transport	S278	Arun apps P/140/16/OUT P/6/17/OUT P/6/17/OUT	Arun Strategic Housing sites at Pagham	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	Tbc	Tbc
IBP/339	A27 Bognor Road Roundabout	Transport	S278	14.04284/OUT	Bognor Rd Former Fuel Depot	S278 Private Developers	Highways England	Tbc	Tbc

IBP/339 will be amended to reflect these changes.

Minor points

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

			IBP/345, and IBP/538 (see also page 89) – funding is through S278 with Highways England. The delivery lead is Highways England.	IBP/345 & IBP/538 will be amended as suggested.
Network Rail	Paul Best	Paul.Best@networkrail.co.uk	The costs for the Arundel Chord are detailed in the South East Route: Sussex Area Route Study, and we are not convinced of the benefits of the Chord, as detailed in the Route Study.	Comments Noted, no changes required to IBP
South Downs National Park Authority	Vicki Colwell	Vicki.Colwell@southdowns.gov.uk	<p>In general, there seems to be an opportunity to be clearer where there is potential for joint funding to be provided for projects, either with the SDNPA or Parish Councils, for example.</p> <p>There is also the potential to help fulfil the strategic need for pollinating services to be addressed in areas of high demand around urban edges of the Coastal Plain, as identified in the Green Infrastructure framework. This could be through the creation and management of habitats for pollinating insects, either associated with forthcoming CIL projects or relevant planning applications. The SDNPA would be happy to provide further advice on how this could be achieved.</p> <p>In terms of specific projects identified on the list: <u>IBP/194</u> – it is noted that funding for this project has been identified as being provided over the next 2 years, which is welcomed. <u>IBP/670</u> – the provision cycle route between Whitehouse Farm development and Salthill Road, I understand was felt to be desirable for the SDNPA when the planning application was being considered. Given the evolution of that particular proposal, and the inclusion of the perimeter walking/cycle route on the site and links to Centurion Way, I don't believe the SDNPA would be insisting it should be delivered and would not class this as an 'ambition' of the SDNPA. It is unlikely that we would be in a position to provide any direct funding for this and therefore the reference to this in the IBP should be omitted. <u>IBP/671</u> – it is noted that the provision of this cycle way is a requirement of Policy 17 of the Chichester District Local Plan 2014-2029. I understand there has been earlier correspondence with the SDNPA on the matter of provision, where it has been explained that we would be unlikely to provide financial support as this route is outside of the SDNP, and the demand for use will directly arise from a strategic development (along with associated links) that the District Council promoted through its' own Local Plan. Notwithstanding the fact that we could not contribute financially to this scheme, officers from the SDNPA would be very willing to provide support in terms of further advice on the three route options and experience of the cost of similar projects that we have delivered elsewhere. It is very possible that a route could be delivered at a significantly lower price than the £150,000 quoted, but if additional financial support were still needed, we are also</p>	<p>Organisations and Parishes are encouraged to do this and advise CDC where this is the intention.</p> <p>IBP/194 Comments Noted, no changes required to IBP</p> <p>IBP/670 the reference to the ambitions of the SDNPA will be removed from the IBP.</p> <p>IBP/671 the reference to the ambitions of the SDNPA will be removed from the IBP.</p>

			<p>happy to share our experience of seeking external funding sources for such schemes.</p> <p>I trust you find the above comments useful. If you have any queries, or require clarification, please let me know.</p>	
Sussex and Surrey Police	Andy Taylor	Andrew.b.taylor@sussex.pnn.police.uk	<p>Chichester Infrastructure Business Plan: Sussex Police response</p> <p>Our representation dated 19th May 2017 provided an overview of our existing level of infrastructure and the predicted expansion required to mitigate against the projected housing growth in Chichester. Notwithstanding the sites identified for additional ANPR coverage the remaining items of infrastructure (vehicles, premises, start-up costs, control room capacity) will require expansion proportionate to the increased population in Chichester and increased demand on our services.</p> <p>The existing capital programme is entirely devoted to maintaining the current level of infrastructure. Staff levels are under constant review to ensure that only minimum levels are maintained; the same applies to personal equipment, police vehicles, and radio cover, all of which correspond to staff levels.</p> <p>Admittedly there appears to some misunderstanding over this issue following your comments that the increase in fleet and ANPR capacity is only tied to the development of the strategic sites in Chichester. Chichester District Council have a projected housing requirement of 605 homes from 2017-2022 and each household will place an additional demand upon the services of the police force. The future demands upon the police force are not only directly tied to the strategic sites in Chichester but each new housing unit and resident in the District. The next five years will see the development of over 3000 homes in the District which will require mitigation which in this case concerns investment in police infrastructure.</p> <p>Sussex Police have allocated substantial funding in our capital and investment program to complete the necessary improvements to Chichester Police station to ensure additional capacity can be provided in the short term. However, moving forward we will need to significantly reduce our capital expenditure in our efforts to deliver savings and maximise our revenue budget for front line policing. For this reason we would ask if Chichester District Council would reconsider the allocation of funds within the draft IBP and prioritise the following projects:</p> <p>ANPR (Automatic Number Plate Recognition)</p> <p>Notwithstanding the six recommended sites for new ANPR, our intelligence department has highlighted two additional sites to serve the major development of 750 homes at</p>	<p>Comments Noted, no changes required to IBP</p> <p>Every new home will pay council tax towards police services.</p> <p>Each Band D property will yield the police £153.91 per year. So the 3000 new homes referred to would generate an additional £462k per year, ignoring any future council tax rises.</p> <p>750 homes at Graylingwell would generate £115k per year.</p>

		<p>Graylingwell Hospital, College Lane, Chichester. These sites have been identified by our intelligence department to mitigate against the rise in police incidents in the locality and absence of coverage in the wider surrounding area. These sites would need to be delivered prior to completion of this development or ideally within the next 12 months. The two identified sites are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A285 east of Sainsbury’s near junction to Kingsmead Avenue (Fixed ANPR camera with existing identified infrastructure) - £9,000 • A286 between Lavant and Binderton - (Fixed ANPR camera with existing identified infrastructure) - £9,000 <p>Police vehicles Our office have sought £63,360 to fund two additional police vehicles to increase Chichester’s fleet capacity. Vehicle costs have been capitalised on a 3 year pro rata lifetime cost for a low/medium size equipped vehicle (excluding fuel). Sussex Police are looking at a variety of options for our fleet replacement and expansion program to meet the increased demands upon our service. Our lowest specification vehicle is a Vauxhall Astra which has a capital cost of £17,000 per vehicle. To meet our increasing fleet capacity over the development plan period we have estimated that £265,456 would need to be invested to ensure our fleet capacity is proportionately increased in line with the rising population in Chichester. This amounts to a minimum of £22,121 per year over the next 12 years and over the next 5 years this would be £110,605. This does not take into account the substantial funding required to support our specialist fleet departments combatting major crime, counterterrorism, etc.</p> <p>Sussex Police have a statutory duty to provide the same level of service to new residents of Chichester that is currently delivered to the existing residents. The alternative is diverting vehicles from duties elsewhere, which simply moves the lack of capacity to a different location in the District and would clearly be an unacceptable impact. To support the increasing population in the Chichester District we consider that a minimum of two additional vehicles would be required at a minimum cost of £17,000 per vehicle or a total of £34,000 to be funded between 2017-2020. The whole life costs (5 year) per vehicle are estimated to be £52,800 per vehicle and therefore Sussex Police would be funding the majority of these projects with the upfront capital cost being supported by CIL.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two additional vehicles at £17,000 per vehicle = £34,000 <p><u>Overview</u> Whilst our office appreciate the recognition of policing as an infrastructure provider on the</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>current CIL Regulation 123 list it is unlikely that CIL will be able to provide significant funding towards policing in the District. The Police service nationally have only received negligible amounts of capital funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy and which is concerning considering the number of CIL charging authorities across Sussex and Surrey at this time. In the absence of securing developer contributions via S106 or CIL the force will need to continually draw funding away from our revenue budget and the ability to increase front line policing in line with our fast growing population. In terms of the prioritisation of infrastructure types we consider each item of policing infrastructure to be critical to delivering effective policing in the District and creating safe and cohesive communities. We will need to complete more background work to support our engagement with each Council however the legal principle of contributions towards policing is clearly sound.</p> <p>Police forces nationally, are not in a position to support major development of the scale now being proposed for many of the nation's town and cities without the support from the planning system. If we are obliged to do so using our own resources only, then it is reasonable to conclude that there will be a serious risk of service degradation as existing coverage is stretched to encompass the new development and associated population growth.</p> <p>Our force must ensure that development growth is supported by the infrastructure necessary to guarantee the safety and security of the new communities. For this reason we are requesting the Council reconsider the request of our office to fund two new ANPR cameras and vehicles to serve the District of Chichester via the Chichester CIL.</p> <p>Thank you for the continued support of Sussex Police and if additional information is required to support this request I would be happy to provide this.</p>	
Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Chloe Rose	Chloe.Rose@rspb.org.uk	IBP/376 Change cost to £300,00 and phasing to 2018/19	These amendments will be made to IBP/376
Scottish and Southern Electricity	Terry Davies	Terry.davies@sse.com	<p>I can provide general guidance on the provision of electricity infrastructure and the treatment of any existing infrastructure in relation to future development.</p> <p>Connections for new development from existing infrastructure can be provided subject to cost and timescale.</p>	Comments Noted, no changes required to IBP

			<p>Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from the new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and DNO (Distribution Network Operator) in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM). Maximum timescales in these instances would not normally exceed around 2 years and should not therefore impede delivery of any proposed housing development.</p> <p>Where overhead lines cross development sites, these will, with the exception of 400kV tower lines, normally be owned and operated by Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks. In order to minimise costs, wherever possible, existing overhead lines can remain in place with uses such as open space, parking, garages or public highways generally being permitted in proximity to the overhead lines. Where this is not practicable, or where developers choose to lay out their proposals otherwise, then agreement will be needed as to how these will be dealt with, including agreeing costs and identifying suitable alternative routing for the circuits. The existing customer base should not be burdened by any costs arising from new development proposals.</p> <p>To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead lines should be formally agreed with Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	
<p>Thames Water</p>	<p>David Wilson</p>	<p>drwilson@savills.com</p>	<p>General Comments on Water/Wastewater Infrastructure</p> <p>Thames Water seeks to co-operate and maintain a good working relationship with local planning authorities in its area and to provide the support they need with regards to the provision of sewerage/wastewater treatment [and water supply] infrastructure.</p> <p>Wastewater [and water supply] infrastructure is essential to any development. Failure to ensure that any required upgrades to the infrastructure network are delivered alongside development could result in adverse impacts in the form of internal and external sewer flooding and pollution of land and water courses and/or low water pressure.</p> <p>Thames Water therefore support the section on how utility companies are funded and the use of conditions to infrastructure is delivered ahead of development coming forward on pages 128-129.</p> <p>Thames Water is funded in 5 year periods called Asset Management Plans (AMPs). We are currently in AMP6 (6th since privatisation) which runs from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2020. Details of Thames Water’s 5 year plan for AMP6 can be viewed on their website at: http://ourplan.thameswater.co.uk/water-sewerage/</p>	<p>Comments Noted, no changes required to IBP</p>

		<p>Thames Water’s growth plans are based on planning information in the public domain and as such, Local Plans play an extremely important role in their growth assumption planning.</p> <p>As part of Thames Water’s five year business plan they advise OFWAT on the funding required to accommodate growth at their treatment works. As a result Thames Water base their investment programmes on development plan allocations which form the clearest picture of the shape of the community as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 162) and the National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The time to deliver solutions should not be underestimated. For example, local network upgrades take around 18 months and Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years.</p> <p>Thames Water are currently working on the draft Business Plan for the next Price Review in 2019 (PR19) which will cover AMP7 (1st April 2020 to 31st March 2025).</p> <p>It may be necessary for new or upgraded water and waste water infrastructure to be provided in respect of individual developments, depending on the type, scale and location of development. It is crucial that any such additional infrastructure is provided in time to service development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment and this is the reason that Thames Water seeks adequate policy coverage and support for Water/Wastewater Infrastructure within Local Plans and related planning policy documents.</p> <p>Thames Water understands that it cannot require that Section 106 Agreements be used to secure wastewater infrastructure upgrades. However, it is essential to ensure that such infrastructure is in place to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as internal and external sewer flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses. Thames Water therefore support the section on utilities at pages 157-158 and the following paragraph in particular: <i>“Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by the utility company, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide for appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development. Such improvements should be secured through phasing or by the use of Grampian style conditions attached to planning permission.”</i></p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Summary of representation and proposed Modifications to the IBP 2018 – 2023

APPENDIX 1

Chidham and Hambrook – updated projects

IBPId	Category	ProjectType	Scheme	Justification	Delivery Lead	Priority Category	Phasing	Term Time	Funding Sources	Total Max Cost £	Funding Shortfall	Requested CIL	CIL/S106/Other	Comments
IBP/709	Public and Community Services	Cemetery	St Mary's Church Graveyard, Cot Lane, Chidham. Looking to extend graveyard. Local farmer willing to donate land adjacent to main churchyard.	Existing extension graveyard will be full in 18-24 months time.	Chidham and Hambrook PC	4 Desirable				£9,240.00			CIL	PC to be responsible for any costs. Could accommodate up to 130 graves. (Costs supplied without VAT)
IBP/713	Social Infrastructure	Community facilities	Improvements to St. Wilfrid's Church Hall	To enable them to support the community	St. Wilfrid's PCC	Desirable	2016-2023	Short term 2016-2023	S106	£57,368			S106	