

Chichester District Council

THE CABINET

5 March 2019

COUNCIL

5 March 2019

Consideration of consultation responses and modifications to the District Council's Infrastructure Business Plan 2019-2024

1. Contacts

Report Author:

Karen Dower – Principal Planning Officer (Infrastructure Planning)
Telephone: 01243 521049 E-mail: kdower@chichester.gov.uk

Cabinet Member:

Susan Taylor - Cabinet Member for Planning Services
Telephone: 01243 514034 E-mail: staylor@chichester.gov.uk

2. Recommendation

2.1 That Cabinet recommends to the Council that it:

- (i) Approves the proposed responses to the representations received and subsequent modifications to the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) as set out in Appendix 1; and
- (ii) Approves the amended IBP including CIL Spending Plan attached as Appendix 2.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) has been subject to consultation with the City, Town and Parish Councils, WSCC, Neighbouring Planning Authorities including the South Downs National Park Authority and key infrastructure delivery commissioners. The consultation ran for six weeks from 8 October to 19 November 2018.
- 3.2 The Chichester Growth Board, and the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel have considered the proposed responses to the representations received as a result of the consultation. Appendices 1 and 2 reflect their views.
- 3.3 The consultation resulted in responses being received from three Local Authorities: **WSCC, Chichester District Council, and the South Downs National Park Authority**; the following City, Town and Parish Councils: **Chichester City; Chidham and Hambrook; Earnley; East Wittering & Bracklesham; Hunston; Fishbourne; Loxwood; Selsey; Tangmere; West Wittering, and Westbourne**, and the following key Infrastructure Commissioners: **Highways England and the Royal Society for**

the Protection of Birds. The consultation responses are summarised in Appendix 1 of this report.

- 3.4 Most of the consultation responses relate to:
- Re-phasing of projects;
 - Updates to the text of the IBP;
 - Projects to be deleted as they have been delivered or are no longer required;
 - Updated details for the projects; and
 - New projects to be added.
- 3.5 Since the implementation of the CIL on 1 February 2016, £6,102,183.07 has been collected to date (5 December 2018). This includes £305,109.15 (5%) which potentially could have been used for administration and monitoring (although only £101,723.32 was used up to the end of the last financial year), and £4,578,381.59 for District Council CIL spend. At the end of October 2018 the total amount handed over to Parishes was £1,110,445.47.
- 3.6 Projects delivered during 2018/2019 via funding from other sources (these projects were either not selected for CIL funding, or were never intended to be funded from CIL) are as follows:
- IBP/5 Refurbishment of Children's play area, Birdham;
 - IBP/7 Landscaping and tree and hedge planting along western edge of playing field, Birdham;
 - IBP/56 Road colouring and 30mph roundels at village entrances, Fishbourne;
 - IBP/58 Vehicle activated speed sign Salthill Road northern part of parish boundary (SIDs in 5 sites), Fishbourne;
 - IBP/66 Seating around village, Fishbourne
 - IBP/47 Youth club facilities, East Wittering and Bracklesham;
 - IBP/155 Bus shelter to serve City Fields Business Park and Blenheim Park housing development, Tangmere;
 - IBP/735 Hearing Loop, Chidham and Hambrook Village Hall;
 - IBP/614 Maintenance of the Dell Public Open Space, Chidham and Hambrook;
 - IBP/645 Provision of storage for equipment to undertake community projects e.g. path maintenance and construction, Lavant.
 - IBP/697 Vehicle Activated Sign poles, Loxwood.
- 3.7 Further information is expected from West Sussex County Council (WSCC) about which schools will be expanded, so more accurate costings will be provided once this information becomes available, together with other sources of funding to offset their requests for CIL. WSCC has requested that IBP/329 primary school at Graylingwell Strategic Development Location be removed from the IBP as the project is not required as the development has not yielded the expected number of children needing additional school places.
- 3.8 WSCC has requested that the Chichester Road Space Audit projects are moved from 2019/20 to 2020/21. All feasibility costs to date (£60K), as well as the current costs of designing proposals (£50K) have been met by the County Council. Should a design for a city wide parking management plan be approved, the county council has

proposed that the costs of implementation (the cost of signs and lines), should be part funded by the County Council, as some of the issues are historic. The costs will be assessed once an initial design has been completed. The County Council anticipates that a significant amount of additional parking infrastructure will be needed to support the growth identified in the adopted Local Plan to 2029, and is therefore seeking CIL funding. The final cost will be assessed once an initial design has been agreed. The overall cost estimate for the work is £750k as identified in IBP/654, IBP/655 and IBP/665. Any additional enforcement costs, associated with the city wide plan will be met by the County Council. The effect of this change to the IBP CIL Spending Plan, and adjustments relating to the amount of CIL expected to be collected in relation to the housing trajectory January 2019, are shown in Appendix 2.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The IBP is reviewed and rolled forward annually. It includes all the key infrastructure projects within the Local Plan area, monitors their progress and identifies which infrastructure projects have been selected to be funded from the District Council's CIL in the five year period, together with the City, Town and Parish Councils' CIL spending plans. Through the production of the IBP, the Council can prioritise the infrastructure that will be delivered utilising CIL funds to meet the needs generated by development

5. Proposal

- 5.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the representations received as a result of the consultation and the suggested modifications to be made to the IBP as highlighted in this report and Appendix 1. It is proposed that the IBP and CIL spending plan set out at Appendix 2 are approved. Due to the length of the full IBP, it has been circulated electronically.

6. Alternatives Considered

- 6.1 The alternative is not to have an IBP, or not to have a formal process for selecting projects to be funded from the CIL. Many local authorities that have been collecting CIL allocate it to projects on their Regulation 123 list without having a formal process for doing so. The disadvantage of this approach is that it does not provide 'up front' certainty about which infrastructure projects will be funded and no guarantee that the infrastructure delivery commissioner will be able to provide the infrastructure in time to accompany the growth of the area. It also ignores the need to work in partnership with West Sussex County Council and parish councils.

7 Resource and Legal Implications

- 7.1 The projects selected for CIL funding must be in accordance with the Council's published regulation 123 list. This is to accord with the CIL Regulations.

8 Consultation

- 8.1 The projects within this IBP were identified through consultation with West Sussex County Council, key infrastructure providers, and the City, Town and Parish Councils.

9 Community Impact and Corporate Risks

9.1 This IBP will provide transparency about which projects have been and will be funded from the CIL within the five year rolling plan period and which infrastructure projects will be funded from other sources. It will enable the Council to have more control over the timing of infrastructure to accompany new development. The risks are as follows:

- That the rate of housebuilding changes from that projected;
- That further changes are made to the CIL regulations which will remove types of development from paying the levy, creating a larger funding gap than identified in this IBP;
- That other sources of funding fail to materialise;
- That consensus is not reached over which projects should be prioritised for CIL funding;
- That infrastructure delivery commissioner(s) funding priorities change;
- That identified sources for part-funding are withdrawn;
- That the parish councils do not spend their CIL within five years of receipt and thus the District Council as Charging Authority may ask for its return; and
- That the total amount of infrastructure provided is insufficient to mitigate the impact of development.

10 Other Implications

	Yes	No
Crime and Disorder		✓
Climate Change and Biodiversity		✓
Human Rights and Equality Impact		✓
Safeguarding and Early Help		✓
General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)		✓
Health and Wellbeing		✓

11 Appendices

11.1 Appendix 1: Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

11.2 Appendix 2: Infrastructure Business Plan 2019-2024, as modified. This has been circulated electronically only due to its length with the exception of the CIL spending plan.

12 Background Papers

12.1 None.