

Chichester District Council

Cabinet

4 February 2020

Council

3 March 2020

Consideration of consultation responses and modifications to the District Council's Infrastructure Business Plan 2020-2025

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 IBP is updated each year. It prioritises the strategic infrastructure projects from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) necessary to deliver the growth identified in the Chichester Local Plan, particularly within the five year period 2020-2025. It includes updates and new projects put forward by WSCC and the key infrastructure commissioners. Appendix A of the IBP (see Appendix 2 of this report, the full version of which which can be accessed via the link in Section 11 below) includes the most up to date list of local projects which the City, Town and Parish Councils intend to deliver from their proportion of the CIL.
- 3.2** The IBP sets out the methodology for selecting which infrastructure projects have been prioritised for funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) during the five year period from 2020 to 2025, which ones will be funded from S106/S278 agreements and which infrastructure projects are to be, or would need to be, funded from other sources.

- 3.3 The Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) has been subject to consultation with the City, Town and Parish Councils, West Sussex County Council (WSCC), Neighbouring Planning Authorities including the South Downs National Park Authority and key infrastructure delivery commissioners. The consultation ran for six weeks from 7 October to 18 November 2019.
- 3.4 The Chichester Growth Board met on 9 January 2020 and DPIP met on 16 January 2020 to consider the proposed responses to the representations received as a result of the consultation. Appendices 1 and 2 reflect their views.
- 3.5 The consultation resulted in responses being received from WSCC, and the following City, Town and Parish Councils: Bosham; Chichester City; Chidham and Hambrook; Donnington; Kirdford; Lavant; Loxwood; Southbourne; Tangmere; Westbourne; Wisborough Green, and the following key Infrastructure Commissioners: Highways England, and the University of Chichester. The consultation responses are summarised in Appendix 1 of this report.
- 3.6 Most of the consultation responses related 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/costs for the projects; and
 - New projects to be added.
- 3.7 Since the implementation of the CIL on 1 February 2016, £9,828,007 has been collected to date (4 December 2019). This includes £491,400 (5%), which potentially could have been used for monitoring (although only £145,598 was used as of the end of the last financial year), and £7,578,040 for District Council CIL spend. At the end of October 2019 the total amount handed over to Parishes to date was £1,666,648.
- 3.8 Projects delivered during 2019 from CIL and other funding sources include:
- IBP/293 Local Land Drainage – East Beach Sea Outfall, Selsey;
 - IBP/571 Improvements to vehicular access to North Hall, Loxwood;
 - IBP/573 Extension to storage facility, Loxwood;
 - IBP/397 Upgrade to Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works, Tangmere;
 - IBP/802 New aluminium parish noticeboard, Funtington;
 - IBP/624 Install WiFi to the village hall, Chidham & Hambrook;
 - IBP/713 Improvements to St. Wifrid’s Church Hall, Chidham & Hambrook;
 - IBP/737 Maybush Copse – wheelchair access, Chidham & Hambrook;
 - IBP/521 Provision of double yellow lines at the junctions of Lumley Road/Main Road, Lumley Road/Pagham Close and Pagham Close/Sadlers Walk, Southbourne;
 - IBP/196 Brandy Hole Copse, Chichester;
 - IBP/194 Enhancements to the Lavant Biodiversity Opportunity Area, Lavant & Westhampnett;
 - IBP/747 Historical/wildlife information board to be sited along Catch Pond, Chidham & Hambrook;
 - IBP/811 Signage and SIDs, Chidham & Hambrook;
 - IBP/35 Improvements and additional equipment for village hall, Donnington;

- IBP/43 Village hall extension, Donnington;
- IBP/708 Bus shelters, Chichester City;
- IBP/721 Cheshire Crescent, Tangmere;
- IBP/738 Replacement of cycle racks, Chichester City
- IBP/739 Lighting in Littern Gardens and 8 Heritage Columns at the war memorial, Chichester City;
- IBP/344 Kingsmead Avenue / Palmers Field Avenue traffic management, Chichester City;
- IBP/580 Ensure superfast broadband coverage of 95% of the area and basic broadband coverage of 100% of the area in line with government targets, District-wide;
- IBP/776 Loxwood School outdoor area, Loxwood.

3.9 Looking forward, WSCC has identified a number of school expansion projects, further information is expected about which schools will be expanded. More accurate costings can be provided once school expansions are confirmed, this together with other sources of funding will enable the CIL requirement to be updated.

3.10 WSCC has requested the addition of two new transport projects, which will be considered for inclusion within the CIL Spending Plan, at the start of the new IBP process at the joint officers' group meeting in June 2020:

- IBP/840 (College Lane/Spitalfields Road Junction improvements) to make it suitable for shared use in years 2021/2022 cost estimate £60,000 to be fully funded from CIL; and
- IBP/841 (Chidham Sustainable Transport Improvements) to widen existing footways to accommodate shared use to start 2022/2023, requesting £500,000 from CIL together with S106 from new developments at total cost estimate £1.8 – 2m.

3.11 With regards to existing projects, WSCC has sought a number of amendments some of which are set out below:

- WSCC is currently undertaking feasibility work for IBP/349 A286 Birdham Road/B2201 (Selsey Tram Roundabout) junction. This project is currently included in the CIL Spending Plan for £111,000 but the costs have increased and the CIL request is now for £440,000. The reason for this price increase is that the options now under consideration are different from the scheme envisaged at the time planning permission was granted;
- That IBP/353 (Sustainable transport corridor, City Centre to Westhampnett) is moved back from 2019/2020 to 2020/2021;
- That IBP/659 (school access improvements – drop off and pick up arrangements at expanded primary schools – Manhood Peninsula) is moved back from 2020/2021 to 2021/2022;
- That IBP/665, 655 and 654 be amalgamated into two projects and the costs equally divided, therefore IBP/654 has been deleted, and IBP/655 (Phase 2 of the Chichester Road Space Audit) for £375,000 has been re-phased from 2020/2021 to 2021/2022, and IBP/665 (Phase 1 of the Chichester Road Space Audit) is now 375,000 for 2020/2021

The effect of these changes to the IBP CIL Spending Plan, and adjustments relating to the amount of CIL expected to be collected in relation to the housing trajectory December 2019 are shown in Appendix 2.

4. Outcomes to be Achieved

- 4.1 The IBP will be 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 suggested modifications to be made to the IBP as highlighted in this report at Appendix 1 and to approve the IBP 2020-2025 and CIL spending plan set out at Appendix 2. Due to the length of the full IBP, it is available to view via the link in Section 11 below.

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 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 published and monitored in the new Infrastructure Funding Statement to conform to the 2019 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		✓
Other (please specify)		✓

11 Appendices

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

11.2 Appendix 2: Infrastructure Business Plan 2020-2025, as modified. The full version is available electronically only (via the link below) due to its length, with the exception of the CIL spending plan.

<https://chichester.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=135&MIId=1171>.

12 Background Papers

12.1 None.