

| Authority/ organisati on | Representations | Recommended changes following consultation |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| WSSC | <p>Whilst the dual aim of the IBP is supported, the document should be more clearly set out to clarify which sections provide the whole picture of infrastructure delivery and which are there to act as a spending plan for the CIL. This should clearly relate to the Local Plan and include a brief section summarising the spatial strategy as this will help stakeholders to understand the choices which are being made.</p> <p>The scope of the IBP could be better defined in relation to the spending of CIL on local schemes and the ability for parish councils to spend a percentage of the CIL depending on whether a Neighbourhood Plan is in place. This is set out in the document to an extent, but it is unclear how the lists should be used by the parish councils to identify priorities.</p> <p>It is suggested that the IBP document is split into three clear sections: 1) a holistic plan for infrastructure requirements to support the Local Plan, 2) a Plan for how CDC will spend its CIL, and 3) a Plan for how the parish councils can spend the CIL. There will clearly be overlaps and the County Council would encourage parish councils to spend CIL on strategic priorities where there is potential to combine resources, but the document would function better if these sections were more clearly separated.</p> <p>For completeness, the IBP should provide a signpost to information on existing S106 monies held by the County Council and CDC, and the projects for which those monies are currently earmarked.</p> <p>Tables</p> <p>Each table in the IBP should have a clear purpose and not attempt to present information to support multiple aims. The IBP could be made more user-friendly by reducing the duplication of key tables throughout the document. As there are currently three sets of tables in the main document, it is difficult to determine which set of data to focus on. It is suggested that the CIL Implementation Plan is removed from the Executive Summary, as this gives it prominence over the table in Section 3 that includes projects from all funding sources. Further proposed improvements to the tables include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each table within the document should be numbered for ease of reference – only | <p>No change required as this is already explained in paragraphs 1.8-1.15</p> <p>New text will be added to paragraph 2.21 summarising the Local Plan spatial strategy.</p> <p>No change required - The Parish Councils have the same freedom to spend their CIL whether they have a Neighbourhood Plan in Place or not.</p> <p>Additional text to table 5 will be added to explain how the City, Town and Parish Councils can use this information to inform their CIL spending priorities.</p> <p>No change required – the projects will be funded from several sources, and therefore cannot really be split into three parts.</p> <p>The tables will be removed from the Executive Summary and will be cross-referenced.</p> <p>Each table will be numbered.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Table 1 is currently numbered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table headings should be repeated at the start of each page for ease of use. • There should be a column in the table for lead delivery party(ies) and a brief justification for each project. • Further clarity is required over whether and to what degree CIL will be used to fund infrastructure funded or delivered by other public sector bodies (e.g. NHS, Sussex Police etc). • There is a need to improve integration and show funding sources for individual projects (e.g. S106 / government grants / CIL), where there is potential for the combined use of existing S106 TAD/ WSCC Capital / CIL monies for cycling infrastructure or existing education S106 / future S106 / CIL /WSCC capital / Central Govt grant monies for primary education. <p>County Council Capital Programme Review</p> <p>The County Council is currently undertaking a review of its capital programme and the processes used to manage the programme. This is to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure is aligned with its priorities. The County Council is therefore unable to provide commitment to the delivery of specific projects until the review has been completed. It is requested that any projects where the County Council is identified to lead on delivery for 2016/17 are moved to future years in the relevant section of the IBP as there is insufficient time to develop new projects for delivery in 2016/17. CIL revenue should be accrued to be spent on projects that have been identified as 'essential infrastructure' to reduce the likely funding shortfall on these projects.</p> <p>Alongside projects identified for delivery in the Strategic Infrastructure Package and Place Plan, the Chichester IBP should identify key projects required to support growth including, for example, sustainable transport infrastructure to complement the proposed behaviour change programme. The IBP, Strategic Infrastructure Package and Place Plan will then inform the development of the County Council capital programme from 2017/18 onwards, ensuring the capital programme and necessary resources are allocated to support delivery of these projects as they are needed and CIL becomes available.</p> | <p>This change will be made.</p> <p>No change required as this information is within the table at Appendix A</p> <p>CIL may be used to provide infrastructure to be delivered by other public sector bodies to supplement other sources of funding where this infrastructure is needed to support growth.</p> <p>This information, where known is shown in table 2</p> <p>The projects for CIL spending in table 11 will be amended to reflect this comment.</p> <p>No change required to IBP at present.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Education</p> <p>Funding for new school places through the Basic Need Grant is set out in Appendix D of the IBP. The grant is based on a DFE cost multiplier that provides the County Council with up to 80% of the funding for the number of new school places required. However, this cost multiplier does not reflect the actual cost of the infrastructure and often leaves a significant shortfall. This is because the DFE funding is predicated on basic design and does not take account of local circumstances. These standardised costs do not match the cost of building new or extending schools in West Sussex.</p> <p>The County Council normally receives a three year allocation of the Basic Need Grant at a time and it is based on the no. of school places needed on a countywide basis. For the Chichester IBP, the County Council supports the approach whereby an assumption of 50% funding from CIL for all primary school expansions is applied unless there is more up to date information available on Basic Need for the first few years of the Plan. The County Council has undertaken a review of the education entries in the draft Strategic Infrastructure Package (SIP), which has informed this consultation response.</p> <p>The Chichester IBP does not currently include provision for new early years education and childcare infrastructure. The Free Entitlement Early Years Provision provided by the Government allows typically 40% of 2 year olds and all 3 and 4 year olds access to free, good quality, flexible early education and care. It is a statutory requirement that the local authority secure sufficient prescribed places, currently the free entitlement places.</p> <p>For the West of Chichester and Tangmere strategic sites, it is considered that new nursery provision would be best delivered as part of the new primary schools. It is likely that new housing development at the West of Chichester will generate the need for 40 new nursery places and Tangmere for 32 new places. The number of nursery places is dependent upon proposed changes to national requirements introduced through the Childcare Bill. These places could not be accommodated in existing provision, therefore both of these sites would require new nursery classrooms to be delivered as part of the new primary school provision. It is likely that at a later date, the County Council will request an amendment to the CIL Regulation 123 List to allow for early years provision to be delivered as part of a new primary school from S106.</p> <p>Foreword</p> <p>In the third paragraph, please amend the definition of the CIL to more closely reflect government guidance.</p> | <p>It is proposed to fund this infrastructure as a CIL Payment In Kind.</p> <p>This change will be made.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>In the sixth paragraph, it could be inferred that prioritisation of infrastructure is less important in the early years of the Plan. It is suggested that this paragraph is amended to emphasise that prioritisation of projects will be imperative in the early years of the Plan.</p> <p>The ‘how to use this document’ section should include advice and guidance for those who wish to identify or secure improvements, the need to discuss plans with partner organisations, and how to add their priority to the tables (if there is scope to do so).</p> <p>Executive Summary</p> <p>1.3: Please clarify whether there has been input from the City Council. The Chichester Business Improvement District (BID) has a number of infrastructure asks, which do not appear to be captured in the document.</p> <p>1.7: The first bullet point could also refer to other providers such as Southern Water, Highways England and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>1.9: Please re-phrase the reference to Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works being funded ‘through future water bills’ – this is too simplistic.</p> <p>It should be noted that the A27 major scheme will be funded by a grant from central government to Highways England. There will also be a contribution from the County Council. In addition to this, there will be a contribution from developers through S278 agreements, but this is only part of the funding for the major scheme and should not be presented as the main source.</p> <p>1.20: Please clarify whether the 5% refers to the administration requirements for each party, or just CDC and the parish councils? Please clarify what the charge will be used for and whether the full 5% is required.</p> <p>Infrastructure Projects</p> <p>3.4: Please set out the process for scheme progression once cost certainty has been</p> | <p>This will be clarified.</p> <p>No change required. This is what the IBP is about.</p> <p>Yes, the City Council has had input to the IBP, and the Chichester BID has put forward additional projects as part of this consultation.</p> <p>This change will be made.</p> <p>This will read: Southern Water through future water bills. A full explanation is made of the funding mechanism in Appendix D under the section on utilities.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.9 will be amended to reflect this representation.</p> <p>The 5% administration cost only applies to the Charging Authority. The Parish share is on the total amount before the administration percentage is taken. Up to 5% of the CIL will be used to cover the costs of the CIL Viability Assessment, the costs of the CIL Examination, Costs of officers administering and monitoring the CIL, and the costs of purchasing and maintaining a new IT system for managing the collection, spending and monitoring of the CIL.</p> <p>No change required to the IBP, as this will introduce too much complexity. It will vary from project to project. The projects will be monitored through the</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>obtained. Please also clarify what the process and method will be for dealing with programmes and projects as they shift and move along the delivery pathway.</p> <p>Table: 'Potential Projects and Spending Profile for IBP from all funding sources' – It is unclear what the colour coding is representing in this table. There should be clearer narrative to support the table and explain how the delivery of infrastructure projects links to Local Plan development. For example, highlighting where there is a link to a particular strategic site.</p> <p>IBP/339: A27 improvements to six junctions – The A27 major scheme will be funded by a grant from central government to Highways England. There will also be a contribution from the County Council. Please add a caveat to explain that the developer contributions will either fund mitigation measures identified to support Local Plan growth or will provide contributions towards the major scheme through S278 agreements.</p> <p>IBP/338: Expansion of the services provided by Southbourne Library – Given that the majority of the housing allocation for Southbourne is expected to come forward within the first five years of the Plan, this project should be included in the short term section.</p> <p>CIL Infrastructure Prioritisation</p> <p>Table 1: The prioritisation of infrastructure by the four categories is supported. However, the wording of the definition section should be tightened as some words are used in multiple sections e.g. the word 'essential' is repeated. The table could be improved by adding gaps or dividers between each category. This table does not need to be repeated in the executive summary and appendices.</p> <p>The list of criteria for further refinement should be revised to better reflect the delivery of key objectives and outcomes of the Local Plan. The strategic and local criteria should be separated, as the parish cluster criteria currently appears as the first consideration. The following criteria are suggested as alternative or further considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to delivery of key outcomes for growth • Evidence of need • Value for money (or return on investment) and payback period (i.e. how long will it take for key outcomes to be delivered) | <p>Communities Facilities Audit Database, Exacom CIL monitoring software, and AMR as stated, and any programme changes will be reflected in the following year's IBP.</p> <p>A key will be provided to explain the colour coding.</p> <p>Additional text will be added to paragraph 3.6</p> <p>The text will be amended to reflect this representation.</p> <p>Project IBP/338 will be moved from the list of medium/long term projects and added to the list of short-term projects.</p> <p>The word 'essential' will be deleted, and the table will have dividers between each category. The table will be removed from the Executive Summary and appendices.</p> <p>This will be added to the criteria list</p> <p>This will be added to the criteria list.</p> <p>R.O.I. will be added but payback period has not.</p> |
|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of funding still to be secured • Deliverability risks <p>As further detail emerges to support the justification for projects, this should be set out in the tables (or an appendix) to demonstrate how projects meet these criteria.</p> <p>CIL Implementation Plan</p> <p>This table should clearly set out the projects that the CIL will be spent on to enable infrastructure providers to easily identify which of their projects will be receiving funding. There are currently projects in this table that do not have a clear case for inclusion, for example where the CIL contribution is £0 or the priority is 'desirable'.</p> <p>IBP/330: Primary school expansion in Chichester locality – The number of dwellings proposed in the locality would possibly lead to an additional 15 pupils per year of age, depending on the housing mix. Although there is some capacity in existing schools, these pupils could not be accommodated in the existing provision due to pupil travel distances. Changes to current school catchments could be considered as an alternative to expansion, but this would require consultation with the wider public and would have to be undertaken well in advance to avoid disruption to families with children already in the education system and their siblings. Please retain this project.</p> <p>IBP/331: Primary school expansion in Bourne locality - Due to the number of proposed dwellings in the Local Plan and parish allocations, expansion of one or more of the schools in the locality would have to be considered due to the rural nature of the locality and the proximity of neighbouring schools. Please retain this project.</p> <p>IBP/332: Primary school expansion in Manhood locality - The pupil product from the housing allocations for East Wittering & Bracklesham, West Wittering, Birdham and Earnley could currently be accommodated in the local schools. This will require careful consideration at the time the planning applications are submitted, depending on the number of dwellings. However, Selsey will require expansion to existing schools due to the distance between the schools in Selsey and the rest of the Manhood Peninsular. Please retain this project.</p> | <p>This has not been included as other identified sources to contribute towards CIL projects is already a criterion as is deliverability</p> <p>This has not been included as risk is already a criterion, as is deliverability.</p> <p>This table simply pulls out the long list of short term projects put forward for CIL funding. It does not indicate which projects are to be funded. If a project has not yet been costed it will not be selected for funding as it is cannot yet be proven to be deliverable. Just because a project is categorised as desirable it does not mean that it would not be selected to be funded from CIL.</p> <p>Project retained</p> <p>Project retained</p> <p>Project retained</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>IBP/536: Primary school expansion in Billingshurst locality - Please amend the project name to 'expansion of existing primary school provision by five places per year of age in the Billingshurst locality falling within Chichester District'. Please amend the estimated cost of this project to £200,000.</p> <p>IBP/533 & 532: this suggests that CIL funding will fully fund the improvements needed. Please clarify the full cost of meeting the needs of the ambulance service and where the remainder of the funding will come from.</p> <p>IBP/350: Behaviour change programme for Chichester city – Due to the current review of its capital programme, the County Council will not be seeking any funding for this project in 2016/17. It is suggested that the project is retained for the remaining years identified, but will be linked to the delivery of infrastructure projects that have not yet been programmed for delivery. The behaviour change programme should promote new sustainable transport infrastructure as it is delivered. The review of the capital programme and the production of a new Walking & Cycling Strategy, which is currently underway, will guide decisions on the delivery of new cycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>Cashflow and Spending Plan</p> <p>Page 49 table: 'Potential CIL revenue from planned housing in Chichester Local Plan period to 2029' – Please clarify whether this table is based on 100% or 75% of the potential CIL revenue.</p> <p>Page 54: The paragraph in bold should be more clearly explained (perhaps in bullet points), as this is a key message.</p> <p>6.4: It is unclear what message this table is setting out. Is this table trying to say that if prioritisation is not undertaken, then this would be the ask? It is unclear as to why any money would be spent on desirable projects in the first five years when there is projected to be a significant funding shortfall for higher priority schemes in later years.</p> | <p>Project costs amended as suggested.</p> <p>This is the full cost of the project for IBP 533. IBP532 has now been implemented so will be removed from the list. (The ambulance service moved money from their core budget to pay for this.)</p> <p>Funding for IBP/350 will be removed from 2016/17 spending plan as requested by WSCC, but retained for remainder of period.</p> <p>This table refers to 100% of the potential CIL revenue.</p> <p>Bullet points will be added.</p> <p>Yes, this table shows the long list of short-term CIL projects that have been put forward for consideration.</p> <p>Just because a project is categorised as 'desirable' it doesn't mean that it will never be selected for funding. It just means that it will probably stand less chance of being funded by the District Council, but the Parish Councils might choose to fund these.</p> |
|---|---|

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Conclusions</p> <p>8.3: It is acknowledged in this section of the IBP that future iterations of the IBP will need to apply further scrutiny to the cost breakdown of infrastructure projects and be informed by a more refined appreciation of the development trajectory. It would be useful if this could be explained earlier in the document as part of the clarification of its scope.</p> <p>Appendix A</p> <p>This list appears to include all of the projects on the South Chichester and North Chichester community issues lists. Please note, a review of the community issues lists and prioritisation of local highway schemes is due to be undertaken. It is suggested that the scope of the 'full project list' is more clearly defined, or the community issues list entries are removed. Whilst this list is a catalogue of community aspirations, they are not however agreed County Council priorities and therefore it may not be appropriate for them to be included within this document. Their presence may raise expectations to a level that the County Council is unable to deliver. The IBP should however, include a reference to the community issues lists and the review that will be undertaken.</p> <p>IBP Status: where this is 'select if match funding is identified as this project supports the growth of the area', it is unclear whether this will be included as a priority.</p> <p>There is a need to rationalise the list of projects by combining those individual projects which refer to the same scheme (e.g. cycling routes between main settlements referred to by multiple parishes / WSCC entries in project list). Some projects could be merged with the parish projects where duplication exists. There will then be a need to identify individual elements within a wider generic project for funding / prioritising implementation.</p> | <p>A new paragraph 1.4 will be added to the Executive Summary to explain this point.</p> <p>The Community Issues List of projects will be retained for transparency even if these are just aspirations. Other representors wish to see them retained.</p> <p>It means consider selecting if match-funding is identified. The text will be amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>This will be undertaken where known.</p> |
| Boxgrove | <p>The reduced speed limit in Halnaker has been implemented so can be removed from the list. On the other hand the Pavilion is undergoing a major overhaul and urgently needs funds (not just "desirable"!). So if there were any money to come to Boxgrove once their NP is completed the Pavilion and the playground both need urgent attention. Please could you amend the list accordingly.</p> | <p>Project IBP/421 will be deleted as now completed.</p> <p>Text will be updated to clarify that this is a Parish priority for its CIL spend, but IBP priority as desirable remains unaltered.</p> |
| Chichester City Council | <p>The Planning and Conservation Committee of the City Council resolved on 21 October 2015:-</p> <p>"That with the addition of the Westhampnett Road proposal being referred to the West Sussex County Council, the extant items proposed by the City Council be confirmed for inclusion in the IBF and that Chichester District Council be so advised"</p> <p>Note: The Westhampnett Road proposal was for a cycle path to be created on the north side</p> | <p>No change required.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | of the road and is to be referred to WSCC for consideration and inclusion in their IBF. | |
| Donnington | <p>Donnington Parish Council considered the request for feedback at its meeting on 9th November 2015.</p> <p>It confirms that the parish's plans are accurately reflected in the document. However, it would comment that as a parish with little prospect of generating significant sums of CIL money it is unlikely our projects would ever be cost effective.</p> | No change required |
| East Wittering and Bracklesham | <p>P 36: £200,000 for the Selsey Wittering cycle route - who is funding this?</p> <p>P 36: £1m for beach management – who is funding this?</p> <p>P 149 onwards: Why were the following projects not selected as there was 'little planned development in this cycle'. We will be attaining the level of housing required plus the housing that has already been built has not provided towards any of these much needed items. To dismiss these without consulting the Parish is not acceptable.</p> <p>IBP/47 Improved Youth Club facilities – WSCC has failed to provide an acceptable lease for these facilities. The club now has no premises and is looking for alternatives.</p> <p>IBP/54 Visitor experience at E. Wittering and Bracklesham. This is cited in the Local Plan as being supported by CDC and has received no support. It is our main economy.</p> <p>IBP/53 Steps, handrail and retaining wall in E. Wittering. These are old, rusty and poorly maintained. The retaining wall is cracked and leaning over towards the road. The street scene is in need of work. This appearance is detrimental to our visitor experience.</p> <p>IBP/52 See IBP/53</p> <p>IBP/45 Extended bus service to include later evenings. Due to lack of employment in this Parish it is necessary to travel to Chichester. Buses finishing early means no shift work. Also no evening entertainment in Chichester. West Manhood has population of at least 10,000 who cannot get to Chichester on a bus in the evening. Cost of taxi is prohibitive.</p> <p>IBP/50 Sewage system improvement – this is repeated as a need on every substantial planning application. How can it not be required? Some homes regularly cannot flush their toilets when it has been raining.</p> | <p>IBP/362 – this has been put forward for CIL funding by WSCC (see appendix A)</p> <p>IBP/570 – flood Defence Grant in Aid and CDC with potential top up from CIL.</p> <p>The Parish Council has been sent a letter to explain in more detail the reasons why the projects have not been selected to be funded from the District Council's share of the CIL as summarised below.</p> <p>These projects were not selected to be funded from the District Council's CIL because they have been categorised as 'desirable' and are not essential to delivering the Local Plan. This exercise was the Parish consultation, so these have not been dismissed without consultation.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| | <p>IBP/46 Doctor's surgery in Bracklesham. Bracklesham is now twice the size of E. Wittering. Accessing the doctor when ill is a car journey and parking is difficult the other end and appointments are not easy to get.</p> <p>IBP/456 School safety zone East Wittering. The entrance in Church Road is a hazard with the parked cars and children being dropped off because of the layout and bend in the road. The parking in Stocks Lane at school drop off and pick up times causes large traffic jams. Both of these have a significant impact on safety.</p> <p>IBP/44 & IPB/180 Increased parking in E. Wittering and Bracklesham. This is a seasonal problem April – September. With the influx of tourists parking is a major problem and should not be ignored.</p> <p>IBP/51 Mobile phone. Coverage improvement. There are still areas with very poor reception. As a major tourist destination good coverage is vital especially now public phone boxes are not available and it is the only way to call emergency services in public areas.</p> <p>IBP/462 Speed reduction B2179, Piggery Hall Lane. This road is not wide enough for the large lorries and buses that use it. They straddle the centre line and break down the verges and dolly posts. There are blind bends and the hedging needs cutting back on eastern side.</p> <p>IBP/465 Cycle paths and bridleways around Medmerry. These are listed as important because of our tourism and should be developed.</p> <p>IBP/457 Parking restrictions Longlands Road. We have been requesting this for years. The current parking forces cars to take the bend on the wrong side of the road with no forward view.</p> <p>The only item which seems to be going forward is a pedestrian crossing in Bracklesham Lane which is unlikely to take the whole of our share of the CIL. The other projects identified above should also be considered</p> | |
| Lavant | <p>Although it appears unlikely that Lavant would be able to benefit from any CIL money we would still like to have mentioned Lavant's most urgent infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>At a meeting of the Parish Council it was agreed that these are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • car park for the Primary School; • a pre-school; • volunteer force funding; • footpath maintenance | <p>These projects will be added to the list and they have been forwarded to the SDNPA as Lavant straddles both Local Planning Authority boundaries.</p> |
| Selsey | <p>Selsey Town Council has considered the CDC IBP 2016/2021 and would ask that reference</p> | <p>Project IBP/310 will be deleted at request of parish.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | <p>to the concrete skate park be removed from the list of infrastructure projects (as per page 164).</p> <p>However, STC would like the addition of the Selsey Haven and I attach a project pro-forma as requested.</p> | <p>To be replaced with new project: Selsey Haven</p> |
| <p>Tangmere</p> | <p>It is unlikely that Tangmere Parish will see development within the next 5 years that will result in sufficient CIL receipts to deliver any significant projects on their own. However two extant permissions for a total of 219 dwellings will, if implemented, yield substantial S106 sums over which the Parish Council desires to have a substantial say over how they are spent. It has identified a number of projects through the Community Facilities Audit which would address current infrastructure shortfalls within the Parish which will be exacerbated by additional permitted housing and consequent population growth.</p> <p>TPC has concerns over the degree to which CIL (particularly Parish controlled CIL) may be 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? 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>Throughout the IBP reference is made to a 5% administration charge. Clarity as to what CDC will use that for and whether it needs that level of take from the limited CIL pool is required. Consideration should be given to covering administration costs from CDC's general revenue budget in order to preserve as much CIL funds for infrastructure as possible.</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</p> | <p>The parish have not as yet been asked to contribute towards schemes of strategic priority to deliver the Local Plan at present.</p> <p>The ambulance, medical and education infrastructure are of a strategic nature and key to delivering the Local Plan, which is why they have been selected for funding.</p> <p>The parishes can choose how to spend their CIL receipts on infrastructure of local priority.</p> <p>Up to 5% of the CIL will be used to cover the costs of the CIL Viability Assessment, the costs of the CIL Examination, costs of officers administering and monitoring the CIL, and the costs of purchasing and maintaining a new IT system for managing the collection, spending and monitoring of the CIL.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>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>Tangmere PC also responded to a recent WSCC consultation on its cycling and walking strategy (below) and those comments are also submitted for consideration with regards its views on prioritisation. Also note the number of IBP App A Projects that relate to each of the three identified priority schemes, which indicates a significant degree of rationalisation of the overall project list is required, though the need to identify elements of any wider scheme for incremental delivery of the whole is acknowledged.</p> <p>(See attachment for full table).</p> <p>The table referred to above, concluded that the best way to encourage cycling and walking is to provide safe high quality facilities and routes. Soft measures are of limited use if suitable infrastructure is not available. Cycling Safety at schools should be continued.</p> <p>The Parish has stated that its top priorities for cycling/walking infrastructure are as follows (in order of priority):</p> <p>Priority 1: Continuous off road cycle/footway to Chichester city centre. initially via Westhampnett (note gap along Stane Street by Rolls Royce) to be replaced as main route, as strategic housing development proceeds, by pathway alongside of A27 (with hedgerow between A27 and path and underpass below SDL vehicle access to A27/A285) to link with Shopwyke lakes cycle routes and bridges. CDC IBP. 364/540/345/347/358/359/425.</p> <p>Priority 2: Traffic calming and footway improvements along Tangmere Rd and Meadow Way within village to reduce vehicle speeds hence make cycling walking to/from/between village facilities more attractive. CDC IBP: 140/243/240/245/160. Current vehicle speeds, rain water ponding, narrow/gapped footways (on Tangmere Rd) and limited forward visibility in places discourages non vehicle movement. Potential part fund from S106 TAD funds from yet to be implemented housing planning permissions.</p> <p>Priority 3: Round airfield circular route utilising existing WSCC owned perimeter track/apron, existing</p> | |
|--|--|

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>desire line s of museum to Oving’s Church Lane, bridleway 3581, Oving’s Church Lane and footpath 3582. CDC IBP 148/236. to provide safe and attractive recreational route for residents s of A27 and link to potential Barnham – Chichester cycle route.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above there is a clear preference for hard sustainable transport infrastructure projects over soft “behaviour change” measures (IBP Project 350). Therefore TPC has considerable concerns over the principle of, and proposed level of spend on, soft measures contained within the CIL Implementation Plan (Section 5) and the Section 6 table on page 59 and their “essential” categorisation.</p> <p>A further question arises as to how projects identified in WSCC’s Capital Programme (resulting from various work streams and studies currently underway in that Authority) will be integrated into the CIL orientated IBP to ensure comprehensive coverage of funding and avoidance of duplication.</p> <p>With regard the individual projects listed in App A (pp124-132) related to Tangmere Parish the following comments are submitted (omitted project entries remain as is):</p> <p>149. Museum. Justification – replace “Relocate” with “Expand”. Cost – depends on securing allotment land on SDL at agricultural land values via SDL S106 Agreement? Funding Sources – Museum/Grants. Delivery lead – add “Museum”</p> <p>148. Cycle routes and pathways. Delete cost est. Funding Sources – insert “Existing S106 TAD funds”. Add “S106” in CIL/S106 column.</p> <p>147. Allotment improvements. Add note “See also project 149.”.Funding sources – add “NHB”. Delivery lead – add “Parish”</p> <p>146. Skate Park. Delete as NHB grant secured and project in course of delivery.</p> <p>245. Malcolm/Tangmere Rd junction (South side) footway crossing. Combine with 154 as Parish item. Funding – S106. Delivery lead – add “WSCC/Parish”.</p> <p>144. Additional burial space. Funding sources – SDL S106 and Church. Delivery lead – add “Church”</p> <p>143. Existing/New Community Facilities. Funding sources add S106/NHB. Delivery lead –</p> | <p>These concerns will be raised with WSCC.</p> <p>This will be raised with WSCC as all infrastructure projects should have been captured within this IBP.</p> <p>IBP/149 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/148 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/147 & 149 will be amended as requested and cross-referenced to each other.</p> <p>IBP/146 will be deleted as requested.</p> <p>IBP/245 and 154 will be amended as requested and cross-referenced to each other.</p> <p>IBP/144 will be amended as requested.</p> |
|---|--|

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>add "Parish/Developers"</p> <p>236. Orbital ped/cycle/bridle route and Barnham-Chichester cycle route. Add note "See also project 148.". Add to Parish CFA/IBP list (should WSCC de-list its Community Issues List projects from IBP) and remove ref to this in 148. Delivery lead – add "WSCC".</p> <p>237. Safer Routes to school. Add "WSCC study underway 2015". Delivery lead – add "WSCC".</p> <p>240. Traffic calming and footways Tangmere Rd/Meadow Way. Combine with Parish CFA/IBP list (should WSCC de-list its Community Issues List projects from IBP) 140 and 160.</p> <p>243. Church Lane/Tangmere Road footway. Add to Parish CFA/IBP list (should WSCC de-list its Community Issues List projects from IBP). Funding sources – S106(incl SDL). Part of 240 and 148. Delivery lead – add "WSCC/Parish".</p> <p>244. Churchwood Drive dropped kerb. Scheme – add "for cycle access". Add to Parish CFA/IBP list (should WSCC de-list its Community Issues List projects from IBP). Funding – S106 (H block)". Delivery lead – add "WSCC/Parish".</p> <p>157. Existing Recreation Field drainage. Funding sources – add "S106 (Hanger/Meadow Way Sport S106)". Delivery lead – add "Parish".</p> <p>140. Combine with 240 and 160 as Parish item. Delivery lead – add "WSCC/Parish".</p> <p>141. Church Parking. Funding sources – add "SDL S106 and Church". Delivery lead – add "Church"</p> <p>162. Scout/Church hall. Funding sources – add "SDL S106, Scouts and Church". Delivery lead – add "Church and Scouts"</p> <p>161. Sports Hall. Funding sources – add "SDL/Hanger/Meadow Way S106 and NHB." Delivery lead – add "Parish/Developers"</p> <p>160. Combine with 240 and 140.</p> <p>150. Village Centre Car Park. Funding sources – add "S106/NHB". Delivery lead – add</p> | <p>IBP/143 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/236 and 148 will be amended as requested and cross-referenced to each other.</p> <p>IBP/237 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/240 will be amended as requested, and combined with projects 140 & 160.</p> <p>IBP/243 will be amended as requested, and combined with projects 240 & 148.</p> <p>IBP/244 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/157 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/140 will be amended as requested, and combined with projects 240 & 160.</p> <p>IBP/141 is an item of transport infrastructure that was not carved out of the Reg 123 list, therefore it can't be funded from S106.</p> <p>IBP/162 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/161 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/160 will be combined with projects 240 & 160.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>“Parish”.</p> <p>158. Broadband. Delivery lead – add “developers/Telecom providers”.</p> <p>151. Memorial Woodland. Delete as maintenance item covered by Parish precept.</p> <p>155. Bus Shelters. Justification – delete “possibly...Agreement”. Funding sources – add “S106 TAD/NHB”. Delivery lead – Parish.</p> <p>397. WWTW upgrade. Phasing – replace “2019” with “2018”.</p> <p>154. Malcolm/Tangmere Rd crossing. Combine with 245 as Parish item. Delivery lead WSCC/Parish. Priority “3 High”.</p> <p>153. New Community Hall. Funding Sources – add “SDL/Hanger/Meadow Way S106 and NHB. Delivery lead add “Parish/Developer”.</p> <p>152. Existing changingroom modernisation. Funding Sources – add “Hanger/Meadow Way S106 and NHB.” Delivery lead – add “Parish”.</p> <p>New project – Tangmere SDL specific Green Infrastructure (all types). Justification – Local Plan Policy 18, Tangmere Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 and 8. Separates out projects specific to this SDL. Funding Sources – “SDL S106”. Delivery lead – “Developers”. Also add to Chapter 3 table on pp27-36.</p> <p>326. SDL Primary School site. Given state of repair of existing school buildings, including temporary structures, and limited space on existing site for additional temporary buildings should not new school site and buildings be in place by 2023 to cater for whole village Primary and pre-school education?</p> <p>336. Library. Delete 337 (pp33/107) – appears this is same project as that for delivery as part of new Tangmere Community Facility provision. If not, justification required as to scale of duplicate spending on additional facility in relatively close proximity to project 336 Tangmere facility.</p> | <p>IBP/150 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/158 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/151 will be deleted as requested.</p> <p>IBP/155 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/397 will be amended as requested by Southern Water. The phasing will be changed to expected to be operational by 2017.</p> <p>IBP/154 will be amended as requested and combined with project 245.</p> <p>IBP/153 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>IBP/152 will be amended as requested.</p> <p>New project to be added as requested.</p> <p>IBP/326 – these comments have been forwarded to WSCC for consideration.</p> <p>IBP/336 – IBP/337 is not a duplicate comment. WSCC has been asked to provide justification as requested.</p> |
| <p>Wisborough Green</p> | <p>Wisborough Green Parish Council has reviewed the IBP, particularly the identified Parish projects. Please find attached two documents.</p> <p>1. Amended wording and explanation to the current IBP Parish details (annotated).</p> | |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>2. Details of new projects to be included.</p> <p>I have also highlighted that the Parish Council is now discussing a Village Traffic Management Plan so further projects relating to traffic calming may come through as a result, but hopefully this will all be covered under the generic ‘village traffic calming’.</p> <p>Projects to be amended:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IBP/322 2. IBP/323 3. IBP/230 (WSCC Community issues list) delete 4. IBP/229 5. IBP/225 (WSCC Community issues list) delete 6. IBP/224 <p>New projects to be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improvements to Village Hall 2. Improvements to public toilets 3. Village Green Drainage | <p>The requested changes will be made and the deletion of projects on WSCC Communities issues List will be discussed with WSCC.</p> <p>These new projects will be added.</p> |
| <p>Infrastructure Commissioners</p> | | |
| <p>Highways England</p> | <p>Thank you for your correspondence dated 28 September 2015 inviting Highways England to be involved in the above consultation process.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We have reviewed the document for this consultation and note that page 31, IBP/339 advises that short term improvements on the SRN (A27 improvements to six junctions) is proposed to be secured via S106 funding. Given the complexity and number of the allocated sites within the Chichester Local Plan, we suggest that using S106 agreements may not be the most practicable way of securing the funding. In recent discussions with yourselves, we understand that S278 agreements may be the preferred funding mechanism for the required SRN improvements and that the exact amounts payable for each development are still to be determined by yourselves. We further understand that you may be considering a proposed funding mechanism for the strategic development sites which focusses on traffic impacts on the SRN rather than a mechanism based on development quantum. However, we appreciate</p> | <p>The text in relation to IBP/339 will be updated to reflect the latest position and reference to funding from S106 will be changed to S278.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | <p>that further analysis and discussions are ongoing and therefore that the proposed funding mechanism is subject to change. Accordingly, we look forward to receiving your further considerations on how the Local Plan improvements will be funded in due course.</p> <p>Thank you again for consulting with Highways England.</p> | |
| RSPB Pagham Harbour | <p>Thank you for consulting the RSPB on Chichester District Council’s draft Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP).</p> <p>The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of Green Links across the Manhood (GLaM) projects in the IBP. We are particularly pleased to see that the Pagham to Medmerry Trail (project IBP/376) in the list of medium- to long-term projects on page 36. This project will be delivered by WSCC and the RSPB. Therefore, where this project is mentioned in Appendix A, we would be grateful if you would replace Southern Water and the Sussex Wildlife Trust with the RSPB. The two organisations are landowners on the trail route, but will not be delivering the project.</p> <p>The RSPB would also like to request that another project is added to the long-list of projects: Infrastructure category: Green infrastructure Scheme: New visitor centre at Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve Justification: By creating much improved facilities for visitors to Pagham Harbour, where they can learn about the special qualities of the area, a new visitor centre will contribute to achieving the first objective of Policy 22 in the Local Plan, to <i>‘facilitate the economic, environmental and social well-being of the Manhood Peninsula’</i>. It will also contribute to objective 3.27 of the Local Plan: to <i>‘enrich the quality of life by providing communities with the opportunity to enjoy and celebrate the richness of their heritage, the arts and environment’</i>. Phasing: 2018-2022 Total estimated infrastructure cost: to be confirmed Sources of funding: to be confirmed Delivery lead: RSPB</p> | <p>Reference to IBP/376 joint lead with WSCC will be changed to RSPB. Reference to SW and Sussex Wildlife Trust will be removed.</p> <p>New project will be added as requested.</p> |
| Portsmouth Water | <p>As it says in the foreword, water supply is funded through customers bill, we have no specific comments on the plan or on CIL payments.</p> | No change required |
| Southern Water | <p>Thank you for consulting us on the draft Chichester Infrastructure Business Plan. Southern Water provides wastewater services to Chichester District and water to parts of the District. As previously indicated, Southern Water believes that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not designed to include utility infrastructure, such as underground sewers and associated facilities (e.g. pumping stations). The local infrastructure required to service individual sites is achieved by agreements direct with developers. The costs incurred in providing this infrastructure are additional to those incurred through the CIL and/or S106 planning obligations. Accordingly, we only seek minor amendments to Appendix A of the</p> | |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | <p>draft Business Plan as indicated on the attached table. (The attached table contains minor wording amendments)</p> <p>Amendments sought to following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IBP/14 2. IBP/97 3. IBP/397 4. IBP/50 <p>We would be grateful if these minor amendments could be incorporated in the next version of the document. We would also be grateful if you could keep us informed of the progress that is made.</p> | <p>The requested amendments will be made.</p> |
| <p>Thames Water</p> | <p>Thames Water support the section on how utility companies are funded in principal, but consider that further reference is required to the use of planning conditions where work isn't planned by the utility providers, to ensure infrastructure is delivered ahead of development coming forward.</p> <p>As part of Thames Water's five year business plan they advise OFWAT on the funding required to accommodate growth at all their wastewater treatment works. As a result Thames Water base our 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 Sewage Treatment Works upgrades can take 3-5 years.</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.</p> <p>Chichester District Council should seek to ensure that there is adequate wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers should be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to adverse amenity impacts for existing or future users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate appraisals and reports to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of</p> | <p>Add additional text to Appendix D: Funding source review at the end of section on utilities, as follows:</p> <p>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.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>existing infrastructure. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by the water 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.</p> | |
| <p>Southern Electric Power Distribution plc</p> | <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><i>Connections for new development from existing infrastructure can be provided subject to cost and timescale.</i></p> <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 Southern Electric Power Distribution. 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 Southern Electric Power Distribution prior to submission of a planning application.</p> <p>I trust this is helpful to you at this current stage and can be included in your Core Strategy Document, but you can contact me directly on the above telephone number should you require any further advice particularly relating to specific sites.</p> | <p>No change required</p> |
| <p>South East Coast NHS</p> | <p>I can confirm on behalf of SECAMB that the costs for the Chichester North & South Ambulance Community response posts are in relation to the total cost of the building set-up costs (revenue costs would be met by SECAMB). We do not have any other funding streams available and have diverted internal funds for these projects from our overall budget to</p> | <p>Project IBP/532 will be deleted as it has now been completed.</p> |

Summary of Representations and Proposed Modifications to the IBP

APPENDIX 1

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>Foundation Ambulance Trust</p> | <p>provide emergency healthcare. Chichester North ACRP at the St James Industrial Estate has recently been completed and the likely date for the Chichester South ACRP will be during 2016-17.</p> | |
| <p>City Centre Partnership</p> | <p>We held a special meeting to go through the schedule of proposals affecting the BID area and this resulted in the attached comments.</p> <p>Largely we would like to see reference back to the <i>Chichester City Centre Public Realm and enhancement strategy 2005-</i> . We consider that this is still a relevant and appropriate piece of work that is still valid.</p> <p>Otherwise I hope that the comments are self-explanatory.</p> <p>See attached response</p> <p>Two new projects to be added:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Railway Crossing Improvements at Basin Road & Southgate/Stockbridge Road 2. Free Wi-fi in Chichester city centre <p>Amendments sought to following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IBP/208 2. IBP/207 3. IBP/206 4. IBP/204 5. IBP/356 6. IBP/355 7. IBP/351 & IBP/206 (interlinked) 8. IBP/350 9. IBP/26 10. IBP/22/23 & 28 (combine projects) 11. IBP/27 | <p>New projects will be added.</p> <p>208 & 207 will be amended</p> <p>206 & 204 the priority will remain unchanged</p> <p>356 & 355 support from BID will be added.</p> <p>351 & 206 reference will be made to the link 350 will be amended</p> <p>22/23/28 will be combined and amended 27 will be amended</p> |