

**Chichester District Council**  
**Infrastructure Business Plan**  
**2016/2021**



8th draft 19 January 2016

[www.chichester.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.chichester.gov.uk/planningpolicy)

## **Contents**

Foreword	3-4
How to use this document	5
1. Executive Summary	6-10
2. Purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan	11-15
3. Infrastructure Projects	16-29
4. CIL Infrastructure Prioritisation	30-32
5. CIL Implementation Plan	33-41
6. Cashflow and Spending Plan	42-56
7. Implementation, Monitoring & Governance	57-59
8. Conclusions	60

## **Page No.**

## **Appendices**

A. Full Infrastructure Project list	62-171
B. CIL Applicable Housing Trajectory	172-173
C. Infrastructure Prioritisation Process	174
D. Funding Source Review	175-191
E. Project Pro-forma	192
F. Regulation 123 list	193-195
G. IBP Glossary	196

# Foreword

One of the concerns that local communities frequently raise is that infrastructure (by which we mean roads, flood defences, schools, doctors surgeries, children's playgrounds etc) does not keep pace with the rate of new house building.

One of the purposes of the Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) is to ensure that infrastructure is provided at the right time and in the right place to accompany new homes so that this problem does not get worse in the future.

Infrastructure can be paid for in several different ways, for example:

- Customer bills – to telephone and broadband companies, and water companies to supply fresh water and to take away and treat wastewater.
- Government grants, to help provide school places (or other grant sources from Europe or the Local Economic Partnership).
- Planning obligations – S106/S278 (infrastructure that provides mitigation directly related to a planning application).
- Community Infrastructure Levy (*a levy on certain types of new development which creates net additional floorspace*)

Sometimes several different funding sources have to be combined to pay for the infrastructure that is needed. The IBP shows which funding sources will contribute to each infrastructure item/project, and where and when it will be provided. It also shows that there will be a funding shortfall.

Because of the funding shortfall, the IBP has identified a way of selecting which infrastructure is needed most, where it is needed and when it will be provided.

Projects eligible to be funded from CIL are those which relate to the cumulative growth of the area. These need to be prioritised because the CIL receipts will be insufficient to fund all the projects that have been put forward. In the early years when the CIL is first introduced there will be little money collected in CIL receipts, so fewer, or less expensive projects will be funded from the CIL (this does not negate the importance of prioritising these). As the years progress, and development gets underway, the amount of money collected from CIL will steadily increase, which will enable more substantial infrastructure projects to be delivered.

The IBP can never be precise about the amount of money that will be available; it is just the best estimate at any given point in time. Because of this it is a 'living' document which will be kept under review, and updated and rolled forward each year to reflect how much money has been made available, how much development has occurred, and how much of each type of infrastructure is still needed.

Some of the Community Infrastructure levy will be passed to the parish councils to be spent on infrastructure of their choice. Parishes which don't have a Neighbourhood Plan will get 15% of the total amount of CIL collected from new development in the parish (capped at £100 per existing Council tax dwelling each year). This increases to 25% (uncapped) for those that have Neighbourhood Plans in place.

I would like to thank all the organisations who provided the information to help put this document together, and hope that you find it useful.

Councillor Susan Taylor  
Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning

## How to use this document

It is suggested that the Executive Summary, pages 6-20 is read first, as this summarises the key information contained within each section of this document. The sections within the main body of the document provide this information in greater detail and the appendices provide further useful reference material.

Section 4, pages 37-39 shows the criteria for prioritising projects.

Section 5, pages 40-47 this table lists CIL projects which have been identified to be delivered in the first five years into the priority categories using the methodology in section 4.

Section 6, pages 48-60 the first table on pages 49 and 50 shows the amount of homes to be delivered in each parish, together with the total estimated CIL receipts for the Local Plan period. The second table on pages 51-52 shows the estimated amount of CIL receipts to be handed over to each parish if Neighbourhood Plans are in place, this is broken down year by year for the first five years. The third table on pages 52- 53 shows the estimated amount of CIL receipts to be handed over to each parish if Neighbourhood Plans are not in place, this is broken down year by year for the first five years. The fourth table pages 54-58 highlights the total amount of CIL receipts estimated to be collected in each Parish including both the parish and district share, broken down year by year for the first five years. This information should be used by the City, Town and Parish Councils when selecting and prioritising their own CIL spending projects.

The first table underneath paragraph 6.4, page 59 shows the total cost of projects put forward for each five year period, classified before any projects have been selected for funding. The final row of this table shows whether there are sufficient CIL funds to cover these costs, and if not, the shortfall is shown. Either additional funding will need to be found to meet the shortfall, or the projects will need to be prioritised for funding, and some may remain unfunded and will not be implemented.

The second table underneath paragraph 6.4, pages 59 and 60 identifies which projects it is intended should be funded by CIL in each of the first five years. The table is based on conservative estimates throughout. Row 1 shows the collection year, row 2 shows a cautious estimate of the CIL income expected to be collected. Row 3 shows the amount of CIL available once the highest (25%) share has been passed to the parish councils. Row 4 shows the amount of CIL available to the district council once the administrative costs of managing the CIL have been taken into account (maximum of 5%). Rows 9 – 11 show which projects have been selected for CIL funding, and finally, row 12 shows the balance of funds to be banked (after the selected projects have been allocated funding) to be carried forward into the next year.

Section 7, pages 61-63 explains the governance and monitoring arrangements.

Section 8, page 64 provides the conclusions.

# 1 Executive Summary

## The Purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan

1.1 This Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) has been prepared by a working party of officers from Chichester District Council and West Sussex County Council in close liaison with the Parish and Town Councils and Ward Members within the Local Plan area; nominated County Councillors; Strategic Sites developers; and with input from relevant Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners. It sets out the current understanding of infrastructure required to support the delivery of the Chichester Local Plan to 2029 on the basis of a five year rolling programme. It has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) and builds upon the Regulation 123 List. It should be noted that the infrastructure list is not exhaustive and as time progresses and future IBPs developed it is expected that additional and or alternative infrastructure requirements will be defined. Such projects will require individual assessment and be subject to the same tests that have determined the projects in this IBP. This will confirm the appropriate delivery mechanism such as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) with other identified funding sources or S106/S278. At this time however and prior to periodic review this IBP project list represents the current understanding of projects appropriate to fund via the CIL and therefore confirms that no double counting will take place. Detailing a clear approach to prioritisation of infrastructure to be funded (in whole or part) through the CIL it provides a robust evidence base upon which to further refine an appropriate approach to delivery.

1.2 The IBP will support the implementation of the Local Plan and demonstrates the importance of the CIL Charging Schedule and Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

1.3 The IBP has been prepared collaboratively with the three tiers of local government (District, County and City/Town/Parish Councils) and in close cooperation with infrastructure delivery commissioners including strategic site developers, to ensure that development within the Chichester plan area is supported by the timely provision of infrastructure. The IBP will be rolled forward and updated each year and will be subject to annual review remaining continually revised to reflect development delivery rates and adjusted infrastructure requirements across the plan area.

1.4 Despite a clear approach to infrastructure prioritisation being set out and an initial attempt to model infrastructure both by level of priority and timeframe for delivery there remains a significant funding gap in the short, medium and long term. This is detailed across chapter 6 which presents the current CIL cashflow and spending plan. Whilst the deficit is not unexpected, future iterations of the IBP need to scrutinise the cost breakdown of infrastructure projects, their ability to meet the legal tests set out for CIL funding. This will be facilitated by a more refined appreciation of the development trajectory as time progresses with further details of project delivery known. This greater level of detail will benefit future decision-making as it will show greater detail on the candidate projects for funding support, the ways in which the project will be delivered and managed and any link between CIL funding support and leveraging in other private/public funding sources.

1.5 This document therefore provides the means to further define and inform the next steps, guiding the approach towards management of CIL receipts across the first five year rolling IBP programme.

### **Policy Context**

1.4 The importance of robust infrastructure planning is emphasised in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that:

Local Planning Authorities should work with other authorities and providers such as Southern Water, Highways England and the Environment Agency to:

- Assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply, wastewater and its treatment, energy (including heat), telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education, flood risk and coastal change management, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and
- Take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.

1.5 The NPPF emphasises the importance of identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure. Planned infrastructure should be delivered in a timely fashion and local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development.

1.6 The Government's planning practice guidance states that as part of the Local Plan process, local authorities should identify what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded and brought on stream at the appropriate time whilst ensuring that the requirements of the plan as a whole will not prejudice the viability of development.

1.7 This IBP has sought to apply a consistent approach apportioning infrastructure by Spatial Area as follows:

- Cross-authority projects
- Spatial Planning Areas as identified in the Local Plan
  - East – West Corridor
  - Manhood Peninsula
  - Plan area (North)

### **Infrastructure Projects**

1.8 The IBP process started by identifying all of the infrastructure requirements necessary to support anticipated growth set out in the Local Plan to 2029, and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The Infrastructure Project list has drawn upon the projects identified in the Regulation 123 list produced to support the CIL Charging Schedule, and has been worked up to reflect as accurately as possible the latest understanding of anticipated project requirements. It must be noted that this IBP project list is a reflection of current day understanding and is not exhaustive of future requirements. Periodic review of the project list and publication of future IBPs is anticipated to refine the understanding of infrastructure requirements with additional and or alternative items added. This current project list has however been reviewed by the IBP officers working group.

1.9 Section 3 therefore provides a comprehensive list of currently identified projects including those to be funded under CIL, S106/S278 or by other identified funding sources. Please note that no CIL projects have been identified as being 'critical'. This is because the critical projects – the Tangmere Wastewater Treatment Works is to be funded by Southern Water through future water bills, and A27 improvements are to be funded by a grant from central government to Highways England, together with a contribution from West Sussex County Council, and a contribution from developers through S278 agreements. This detailed level of appreciation is critical in order to appropriately undertake a process of prioritisation for CIL funding. An indicative project cost has been established for all projects which are based on current cost estimates. The costs associated with projects will be kept under review.

### **CIL Infrastructure Prioritisation**

1.10 Section 4 of this IBP provides a clear approach and process for prioritising infrastructure. A transparent process for prioritising infrastructure is needed because CIL receipts will not be sufficient to fund all infrastructure required within the Plan area. Prioritisation facilitates a considered approach towards infrastructure delivery and will support the effective management of resources.

1.11 Establishing a detailed understanding of infrastructure delivery is multi-faceted and requires the consideration of a number of inter-dependent factors including:

- The Development trajectories
- Prioritisation of Infrastructure projects
- Phasing of Infrastructure.

1.12 Infrastructure delivery is intrinsically aligned to growth and the necessity to mitigate the impacts arising from development. The development trajectories detailed in Appendix B of this paper therefore represent current projections aligned with the draft Local Plan: Key Policies trajectory, but must remain under continual review as annual monitoring of the Infrastructure Business Plan is undertaken.

1.13 Prioritisation of projects should be guided by a review of the Infrastructure Business Plan. A consistent and common approach across all stakeholders is essential if an appropriate approach is to be established towards the phased funding and delivery of infrastructure. The methodology for prioritising projects is set out in section 4 of this IBP, Table 1.

1.14 The final element that supports the prioritisation of infrastructure is to ensure an appreciation of the necessary phasing of infrastructure requirements. It is this stage that is central to the Infrastructure Business Plan as it represents the primary evidence base for anticipating cash-flow from infrastructure spending against the receipt of CIL Payments.



## CIL Implementation Plan

1.15 Section 5 of this IBP presents the outcomes of the initial infrastructure prioritisation undertaken as part of this IBP providing a more detailed understanding of those projects considered appropriate to fund (in part or in whole) under the CIL. This is provided by Spatial Planning Area and clearly indicates the short, medium and long term delivery requirements. (short is defined as 2016 to 2021, and medium/long term from 2021 – 2029).

1.16 The joint Chichester District Council/West Sussex County Council officers (Growth and Infrastructure) Group will work with stakeholders in order to refine projects to facilitate the production of a more detailed understanding of cashflow modelling. A clear understanding of CIL receipts against anticipated expenditure requirements is essential to provide a robust Infrastructure Business Plan that can effectively manage the call on resources and requirements to mitigate pressures arising from growth. The ability to identify appropriate funding sources is essential given the anticipated funding gap. Table 3 in section 5 summarises the projects identified for the short term (2016-2021) to date, where the costs/phasing is known. This will change as further project information is known.

## Cashflow and Spending Plan

1.17 Section 6 identifies how much CIL is likely to be generated and in which period, and sets out the CIL spending priorities.

## Next Steps

1.18 The following timetable shows the next steps that will lead to the publication of the March 2016 Infrastructure Business Plan.

Action	Date
Workshops with locational groups	April 2015
Joint officer group meeting to prioritise infrastructure	April 2015
Draft IBP for circulation to joint officer group for comment	May/June 2015
Cabinet & WSCC to appoint Members to sit on joint member liaison group	2 June 2015
Draft IBP to CMT	13 July 2015
Draft the report to DPIP & Cabinet explaining progress with IBP & next steps	11 Aug 2015
Draft report to DPIP & Cabinet to be placed on x drive	18 Aug 2015
DPIP to consider the IBP priorities	27 Aug 2015
Joint CDC/WSCC member liaison decision to consult on IBP	4 Sept 2015
Cabinet to consider IBP & any changes resulting from joint CDC/WSCC member liaison group	8 Sept 2015
Council to approve IBP for consultation	22 Sept 2015
CIL to be adopted	1 February 2016
Draft IBP to stakeholders for 6 week consultation	1 Oct – 12 Nov 2015
Proposed modifications and revised IDP to CDC/WSCC joint Member liaison Group, with draft Cabinet report for approval to go to Cabinet	2 Dec 2015
IBP to go to DPIP	14 January 2016

IBP to be approved by Cabinet	9 Feb 2016
Budget and allocation of CIL to be approved by Council	1 March 2016
SLA with each delivery partners per annum to ensure timed project delivery	April 2016 onwards
Establish amount of CIL to be passed to Town, City and Parish Councils	End March 2016
CIL passed to Town, City and Parish Councils	End April 2016
Establish amount of CIL to be passed to Town, City and Parish Councils	End September 2016
CIL passed to Town, City and Parish Councils	End October 2016
Spending of CIL monitored – both CDC and reports from Town, City and Parish Councils	October 2016
Scrutiny and Accountability – Corporate Governance & Audit considers IBP within draft AMR and will report on any amendments as appropriate	Late November (probably last Tuesday) 2016

## 2 Purpose of the Infrastructure Business Plan

### Introduction

2.1 This Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) sets out the current understanding of infrastructure required to support the delivery of the Chichester Local Plan to 2029, and sets out an approach to prioritising infrastructure requiring funding through the Chichester Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which came into force on 1 February 2016. It has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) and builds upon the Regulation 123 List. This approach will remain common to future IBPs that will allow periodic review of the infrastructure project list and ensure all projects necessary to support the delivery of the Local Plan are considered with appropriate funding mechanisms identified.

2.2 The IBP has been prepared by a working party of officers from Chichester District Council and West Sussex County Council in close liaison with the Parish and Town Councils and Ward Members within the Local Plan area; nominated County Councillors; Strategic Sites developers; and with input from relevant Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners.

2.3 The IBP prioritises the infrastructure identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as needed to support anticipated growth in the Local Plan via a five year rolling programme for its delivery, together with possible funding sources broken down by source. The CIL Regulation 123 list identifies which items of infrastructure or infrastructure projects could be funded from CIL. The types of development which will pay the levy, together with the charging rate are set out in the CIL Charging Schedule. Funding from S106 sources and solely from infrastructure delivery partners is considered within this IDP to be committed, and its phasing will be set out in the S106 agreements for each planning application. Projects to be funded from other sources have also been identified in the long list in Appendix A for the sake of completeness.

2.4 There will inevitably be a funding gap as infrastructure requirements will exceed the funds available. CIL will go part way towards bridging the gap, but will be insufficient to completely fill it. There will therefore be a need for prioritisation along with exploration of external funding opportunities and innovative approaches to financing which will require strong partnership working arrangements with infrastructure providers.

2.5 Prioritisation needs to be informed by the Local Plan housing trajectory (the phasing of development and its supporting infrastructure). This is because infrastructure delivery is aligned with growth and the need to mitigate the impacts arising from both housing and economic development. It will also be prioritised by schemes which have already been prioritised by WSCC Local Committees, and projects which have identified other sources of funding to contribute towards CIL projects. A detailed consideration of the governance structure that has been established to take responsibility for prioritising the delivery of required projects, describing the role of key stakeholders and delivery partners in preparing this IBP, is summarised in Chapter 7.

2.6 The IBP five year rolling programme will be updated each year to reflect the most up to date housing trajectory and evolving development requirements across the plan area. It has thus been written as a 'living' document and will be required to support planning decisions and infrastructure investment priorities, providing both a plan wide and area based appreciation of requirements.

### **Policy and legislative context**

2.7 The IBP has been prepared to reflect national and local policy, and current legislation, including:

- The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- The Localism Act (2011)
- The CIL Regulations (2010) (as amended)

### **The National Context**

#### ***The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)***

2.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policy for England, providing a framework within which local people and local planning authorities can produce plans that reflect the needs and priorities of their communities. The IBP takes into account the following aspects of the NPPF:

2.9 At Paragraph 14, the NPPF sets the focus for the NPPF with a presumption in favour of sustainable development and requires that Local Plans plan positively for development and infrastructure required in an area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework. Paragraph 162, specifically addressing infrastructure planning, notes that local planning authorities should work with other authorities and providers to assess the quality and capacity of transport, water, energy, telecommunications, utilities, health and social care, waste and flood defence infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands; taking account of the need for nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.

2.10 Throughout the document the NPPF focuses guidance to encourage those responsible for bringing forward development to recognise and respond to the needs of communities. Development should be of good design and appropriately located. National incentives and relevant local charges will help ensure local communities benefit directly from the increase in development that the Framework seeks to achieve. Revenue generated from development related contributions should help sustain local services, fund infrastructure and deliver environmental enhancement.

2.11 The NPPF also underlines at paragraph 175 that where practical Community Infrastructure Levy charges should be worked up and tested alongside the Local Plan. The Community Infrastructure Levy should support and incentivise new development, particularly by placing control over a meaningful proportion of the funds raised with the neighbourhoods where development takes place.

2.12 The NPPF provides clear direction at paragraph 177 that local planning authorities should ensure infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion with planning authorities required to understand both district wide as well as local requirements in preparing Local Plans.

## **CIL Regulations**

### ***The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 Amendments)***

2.13 CIL came into effect under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and was subsequently amended in 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. The purpose of CIL is to provide developers with certainty over costs applicable to development and planning authorities with the flexibility to direct funds to infrastructure as appropriate. It represents a fundamental change from the current funding source through Section 106 obligations, meaning that CIL receipts can fund broader strategic infrastructure to support the growth of the area.

2.14 Section 106 obligations are currently the main mechanism by which new developments fund infrastructure. However, from April 2015, the regulations restrict the pooling of S106 contributions to no more than 5 obligations, and CIL will be the main mechanism for delivering off-site community infrastructure from developer contributions. Although CIL will become the main mechanism for collecting financial contributions from development, Section 106 obligations will still be used to deliver affordable housing and certain site-specific infrastructure needs and mitigation measures. In addition, section 278 agreements will still be used to secure highway improvements to mitigate the impact of new development.

2.15 CIL Regulations have placed limitations on the use of S106 planning obligations by:

- Putting the three tests on the use of planning obligations as set out in the NPPF on a statutory basis for developments which are capable of being charged the Levy;
- Ensuring the local use of the CIL and planning obligations does not overlap. It is important that the CIL Charging Schedule differentiates between any site specific infrastructure projects it intends to continue to seek through S106 contributions, to ensure no double counting takes place between items on the Regulation 123 list, and
- Limiting pooled contributions from planning obligations, from no more than five developments which may be funded by the Levy.

### ***Key elements of CIL***

2.16 In setting the CIL, the charging authority must aim to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure required to support the development of its area, (taking into account other sources of funding) and the potential effects of the CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.

2.17 CIL Regulations state that an adopted development plan including compliant infrastructure plans, as set out in a draft or adopted Local Plan are prerequisites for the adoption of CIL. Local authorities will adopt a CIL Charging Schedule that sets out the level of charge and indicative list of infrastructure projects to be funded.

2.18 Subject to viability considerations CIL can be levied on most types of new building development where the gross internal area of new build exceeds 100 square metres. That limit does not apply to new homes, and a charge can be levied on a single home of any size unless it is built by a 'self-builder' (See CIL Regulation 54A and 54B). Once adopted, CIL is mandatory for all eligible development and is chargeable on net additional new floorspace over 100 square metres gross internal area. It is based on a

calculation related to pounds (£) per square metre of development. All new build development will be expected to pay although the regulations do allow for the possibility to apply for CIL relief in regard to identified uses such as affordable housing.

### ***Neighbourhood Proportion***

2.19 The CIL (Amendment) Regulations 2013 state that 25% of CIL funds collected from a development will be passed directly to the parish council in which the site is located, if there is an adopted Neighbourhood Plan in place. The amount is reduced to 15% (capped at £100 per existing council tax dwelling per year) in areas without an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The funds are to be spent on infrastructure projects of their choice. In view of this it will be critical that the city, town and parish councils are fully aware of the implications on infrastructure delivery and work with Chichester District Council and West Sussex County Council and other infrastructure delivery commissioners in order that the provision of new local community facilities can be planned in partnership.

2.20 Whilst the CIL is intended to incentivise development at the local level it is critical that the collection and spend of receipts is managed in a holistic manner that balances local and plan-wide requirements. Often, the plan-wide infrastructure projects may still provide greater mitigation than a small scale project at a local level. These discussions will remain central to the prioritisation process discussed in chapter 4 to ensure the balance between local spend and contributions to larger projects remain appropriate.

### **Local Context**

2.21 The Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 sets the strategic planning framework for development within the Chichester plan area. Its broad spatial strategy is to steer major development away from the most environmentally sensitive areas and towards locations that have the widest access to employment opportunities and community facilities, or where development can contribute to addressing an under provision of such facilities. It therefore concentrates new development mainly in the east-west corridor between Southbourne and Tangmere; especially around Chichester City itself. This includes planning for new neighbourhoods to the west of Chichester city and at Shopwyke, and providing for the expansion of Tangmere, Westhampnett (including land north east of the city) and Southbourne. More limited new development is proposed for the manhood Peninsula, in recognition of the transport and environmental and flooding constraints. Some development is proposed at Selsey and East Wittering/Bracklesham to help meet the economic and social objectives for the area. Elsewhere in the Plan area, development will be restricted to small scale housing and employment to meet local needs, whilst seeking to protect and enhance local services and facilities. Development is primarily directed towards the larger and more sustainable villages. It therefore follows that new infrastructure will be concentrated towards the areas that will experience this growth. The Local Plan includes strategic policies to manage growth and guide new development.

2.22 The Local Plan vision states:

*“By 2029, the Plan area will be a place where people can:*

- *Find a range of jobs that match different skills and pay levels and meet their aspirations for employment;*
- *Use their entrepreneurial flair to start and grow creative, innovative and competitive businesses;*
- *Follow a socially responsible and more environmentally friendly way of life;*

- *Pursue a healthy lifestyle and benefit from a sense of well-being supported by good access to education, health, leisure, open space and nature, sports and other essential facilities;*
- *Enjoy a vibrant historic city, thriving towns and villages and areas of attractive, accessible and unspoilt harbours, coast and countryside;*
- *Have a quality of life that is enriched through opportunities to enjoy our local culture, arts and a conserved and enhanced heritage;*
- *Afford good quality homes to suit their incomes, needs and lifestyles;*
- *Live in sustainable neighbourhoods supported by necessary infrastructure and facilities;*
- *Feel safe and secure;*
- *Move around safely and conveniently with opportunities to choose alternatives to car travel;*
- *Take advantage of new communication technologies; and*
- *Feel a sense of community, and feel empowered to help shape its future”.*

2.23 Local Plan Policy 9 outlines contributions required by new developments. The supporting text to this policy acknowledges that contributions will be calculated taking into account provisions of the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and some site specific infrastructure through S106 obligations. The Chichester CIL charges are shown in the table below and were established following viability work which struck an appropriate balance between the desirability for CIL funding of infrastructure and the effects of CIL on the economic viability of the district as a whole.

#### **CIL Charging Schedule**

<b>Use of Development</b>	<b>Proposed Levy (£per square metre)</b>
*Residential – South of the District with 30% affordable housing	£120
*Residential – North of the District with 30% affordable housing	£200
Retail (wholly or mainly convenience)	£125
Retail (wholly or mainly comparison)	£20
Purpose Built Student Housing	£30
Standard Charge (applies to all development not separately defined)	£0

\*This charge applies to the creation of one or more dwellings, and residential extensions or annexes which are 100 square metres or more gross internal area which are not for the benefit of the owner/occupier. See further guidance provided at <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy/relief/self-build-exemption/>

This charge does not apply to residential institutions (C2)

# 3 Infrastructure Projects

## Introduction

3.1 Ahead of prioritising infrastructure and considering its delivery against anticipated cashflow and funding opportunities it is necessary to consider infrastructure needs across the plan area in their totality. Consequently, the Infrastructure Business Plan process begins with the current appreciation in this IBP of all infrastructure requirements necessary to support the anticipated growth set out in the Local Plan to 2029. It has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and builds upon the Regulation 123 list. As noted previously this project list will evolve as further details are known and the development trajectory refined but at this stage it remains a robust reflection of known requirements.

3.2 An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), October 2014 identified the infrastructure requirements associated with the planned growth across the Chichester Plan area to 2029. This IDP was submitted as supporting evidence to both the Local Plan and CIL Charging Schedule examinations.

3.3 The IDP has subsequently been updated in preparation of this Business Plan to reflect as accurately as possible the latest understanding of anticipated project requirements and to present a correct and fair indication of the infrastructure needs for the plan area up to 2029. The project lists presented in this chapter represent a refined infrastructure project list having been reviewed in detail by the IBP officers group between February and April of 2015. The project list has been reviewed in light of the following key factors and, therefore, the project list included within this IBP reflects current understanding and must not be taken to represent an exhaustive list of requirements through to 2029:

- Infrastructure demand levels and adequacy of the infrastructure project list based on the latest understanding of housing and other development proposals
- The timing of project delivery based on the latest housing trajectory (June 2015)
- Best information currently available for existing or planned infrastructure capacity across the plan area

3.4 It should be noted that costs identified for a project are indicative as, in many cases, full design and implementation costs have not yet been determined but that the amount stated is an appropriate and fair estimated value within the currently known parameter. The indicative project cost is based on 2015 figures and will be reviewed where necessary as part of the annual update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

3.5 It is important to also note that the IBP has not currently assessed or estimated the likely requirement of ongoing costs associated to the provision of infrastructure and has focussed wholly on the capital requirement of projects. However, it is acknowledged that CIL allows for the provision to fund ongoing investment and maintenance, as well as revenue costs such as professional fees associated with bringing a project forward. An approach to the modelling and funding of such costs will need to be considered in more detail as the IBP is developed.



3.6 A summary of all projects (excluding Parish Projects) from all funding sources, categorised by spatial planning area as identified in the Local Plan, are detailed across the following tables. The S106 projects are linked to specific planning applications, whereas the CIL and other funding source projects are to provide infrastructure for the cumulative growth of the Local Plan area. The total list of projects including those put forward by the City, Town and Parish Councils is provided in appendix A

### Potential Projects and Spending Profile for IBP from all funding sources

Key to colour coding	Funding Sources
	Mainly CIL
	Other
	Mainly S106
	Mainly government grant with S278 and other
	Unknown at present

**Table 2: List of all projects from all funding sources (excluding City Town and Parish projects)  
Short term projects (2016-2021)**

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/194	District Wide	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Biodiversity Opportunity Areas – creation, restoration and enhancements of BAP habitats and wildlife corridors within the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA) and buffers around BOAs, across the District	Cost unknown, grant funding, local fundraising.	The costs of the works will vary depending on the location and extent of the works to be undertaken	£0
IBP/195	District Wide	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Ecological connectivity – improve connectivity within the local ecological networks, in particular between important habitats/corridors and development sites to facilitate species migration	CIL, Grant funding, Local fundraising	The costs of the works will vary depending on the location and extent of the works to be undertaken	£0

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/288	District Wide	Green Infrastructure	Other		Local Drainage - Local watercourse network improvements identified on the West Sussex Local Flood Risk Managements Priority List.	WSCC	£250k	£250,000
IBP/580	District Wide	Utility Services	Other		Broadband roll out to 13,452 premises (100% of premises) of these 9,429 (70%) connected to enable superfast fibre broadband connection. 2,372 (17.6%) connected to enable basic (between 2 and 24Mbps) fibre broadband connection. 726 premises (5.4%) built by	Public and commercial funding		£0
IBP/330	East West Corridor	Education	CIL		Expansion of existing primary school(s) across the Chichester locality by up to 1/2 Form Entry	Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2 million for half form entry Subject to feasibility & site assessment	£2,000,000
IBP/331	East West Corridor	Education	CIL		Expansion of existing primary schools across the Bourne locality in excess of 1/2 Form Entry	Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2 million for half form entry Subject to feasibility & site assessment	£2,000,000
IBP/377	East West Corridor	Education	Other		Academic Teaching Building	University funded	ca £5.9m	£5,900,000
IBP/378	East West	Education	Other		Music Teaching Building	University funded	ca £3.5m	£3,500,000

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
	Corridor							
IBP/328	East West Corridor	Education	S106		School site and provision of a new 1Form Entry primary school for the Tangmere SDL; the site should be expandable to 2Form Entry	S106 & WSCC (including Basic Need Grant)	£4.8 - £5.4m (1Form Entry) £8.3 - £9.5m (2Form Entry)	£5,400,000
IBP/329	East West Corridor	Education	S106		Site for a 1 Form Entry primary school expandable to 2Form Entry with contributions towards a new 1Form Entry primary school from Graylingwell site	S106 & Basic Need Grant	£4.8 - £5.4m (1Form Entry)	£5,400,000
IBP/327	East West Corridor	Education	S106		School site and provision of a new primary school for the West of Chichester SDL; 1 Form Entry initially but the site should be expandable to 2Form Entry to accommodate the latter phases of development	S106 & WSCC (including Basic Need Grant)	£4.8 - £5.4m (1Form Entry) £8.3 - £9.5m (2Form Entry)	£9,500,000
IBP/396	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure			Bosham fluvial flood relief scheme	400,000	640,000	£640,000
IBP/306	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Youth skate park (Southbourne)	WSCC, Developer contributions and Parish Council	£80k - £120k From WSCC, Developer contributions, Parish Council	£120,000
IBP/304	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Provision of Youth facilities (Southbourne)	WSCC and developer contributions	£? From WSCC, Developer contributions	£0

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/307	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Establishment and maintenance of an accessible Green Ring around the village of Southbourne, providing a variety of green infrastructure assets, including informal open space, allotments, a playing field, a footpath/cycleway network, children's play areas	Cost unknown, Sport England, Sustrans, WSCC, Parish Council	£? From Developer contributions, Sport England, Sustrans, WSCC	£0
IBP/196	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Brandy Hole Copse – restoration and enhancement works at Brandy Hole local Nature Reserve	CIL	£10,000	£10,000
IBP/302	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Resite football club (Bosham)	Parish Council	£500k	£500,000
IBP/305	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Provision of Artificial Grass Pitch/MUGA (Southbourne)	Bourne Community College, WSCC, Developer contributions and Sport England	£700k - £1m From WSCC, Developer contributions, Sport England, Bourne Community College	£1,000,000
IBP/308	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	S106		Amenity tree planting Harbour SPA Solent Disturbance & mitigation Project	Parish Council	£? From Developer contributions, WSCC, CDC	£0

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/398	East West Corridor	Health	CIL		NHS Medical Centre West of Chichester SDL	£3,300,000 total NHS sources/LIFT/third party development (£2m expected to be funded by LIFT)	3,300,000	£3,300,000
IBP/379	East West Corridor	Housing	Other		Student Residential - Redevelopment of Havenstoke (252 new units) and redevelopment of Hammond (77 new units)	University/private funded	ca £15m	£15,000,000
IBP/534	East West Corridor	Public and Community Services	CIL		Part refurbishment of Chichester Police Station	£700k self fund via Sussex Police capital budget.	£1m	£1,000,000
IBP/533	East West Corridor	Public and Community Services	CIL		South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust		£45,000	£45,000
IBP/532	East West Corridor	Public and Community Services	Other		Chichester North Ambulance Community Response Post		£58,000	£58,000
IBP/338	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Expansion of the services provided by Southbourne Library	CIL	TBC	£0
IBP/190	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	S106		West of Chichester – Temporary community facilities	Provided by Developer under S106	Unknown	£0
IBP/191	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	S106	WH/04/03947/OUT	Westhampnett – new Community Building	S106 (historic receipt). S106 to be secured. New Homes Bonus	Scale of building still to be determined based on complexity of	£0

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
							bringing together two sites	
IBP/189	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Shopwhyke – Temporary community Facilities	Provide by Developer under S106	Unknown	£0
IBP/355	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		RTPI screens at key locations		£150,000 (20 screens)	£150,000
IBP/582	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Railway crossing improvements at Basin Road and Southgate/Stockbridge Road	CIL, Network Rail and WSCC		£0
IBP/350	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		High intensity behaviour change programme (new commercial & residential development, existing employers & schools, personalised travel planning) for Chichester City	CIL	£120,000 per annum	£480,000
IBP/346	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Foot / cycle bridge across the A27 to Coach Road	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/340	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	CC/08/03533/OUT	Graylingwell cycle route 1 Wellington Road – Oaklands Way	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/342	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	CC/08/03533/OUT	Toucan crossing on Oaklands Way	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/344	East West	Transport	S106	CC/08/03533/OUT	Kingsmead Avenue / Palmers Field Avenue	S106	Directly providing	£0

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
	Corridor				traffic management			
IBP/348	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Shopwyke Road diversion	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/347	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Shared footway / cycleway along south side of A27 to new access to Shopwyke site	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/346	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Foot / cycle bridge across the A27 to Coach Road	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/345	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	O/11/05283/OUT	Foot / cycle bridge across the A27 south of Portfield Roundabout	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/341	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	CC/08/03533/OUT	Graylingwell cycle route 2 along north side of Westhampnett Road (opp St James' Road to connect with existing footpath rear of Story Road)	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/343	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	CC/08/03533/OUT	Westhampnett Road / Portfield Way (nr Sainsbury's) junction improvement	S106	Directly providing	£0
IBP/339	East West Corridor	Transport	S278		A27 improvements to six junctions: Fishbourne (£2.5m), Stockbridge (£3.8m), Whyke (£3.2m), Bognor Road (£1.8m), Portfield (£891,360) and Oving Road (£660,960).	S278 developers, WSCC and Highways England.	£12.8m	£12,800,000
IBP/397	East West Corridor	Utility Services	Other		Upgrade to Tangmere Wastewater treatment Works (WWTW)	Investment by Southern Water		

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/583	East West Corridor	Utility Services	CIL		Free wifi in Chichester City Centre	LEP, BID	£100,000	£100,000
IBP/391	East West Corridor	Utility Services	Other		Water, drainage and power to support the above developments	University, utility companies and private	Not known as yet The cost and allocation of costs to the University, private partners and utility companies is still to be determined	£0
IBP/332	Manhood Peninsula	Education	CIL		Expansion of existing primary schools across the Manhood locality in excess of 1/2 Form Entry	Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2 million for half form entry Subject to feasibility & site assessment	£2,000,000
IBP/586	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	Other		New visitor centre at Pagham Harbour Local Nature Reserve	to be confirmed		£0
IBP/394	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure			West Wittering Flood Banks	407,000	1,124,000	£1,124,000
IBP/289	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Local Drainage - Crooked Lane, Birdham Surface Water Drainage Improvements	FDGIA/WSCC	£100k	£100,000
IBP/290	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Coast Protection -Selsey – Wittering Beach Management 2016-2021	FDGIA est. £750k CDC est. £250k	£1,000,000	£1,000,000
IBP/293	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Local land Drainage - East Beach Sea Outfall	FDGIA / LA contributions	£250k	£250,000



IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/292	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Hunston - Local Drainage - Pelleys Farm Culvert Construction	WSCC estimated £10k possible CDC £5k	£20k	£20,000
IBP/393	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	Other		Development and implementation of the Selsey, Bracklesham and East Wittering Beach Management		750,000	£750,000
IBP/197	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	Other		FLOW Project (Fixing and Linking Our Wetlands) – improving and enhancing the wetlands habitat on the Manhood Peninsula	Heritage Lottery Funding (granted for £36,000 in development funding to work up an application which would be the £216,000 habitat improvements indicated).	£216,000	£216,000
IBP/193	Manhood Peninsula	Social Infrastructure	S106	D/12/04410/FUL, D/07/04732/FUL, D/11/01198/FUL	Donnington Church Hall – extension	Local fundraising and private donations, S106, NHB or grants?	£250-300k	£300,000
IBP/349	Manhood Peninsula	Transport	S106		A286 Birdham Road / B2201 (Selsey Tram Roundabout) junction improvement	S106	£150,000	£150,000
IBP/536	North of the District	Education	CIL		Expansion of existing primary school provision by 5 places per year of age in the Billingshurst locality falling within Chichester District.	Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£200,000	£200,000

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/318	North of the District	Green Infrastructure	CIL		New footpaths & Community Amenity Space (Kirdford)			£0
IBP/320	North of the District	Green Infrastructure	CIL		New Road, Parking area and SUDS pond and play area (Kirdford)			£0
IBP/316	North of the District	Green Infrastructure	Other		To elevate footpath to North Hall (Loxwood)		£10k	£10,000
IBP/321	North of the District	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Village Social & Recreational Hub (Kirdford)			£0
IBP/319	North of the District	Transport	CIL		Improve local footpaths, cycle tracks & equestrian ways (Kirdford)			£0

#### Medium to long term projects (2021-2029)

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/334	District Wide	Education	CIL		New 6Form Entry secondary school may be required within the Plan period or expansion of existing provision	CIL & WSCC (including Basic Need Grant)	£26.7 - £28.5m	£28,500,000
IBP/291	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Local Drainage - The Avenue, Hambrook Watercourse re-construction	None	£10k	£10,000
IBP/303	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	CIL		New Sports pitch (Bosham)	Parish/WSCC	£100k From WSCC	£100,000
IBP/335	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Library provision as part of a new community centre or school for the West of Chichester SDL; to include shelving and a self- service terminal	CIL	£75,000 - £100,000	£100,000

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/336	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Library provision as part of a new community centre for the Tangmere SDL; to include shelving and a self- service terminal	CIL	£75,000 - £100,000	£100,000
IBP/337	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Library provision as part of a new community facility for development to the East of the city; to include shelving and a self- service terminal	CIL	£75,000 - £100,000	£100,000
IBP/192	East West Corridor	Social Infrastructure	CIL		Southbourne – replacement of Age Concern Building (multi-use community building)	Contributions to be sought form a number of Southbourne permissions	£500k broad estimate (assuming tenure of land secured without purchase)	£500,000
IBP/359	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Portfield cycle route	CIL	£120,000	£120,000
IBP/351	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Chichester bus / rail interchange improvements (Cross reference IBP/206)	CIL	TBC	£0
IBP/352	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Northgate Gyratory junction improvement	CIL	£986,000 - £1.6m	£1,600,000
IBP/353	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Westhampnett Road/ St Pancras/ Spitalfield Lane/ St James Road double mini roundabouts junction improvement	CIL	£1.8m - £2.1m	£2,100,000
IBP/354	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Bus lane along A259 approaching Bognor Road Roundabout	CIL	£1.2m	£1,200,000

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/356	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Variable Message Signing (VMS)	CIL	£8,000	£8,000
IBP/358	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Gap-filling to complete the Chichester Cycle Network: Whyke, Stockbridge, East of the City Centre.	CIL	£500,000	£500,000
IBP/360	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Summersdale cycle route	CIL	£230,000	£230,000
IBP/357	East West Corridor	Transport	CIL		Southgate Gyratory junction improvement	CIL	£200,000	£200,000
IBP/366	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		North / south link road and improvements to nearby roads connecting with southern access to West of Chichester SDL	S106	TBC	£0
IBP/371	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		Cathedral Way / Via Ravenna junction improvement	S106	£170,000	£170,000
IBP/370	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		Sherborne Road / St Paul's Road junction improvement	S106	£540,000	£540,000
IBP/369	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		Sherborne Road traffic calming	S106	TBC	£0
IBP/367	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		St Paul's cycle route	S106	£140,000	£140,000
IBP/365	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		Road link between A27 / A285 junction and Tangmere Road	S106		£0
IBP/364	East West Corridor	Transport	S106	TG/07/04577/FUL, TG/11/04058/FUL, TG/12/01739/OUT, TG/14/00797/FUL	Chichester - Tangmere cycle route	S106	£630,000	£630,000

IBP Id	Location	Category	CIL,S106 or Other	Planning Ref	Scheme	Funding Sources	Cost Range	Total Max Cost £
IBP/368	East West Corridor	Transport	S106		Parklands cycle route	S106	£440,000	£440,000
IBP/570	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Coast Protection -Selsey – Wittering Beach Management 2021-2026	FDGIA est. £750k CDC est. £250k	£1,000,000	£1,000,000
IBP/287	Manhood Peninsula	Green Infrastructure	CIL		Coast Protection - Selsey East Beach – Raising of the Sea Wall	FDGIA, a contribution likely to be required (shortfall)	£5m	£5,000,000
IBP/363	Manhood Peninsula	Transport	CIL		B2145 / B2166 junction improvement	CIL	£100,000	£100,000
IBP/362	Manhood Peninsula	Transport	CIL		Selsey – Witterings cycle route	CIL	£200,000	£200,000
IBP/361	Manhood Peninsula	Transport	CIL		Chichester – Selsey cycle route	CIL	TBC	£0
IBP/376	Manhood Peninsula	Transport	CIL		Green links across the Manhood. (GLaM project). Pagham to Medmerry Trail - provision of public footpath and permissive cycle route to B2145 to access track that circles the new Enviromental Agency tidal bund.	CIL	£200,000	£200,000
IBP/333	North of the District	Education	CIL		Expansion of existing primary schools across the Billingshurst locality by up to 1/2 Form Entry	CIL & WSCC (including Basic Need Grant)	£2 million for half form entry Subject to feasibility & site assessment	£1,500,000

## 4 CIL Infrastructure Prioritisation

4.1 This section sets out the appropriate approach towards prioritisation of projects to be funded via CIL through the IBP. This draws upon the evidence base and Regulation 123 list that supported adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule. The approach taken within the IBP will be subject to review and iteration when the IBP is updated on an annual basis. This approach will inform regular updates to the Infrastructure Project list to ensure appropriate categorisation of projects against the development trajectory.

### **The Need to Prioritise Infrastructure**

4.2 Chichester District Council recognises that the ability to fund required infrastructure to support projected growth across the plan period requires a robust understanding of the anticipated cashflow. It is very unlikely that CIL receipts will ever be sufficient to fund all infrastructure required within the plan area. It is therefore necessary to prioritise the infrastructure projects in most need of CIL funding, and to begin to identify and understand the requirements for additional funding towards particular projects.

4.3 This IBP represents the outcome of a considered approach to delivery that will effectively manage the demand and call on resources. In addition to agreement between stakeholders that have informed this IBP, it is critical that delivery partners recognise the importance of this plan and play their part in ensuring that the infrastructure for which they are responsible is delivered on time.

4.4 The document sets out an appreciation of development timescales and the infrastructure requirements aligned to this trajectory to form the basis for the allocation of CIL receipts. At all stages and points of spend and collection, the relationship between plan-wide, area based, and City, Town, and Parish Council projects will be critical and may need coordination.

4.5 The role of CIL in providing mitigating infrastructure as well as supporting viability of key development sites is recognised and therefore the strategic direction of prioritised spend is central to the IBP process.

### **The Approach towards Infrastructure Prioritisation**

4.6 Establishing a detailed understanding of infrastructure delivery is multi-faceted and requires consideration of a number of inter-dependent factors:

- *The Development Trajectory*
- *Prioritisation of Infrastructure Projects*
- *Phasing of infrastructure*

### ***The Development Trajectory***

4.7 Infrastructure delivery is intrinsically aligned to growth and the necessity to mitigate the impacts arising from development. It is imperative that the phasing of infrastructure represents current development agreements and anticipated trajectories moving forward.

4.8 The Local Plan sets the strategic spatial planning framework for the Chichester plan area, detailing a development strategy up to 2029 and the local context for considering the long-term social, economic, environmental and resource impacts of development.

4.9 Policy 4 of the Local Plan sets out a target of 7,388 homes to be built from 2012 to 2029. This IBP is informed by the detailed development trajectories that are anticipated to deliver this growth and will need to remain reviewed in accordance with future agreements and trajectories. The Monitoring Framework implemented by CDC will be central to this process and ensure achieved and anticipated growth directly informs the IBP.

**Prioritisation of Infrastructure Projects**

4.10 Following the identification of all currently identified Infrastructure Projects (for the whole plan period set out in Appendix A and for the first five years in Section 3) the IBP seeks to align each project a level of priority. This will distinguish those projects critical to enabling development and mitigating infrastructure compared to those that are important to deliver good place making principles, but would be appropriate to deliver at a later date.

**Table 1: Infrastructure Prioritisation Categories**

Category	Definition
<b>Critical Infrastructure</b>	Infrastructure that must happen to enable growth, i.e. it is a prerequisite to unlock any future works without which development cannot proceed. These infrastructure items are ‘blockers’ or ‘showstoppers’, they are most common in relation to transport and utilities infrastructure and are usually linked to triggers controlling the commencement of development activity. It also includes Services that are required to facilitate growth or be delivered in advance of residential/commercial development, i.e. connection to the potable and wastewater network.
<b>Essential Infrastructure</b>	Infrastructure that is considered necessary in order to mitigate impacts arising from the operation of the development. These are projects which are usually identified as required mitigation in EIA/SEA/HRA/TIA testing to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms and are directly related to the proposed development. These items are most common in relation to trips and population generated by the development (including school places, health requirements and public transport (service Projects), and are usually linked to triggers controlling the occupation of development sites.
<b>Policy High Priority Infrastructure</b>	Infrastructure that is required to support wider strategic or site specific objectives which are set out in planning policy or subject to a statutory duty, but would not necessarily prevent development from occurring. This type of infrastructure has a less direct relationship with additional population creating additional need, and is more influenced by whether a person chooses to use this facility or service (including use of community facilities and libraries and use of sports facilities).
<b>Desirable Infrastructure</b>	Infrastructure that is required for sustainable growth but is unlikely to prevent development in the short to medium term. This is often aligned to placemaking objectives without being essential for development to come forward.

Within the categories outlined above, further refinement could be used in order to evaluate and compare projects within each category which would influence the priorities. These could include factors such as:

- Whether neighbouring parishes are prepared to act as a cluster and pool their CIL monies to fund infrastructure projects of mutual benefit to them
- Value for money (or return on investment)
- Number of jobs created
- Number of homes provided
- Deliverability and sustainability (whether the project is “ready to go”)
- Risk
- Other Identified funding sources to contribute towards CIL projects
- Existing infrastructure capacity.
- Direct links to the Local Plan Vision /policies (key outcomes for growth)
- Alignment with delivery partners plans/programmes
- Whether the project could be delivered another way/or through another source of funding
- Whether the project will lead to efficiencies.
- Evidence of need

1.14 The final element that supports the prioritisation of infrastructure is to ensure an appreciation of the necessary phasing of infrastructure requirements. It is this stage that is central to the Infrastructure Business Plan as it represents the primary evidence base for anticipating cash-flow from infrastructure spending against the receipt of CIL Payments.

1.15 The infrastructure prioritisation process is illustrated in the diagram in Appendix C.



## 5 CIL Implementation Plan

5.1. Having outlined all currently identified infrastructure projects under this IBP by Spatial Planning Area and category type in Chapter 3, and outlined the recommended approach towards prioritising that full list of projects, this chapter presents the results of that prioritisation of infrastructure projects for each area. This chapter focuses specifically on those projects identified as potentially funded through CIL income receipts (whether part of wholly funded). The table in chapter 3, paragraph 3.6 also identifies projects to be funded through S106 and other funding sources in order to provide a complete picture of how infrastructure will be provided in this first five years. The full schedule setting out the long list of projects put forward by partners during the life of the Local Plan to 2029 is set out in Appendix A.

**Table 3: Long list of short term projects put forward for CIL funding**

**Short term CIL Implementation Action Plan 2016-2021 – Long list of projects put forward**

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Critical	No CIL Projects						
Essential IBP/536	North of the District	Education – primary schools	Expansion of existing primary school provision by 5 places per year of age in the Billingshurst locality falling within Chichester District.	Select for CIL funding provided other funding sources are found to contribute to the overall costs as the County Council has a statutory duty to provide school places	£200,000 Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£200,000	<b>£100,000 in year 2019-2020</b>
Essential IBP/330	East West Corridor	Education – primary schools	Expansion of existing primary school(s) across the Chichester locality by up to 1/2 Form Entry	Select for CIL funding provided other funding sources are found to contribute to the overall costs as the County Council has a statutory duty to provide school places	£2 million for half form entry (Subject to feasibility & site assessment) Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2,000,000	<b>£1m in year 2018-2019</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Essential IBP/331	East West Corridor	Education – primary schools	Expansion of existing primary schools across the Bourne locality in excess of 1/2 Form Entry	Select for CIL funding provided other funding sources are found to contribute to the overall costs as the County Council has a statutory duty to provide school places	£2 million for half form entry (Subject to feasibility & site assessment) Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2,000,000	<b>£1m in year 2019-2020</b>
Essential IBP/332	Manhood Peninsula	Education – primary schools	Expansion of existing primary schools across the Manhood locality in excess of 1/2 Form Entry	Select for CIL funding provided other funding sources are found to contribute to the overall costs as the County Council has a statutory duty to provide school places	£2 million for half form entry (Subject to feasibility & site assessment) Basic Needs Grant will need to be secured to reduce the funding required from CIL.	£2,000,000	<b>£1m in year 2020-2021</b>
Essential IBP/398	East West Corridor	Community healthcare, primary care facilities & improvements	NHS Medical Centre West of Chichester SDL To amalgamate Chichester practices to cover 20 years ahead and to accommodate new residents/patients from planned developments	Select for CIL funding if the majority of the costs are found from other sources. This project can demonstrate it can assist the growth of the area.	£3,300,000 total NHS sources/LIFT/third party development (£2m expected to be funded by LIFT)	£1,300,000	<b>£1.3m in year 2020-2021</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Essential IBP/533	East West Corridor	Public and Community Services - Ambulance	Chichester South Ambulance Community Response Post.  Changes to the Ambulance Service infrastructure to meet projected patient demand, will include establishment of additional "cover points" (Ambulance Community Response Posts) in the Northern and Southern areas of Chichester. These operating units will be supported by/from the Chichester Make Ready Centre (MRC) located in Tangmere.	Select for CIL funding as this project can demonstrate that it will assist the growth of the area	£45,000	£45,000	<b>£45,000 in year 2016-2017</b>
Essential IBP/350	East West Corridor	Smarter Choices and promote sustainable modes of transport	High intensity behaviour change programme (new commercial & residential development, existing employers & schools, personalised travel planning) for Chichester City	Select for CIL funding as this project can demonstrate that it will assist the growth of the area	£480,000 £120,000 per annum CIL	£480,000	<b>£120k in each year from 2017-2021</b>
Policy High IBP/293	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Local land Drainage - East Beach Sea Outfall	Selected for CIL funding if the majority of money is funded from other sources. This project can demonstrate it can assist the growth of the area.	£250k FDGIA / LA contributions	£100,000	<b>£100,000 in year 2020-2021</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Policy High IBP/195	District Wide	Biodiversity measures	Ecological connectivity – improve connectivity within the local ecological networks, in particular between important habitats/corridors and development sites to facilitate species migration	Not selected at this stage at this stage due to lack of details.	Cost unknown Grant funding. Local fundraising		<b>£0</b>
Policy High IBP/196	East West Corridor	Biodiversity measures	Brandy Hole Copse – restoration and enhancement works at Brandy Hole local Nature Reserve	Select for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area.	£10,000 CIL	£10,000	<b>£10,000 in year 2020-2021</b>
Policy High IBP/289	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Local Drainage - Crooked Lane, Birdham Surface Water Drainage Improvements	Not selected for CIL funding because this project does not support the growth of the area.	£100k FDGIA/WSCC		<b>£0</b>
Policy High IBP/194	District Wide	Biodiversity measures	Biodiversity Opportunity Areas – creation, restoration and enhancements of BAP habitats and wildlife corridors within the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA) and buffers around BOAs, across the District	Not selected at this stage due to lack of details.	Costs unknown Grant funding, Local fundraising		<b>£0</b>
Policy High IBP/292	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Hunston - Local Drainage - Pelleys Farm Culvert Construction	Not selected for CIL funding because this project does not support the growth of the area during this phase.	£20k WSCC estimated £10k possible CDC £5k	£5,000	<b>£0</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
				However it could be a reserved project for a later phase.			
Policy High IBP/307	East West Corridor	Green Infrastructure	Establishment and maintenance of an accessible Green Ring around the village of Southbourne, providing a variety of green infrastructure assets, including informal open space, allotments, a playing field, a footpath/cycleway network, children's play areas	Once costs and other funding sources are known this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown Sport England, Sustrans, WSCC Parish Council		<b>£0</b>
Policy High IBP/290	Manhood Peninsula	Flood and coastal erosion risk management	Coast Protection -Selsey – Wittering Beach Management	Not selected for CIL funding because this project does not support the growth of the area	£1,000,000 FDGIA est. £750k CDC est. £250k	£0 provided that the expected funding from other sources is obtained.	<b>£0</b>
Policy High IBP/338	East West Corridor	Library Services	Expansion of the services provided by Southbourne Library	Once costs and other funding sources are known this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown		<b>£0</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Policy High IBP/355	East West Corridor	Smarter Choices and promote sustainable modes of transport	RTPI screens at key locations	Select for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	£150,000 (20 screens)	£150,000	<b>£150,000 in year 2020-2021</b>
Policy High IBP/582	East West Corridor	Local road network	Railway crossing improvements at Basin Road and Southgate/Stockbridge Road	Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown CIL, Network Rail and WSCC		<b>£0</b>
Desirable IBP/302	East West Corridor	Playing fields, sports pitches, related build and children's play areas	Resite football club (Bosham) Shared use of recreation ground public/school/FC unsatisfactory & prohibitive to promotion/advancement	Not selected for CIL funding because this project does not support the growth of the area	£500k Parish Council	£500,000	<b>£0</b>
Desirable IBP/304	East West Corridor	Playing fields, sports pitches, related build and children's play areas	Provision of Youth facilities (Southbourne)	Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown WSCC, Developer contributions		<b>£0</b>

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Desirable IBP/305	East West Corridor	Playing fields, sports pitches, related build and children's play areas	Provision of Artificial Grass Pitch/MUGA (Southbourne)	Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	£700k - £1m From WSCC, Developer contributions, Sport England, Bourne Community College	£1,000,000	£0
Desirable IBP/306	East West Corridor	Playing fields, sports pitches, related build and children's play areas	Youth skate park (Southbourne Playing fields, sports pitches, related build and children's play areas)	Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	£80k - £120k From WSCC, Developer contributions, Parish Council	£120,000	£0
Desirable IBP/320	North of the District	Public open space	New Road, Parking area and SUDS pond and play area , Butts Common (Kirdford)	Parish to consider funding from their CIL . Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown		£0
Desirable IBP/318	North of the District	Landscaping, planting and woodland creation and public rights of way	New footpaths & Community Amenity Space Development Site North of Village (Kirdford)	Parish to consider funding from their CIL. Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL	Cost unknown		£0

Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
				funding as this project supports the growth of the area			
Desirable IBP/534	East West Corridor	Public and Community Services - Police	Part refurbishment of Chichester Police Station	Not selected as Police are directly funded from Council Tax. The refurbishment should fit the Police funded budget identified.	£1m £700k self fund via Sussex Police capital budget.	£300,000	£0
Desirable IBP/321	North of the District	Community facilities	Village Social & Recreational Hub On land south east of Townfield (Kirdford)	Parish to consider funding from their CIL. Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown		£0
Desirable IBP/319	North of the District	Cycle and pedestrian infrastructure	Improve local footpaths, cycle tracks & equestrian ways Parishwide (Kirdford)	Parish to consider funding from their CIL. Once costs and other funding sources are identified this project could be selected for CIL funding as this project supports the growth of the area	Cost unknown		£0



Prioritisation	Location	Project Type	Project Name	Project Status	Est Cost Funding Sources	Requested CIL	Amount to be granted from CIL by year
Desirable IBP/583	East West Corridor	Utility services	Free wifi in Chichester City Centre	Details of project insufficient at present to be selected at present	£100,000 LEP, BID		<b>£0</b>

# 6 Cashflow and Spending Plan

## Introduction

6.1 This IBP helps to explain the identified priority infrastructure project requirements across the numerous geographies of the Chichester Local Plan area to date and to establish the potential cost of delivering the infrastructure. This section of the IBP builds upon the project costs identified previously and explores the potential funding streams that could meet those costs. An estimation of CIL receipts has been included based on the current housing site trajectory and the current CIL charging rates.

6.2 The identification of likely cash flow provides an opportunity to review the projects which require priority funding through the CIL income stream.

## Estimated CIL Receipt Income

6.3 For the purposes of this IBP an estimation of CIL receipts between 2016 and 2029 has been calculated. This information will be updated as further information becomes available. Until the CIL liability is actually known it can only ever be a best estimate, and it has been based on the following assumptions:

- The trajectory of June 2015 has been used.
- An average residential unit has been applied at 90sqm internal floorspace
- An affordable housing rate of 30% has been applied to all developments.
- Calculations are based on a CIL rate of £120sqm for development in the south of the plan area and £200sqm in the north of the plan area. No index linking has been applied to account for inflation over time.
- It does not take into account the payment by instalment policy, so in practice there will be a time delay in the CIL money being collected, particularly for larger schemes.
- No account has been taken for CIL receipts collected from retail or student housing, this is because these projects are speculative in nature and as such do not have a timeframe attached to them.
- It also does not take account of the 5% allowed to be used for administration of the CIL.

**Table 4. Housing Trajectory showing potential CIL revenue from planned housing in Chichester Local Plan period to 2029  
CIL revenue by parish over Local Plan period (updated 9 December 2015)**

Parish <sup>1</sup>	Housing provision in Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies	Remaining Local Plan housing requirement following permissions granted	Total identified housing potential <sup>2</sup>	Proposed CIL charging rate per sq.m	Assumed % onsite affordable housing <sup>3</sup>	Total Potential CIL revenue from housing development <sup>4</sup>
<b>East-West Corridor</b>						
Bosham	50	50	50	£120	30%	£378,000
Boxgrove	25	25	25	£120	30%	£189,000
Chichester city						
- West of Chichester	1,250	1,250	1,250	£120	30%	£9,450,000
- Westhampnett/NEC (part)	200	200	200	£120	30%	£1,512,000
- Chichester City North			160	£120	30%	£1,209,600
- Other identified sites			21	£120	30%	£158,760
- Chichester parish housing	235	201	201	£120	30%	£1,519,560
Chichester city total	1,685	1,651	1,832			£13,849,920
Chidham & Hambrook	25	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Fishbourne	50	25	40	£120	30%	£302,400
Funtington (part)	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Lavant (part)	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	500	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Southbourne						
- Southbourne village	300	53	55	£120	30%	£415,800
- Elsewhere in parish	50	50	50	£120	30%	£378,000
Southbourne total	350	103	105			793,800
Tangmere (including SDL)						
- Tangmere SDL	1,000	1,000	1,000	£120	30%	£7,560,000
- Non-strategic NP sites	0	0	42	£120	30%	£317,520
Tangmere total	1,000	1,000	1,042			£7,877,520
West Thorney	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Westbourne	25	25	25	£120	30%	£189,000
Westhampnett (part of SDL)	300	300	300	£120	30%	£2,268,000
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>4,010</b>	<b>3,179</b>	<b>3,419</b>			<b>£25,847,640</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>						

Parish <sup>1</sup>	Housing provision in Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies	Remaining Local Plan housing requirement following permissions granted	Total identified housing potential <sup>2</sup>	Proposed CIL charging rate per sq.m	Assumed % onsite affordable housing <sup>3</sup>	Total Potential CIL revenue from housing development <sup>4</sup>
Appledram	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Birdham	50	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Donnington	50	0	16	£120	30%	£120,960
Earnley	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	180	130	130	£120	30%	£982,800
Hunston	25	7	7	£120	0%	£75,600
North Mundham	25	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Selsey	150	0	0	£120	30%	£0
Sidlesham	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
West Itchenor	0	0	0	£120	30%	£0
West Wittering	50	0	0	£120	30%	£0
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>153</b>			<b>£1,179,360</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>						
Lynchmere	10	10	10	£200	0%	£180,000
Kirdford	60	60	60	£200	30%	£756,000
Loxwood	60	43	43	£200	30%	£541,800
Plaistow & Ifold	10	10	10	£200	0%	£180,000
Wisborough Green	60	25	33	£200	30%	£415,800
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>156</b>			<b>£2,073,600</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,740</b>	<b>3,464</b>	<b>3,728</b>			<b>£29,100,600</b>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Small parts of the parishes of Eartham, Ebernoe, Fernhurst, Northchapel, Petworth and Stoughton fall within the Chichester Local Plan area, but are unlikely to deliver new housing within the Plan period.

<sup>2</sup> Includes additional housing proposed in draft neighbourhood plans and other identified sites within existing settlement boundaries (e.g SHLAA sites)

<sup>3</sup> Assumes 30% affordable housing on sites of 11+ dwellings only (smaller developments will provide no affordable housing or provide an in lieu payment for offsite provision)

<sup>4</sup> Assumes average size of residential units to be built = 90 sq.m & 30% affordable housing (CIL exempt)

This shows that the CIL is expected to raise approximately **£29m** over the lifetime of the plan.

The amount showing the estimated amount of CIL to be passed to the City, Town and Parish Councils is shown in the tables below. The City, Town and Parish Council should use this information to inform their CIL spending priorities.

**Table 5: Potential parish level CIL receipts assuming adopted neighbourhood plans (25% of CIL receipts)**

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
<b>East-West Corridor</b>								
Bosham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£94,500	£94,500
Boxgrove	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250
Chichester city								
- <i>West of Chichester</i>	£0	£0	£141,750	£141,750	£141,750	£425,250	£1,937,250	£2,362,500
- <i>Westhampnett/NEC (part)</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£378,000	£378,000
- <i>Chichester City North</i>	£0	£75,600	£113,400	£113,400	£0	£302,400	£0	£302,400
- <i>Other identified sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£39,690	£39,690	£0	£39,690
- <i>Chichester parish housing</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£379,890	£379,890
Chichester city total	£0	£75,600	£255,150	£255,150	£181,440	£767,340	£2,695,140	£3,462,480
Chidham & Hambrook	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fishbourne	£0	£47,250	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£28,350	£75,600
Funtington (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Lavant (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Southbourne								
- <i>Southbourne village</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£75,600	£75,600	£28,350	£103,950
- <i>Elsewhere in parish</i>	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250	£0	£94,500	£0	£94,500
Southbourne total	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250	£75,600	£170,100	£28,350	£198,450
Tangmere (including SDL)								
- <i>Tangmere SDL</i>	£0	£0	£0	£141,750	£141,750	£283,500	£1,606,500	£1,890,000
- <i>Non-strategic NP sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£22,680	£22,680	£56,700	£79,380
Tangmere total	£0	£0	£0	£141,750	£164,430	£306,180	£1,663,200	£1,969,380
West Thorney	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Westbourne	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250
Westhampnett (part of SDL)	£0	£0	£122,850	£122,850	£122,850	£368,550	£198,450	£567,000
<b>E-W Corridor sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£122,850</b>	<b>£425,250</b>	<b>£567,000</b>	<b>£544,320</b>	<b>£1,659,420</b>	<b>£4,802,490</b>	<b>£6,461,910</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>								

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
Appledram	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birdham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Donnington	£0	£0	£30,240	£0	£0	£30,240	£0	£30,240
Earnley	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£245,700	£245,700
Hunston	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£18,900	£18,900
North Mundham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Selsey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sidlesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Itchenor	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Wittering	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Manhood Pen sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£30,240</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£30,240</b>	<b>£264,600</b>	<b>£294,840</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>								
Lynchmere	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,000	£45,000
Kirdford	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£15,750	£141,750	£47,250	£189,000
Loxwood	£0	£0	£63,000	£72,450	£0	£135,450	£0	£135,450
Plaistow & Ifold	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,000	£45,000
Wisborough Green	£0	£0	£34,650	£0	£0	£34,650	£69,300	£103,950
<b>Plan Area (N) sub-total</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£129,150</b>	<b>£103,950</b>	<b>£15,750</b>	<b>£311,850</b>	<b>£206,550</b>	<b>£518,400</b>
<b>PLAN AREA TOTAL</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£154,350</b>	<b>£584,640</b>	<b>£670,950</b>	<b>£560,070</b>	<b>£2,001,510</b>	<b>£5,273,640</b>	<b>£7,275,150</b>

**Table 6: Potential parish level CIL receipts assuming no neighbourhood plans (15% of CIL receipts)**

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
<b>East-West Corridor</b>								
Bosham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£56,700	£56,700
Boxgrove	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350
Chichester city								
- <i>West of Chichester</i>	£0	£0	£85,050	£85,050	£85,050	£255,150	£1,162,350	£1,417,500
- <i>Westhampnett/NEC (part)</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£226,800	£226,800
- <i>Chichester City North</i>	£0	£45,360	£68,040	£68,040	£0	£181,440	£0	£181,440
- <i>Other identified sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£23,814	£23,814	£0	£23,814
- <i>Chichester parish housing</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£227,934	£227,934
Chichester city total	£0	£45,360	£153,090	£153,090	£108,864	£460,404	£1,617,084	£2,077,488
Chidham & Hambrook	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fishbourne	£0	£28,350	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£17,010	£45,360
Funtington (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Lavant (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Southbourne								
- <i>Southbourne village</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,360	£45,360	£17,010	£62,370
- <i>Elsewhere in parish</i>	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350	£0	£56,700	£0	£56,700
Southbourne total	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350	£45,360	£102,060	£17,010	£119,070
Tangmere (including SDL)								
- <i>Tangmere SDL</i>	£0	£0	£0	£85,050	£85,050	£170,100		£170,100
- <i>Non-strategic NP sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£13,608	£13,608		£13,608
Tangmere total <sup>1</sup>	£0	£0	£0	£85,050	£98,658	£183,708	£940,000	£1,123,708
West Thorney	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Westbourne	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350
Westhampnett (part of SDL) <sup>2</sup>	£0	£0	£32,900	£32,900	£32,900	£98,700	£65,800	£164,500
<b>E-W Corridor sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£73,710</b>	<b>£214,340</b>	<b>£299,390</b>	<b>£285,782</b>	<b>£873,222</b>	<b>£2,770,304</b>	<b>£3,643,526</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>								
Appledram	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birdham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Donnington	£0	£0	£18,144	£0	£0	£18,144	£0	£18,144

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
Earnley	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£147,420	£147,420
Hunston	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£11,340	£11,340
North Mundham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Selsey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sidlesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Itchenor	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Wittering	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Manhood Pen sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£18,144</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£18,144</b>	<b>£158,760</b>	<b>£176,904</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>								
Lynchmere	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£27,000	£27,000
Kirdford <sup>3</sup>	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£15,750	£141,750	£47,250	£189,000
Loxwood <sup>3</sup>	£0	£0	£63,000	£72,450	£0	£135,450	£0	£135,450
Plaistow & Ifold	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£27,000	£27,000
Wisborough Green	£0	£0	£20,790	£0	£0	£20,790	£41,580	£62,370
<b>Plan Area (N) sub-total</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£115,290</b>	<b>£103,950</b>	<b>£15,750</b>	<b>£297,990</b>	<b>£142,830</b>	<b>£440,820</b>
<b>PLAN AREA TOTAL</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£105,210</b>	<b>£347,774</b>	<b>£403,340</b>	<b>£301,532</b>	<b>£1,189,356</b>	<b>£3,071,894</b>	<b>£4,261,250</b>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Tangmere Parish annual CIL receipt would be capped at £117,500 per year

<sup>2</sup> Westhampnett Parish annual CIL receipt would be capped at £32,900 per year

<sup>3</sup> Neighbourhood plan already in place so 25% CIL receipts already guaranteed

The tables (7,8 &9) below show the total potential CIL receipts by geographical sub area by phase, before administrative costs of up to 5% are deducted. This identifies that:

- £8m is available to contribute to the priorities identified during this first IBP period (2016-2021) inclusive of parish proportion or
- £6m without parish proportion assuming that a neighbourhood plan is in place, or
- £7m if a neighbourhood plan is not in place.



**Table 7: Potential total CIL receipts from planned housing by Local Plan sub-area**

Assumed average dwelling size (internal floor area) = 90 sq.m

All developments of 11+ dwellings assumed to provide 30% affordable housing (which is CIL exempt)

CIL contribution per dwelling

- South of Plan area £10,800
- North of Plan area £18,000

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
<b>East-West Corridor</b>								
Bosham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£378,000	£378,000
Boxgrove	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£189,000	£189,000
Chichester city								
- <i>West of Chichester</i>	£0	£0	£567,000	£567,000	£567,000	£1,701,000	£7,749,000	£9,450,000
- <i>Westhampnett/NEC (part)</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,512,000	£1,512,000
- <i>Chichester City North</i>	£0	£302,400	£453,600	£453,600	£0	£1,209,600	£0	£1,209,600
- <i>Other identified sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£158,760	£158,760	£0	£158,760
- <i>Chichester parish housing</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£1,519,560	£1,519,560
Chichester city total	£0	£302,400	£1,020,600	£1,020,600	£725,760	£3,069,360	£10,780,560	£13,849,920
Chidham & Hambrook	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fishbourne	£0	£189,000	£0	£0	£0	£189,000	£113,400	£302,400
Funtington (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Lavant (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Southbourne								
- <i>Southbourne village</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£302,400	£302,400	£113,400	£415,800
- <i>Elsewhere in parish</i>	£0	£0	£189,000	£189,000	£0	£378,000	£0	£378,000
Southbourne total	£0	£0	£189,000	£189,000	£302,400	£680,400	£113,400	£793,800
Tangmere (including SDL)								
- <i>Tangmere SDL</i>	£0	£0	£0	£567,000	£567,000	£1,134,000	£6,426,000	£7,560,000
- <i>Non-strategic NP sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£90,720	£90,720	£226,800	£317,520

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
Tangmere total	£0	£0	£0	£567,000	£657,720	£1,224,720	£6,652,800	£7,877,520
West Thorney	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Westbourne	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£189,000	£189,000
Westhampnett (part of SDL)	£0	£0	£491,400	£491,400	£491,400	£1,474,200	£793,800	£2,268,000
<b><i>E-W Corridor sub-total</i></b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£491,400</b>	<b>£1,701,000</b>	<b>£2,268,000</b>	<b>£2,177,280</b>	<b>£6,637,680</b>	<b>£19,209,960</b>	<b>£25,847,640</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>								
Appledram	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birdham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Donnington	£0	£0	£120,960	£0	£0	£120,960	£0	£120,960
Earnley	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£982,800	£982,800
Hunston	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£75,600	£75,600
North Mundham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Selsey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sidlesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Itchenor	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Wittering	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b><i>Manhood Pen sub-total</i></b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£120,960</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£120,960</b>	<b>£1,058,400</b>	<b>£1,179,360</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>								
Lynchmere	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£180,000	£180,000
Kirdford	£126,000	£126,000	£126,000	£126,000	£63,000	£567,000	£189,000	£756,000
Loxwood	£0	£0	£252,000	£289,800	£0	£541,800	£0	£541,800
Plaistow & Ifold	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£180,000	£180,000
Wisborough Green	£0	£0	£138,600	£0	£0	£138,600	£277,200	£415,800
<b><i>Plan Area (N) sub-total</i></b>	<b>£126,000</b>	<b>£126,000</b>	<b>£516,600</b>	<b>£415,800</b>	<b>£63,000</b>	<b>£1,247,400</b>	<b>£826,200</b>	<b>£2,073,600</b>
<b>PLAN AREA TOTAL</b>	<b>£126,000</b>	<b>£617,400</b>	<b>£2,338,560</b>	<b>£2,683,800</b>	<b>£2,240,280</b>	<b>£8,006,040</b>	<b>£21,094,560</b>	<b>£29,100,600</b>

**Table 8: Potential parish level CIL receipts assuming adopted neighbourhood plans (25% of CIL receipts)**

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
<b>East-West Corridor</b>								
Bosham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£94,500	£94,500
Boxgrove	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250
Chichester city								
- <i>West of Chichester</i>	£0	£0	£141,750	£141,750	£141,750	£425,250	£1,937,250	£2,362,500
- <i>Westhampnett/NEC (part)</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£378,000	£378,000
- <i>Chichester City North</i>	£0	£75,600	£113,400	£113,400	£0	£302,400	£0	£302,400
- <i>Other identified sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£39,690	£39,690	£0	£39,690
- <i>Chichester parish housing</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£379,890	£379,890
Chichester city total	£0	£75,600	£255,150	£255,150	£181,440	£767,340	£2,695,140	£3,462,480
Chidham & Hambrook	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fishbourne	£0	£47,250	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£28,350	£75,600
Funtington (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Lavant (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Southbourne								
- <i>Southbourne village</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£75,600	£75,600	£28,350	£103,950
- <i>Elsewhere in parish</i>	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250	£0	£94,500	£0	£94,500
Southbourne total	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250	£75,600	£170,100	£28,350	£198,450
Tangmere (including SDL)								
- <i>Tangmere SDL</i>	£0	£0	£0	£141,750	£141,750	£283,500	£1,606,500	£1,890,000
- <i>Non-strategic NP sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£22,680	£22,680	£56,700	£79,380
Tangmere total	£0	£0	£0	£141,750	£164,430	£306,180	£1,663,200	£1,969,380
West Thorney	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Westbourne	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£47,250	£47,250
Westhampnett (part of SDL)	£0	£0	£122,850	£122,850	£122,850	£368,550	£198,450	£567,000
<b><i>E-W Corridor sub-total</i></b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£122,850</b>	<b>£425,250</b>	<b>£567,000</b>	<b>£544,320</b>	<b>£1,659,420</b>	<b>£4,802,490</b>	<b>£6,461,910</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>								
Appledram	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birdham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
Donnington	£0	£0	£30,240	£0	£0	£30,240	£0	£30,240
Earnley	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£245,700	£245,700
Hunston	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£18,900	£18,900
North Mundham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Selsey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sidlesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Itchenor	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Wittering	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Manhood Pen sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£30,240</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£30,240</b>	<b>£264,600</b>	<b>£294,840</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>								
Lynchmere	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,000	£45,000
Kirdford	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£15,750	£141,750	£47,250	£189,000
Loxwood	£0	£0	£63,000	£72,450	£0	£135,450	£0	£135,450
Plaistow & Ifold	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,000	£45,000
Wisborough Green	£0	£0	£34,650	£0	£0	£34,650	£69,300	£103,950
<b>Plan Area (N) sub-total</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£129,150</b>	<b>£103,950</b>	<b>£15,750</b>	<b>£311,850</b>	<b>£206,550</b>	<b>£518,400</b>
<b>PLAN AREA TOTAL</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£154,350</b>	<b>£584,640</b>	<b>£670,950</b>	<b>£560,070</b>	<b>£2,001,510</b>	<b>£5,273,640</b>	<b>£7,275,150</b>

**Table 9: Potential parish level CIL receipts assuming no neighbourhood plans (15% of CIL receipts)**

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
<b>East-West Corridor</b>								
Bosham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£56,700	£56,700
Boxgrove	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350
Chichester city								
- <i>West of Chichester</i>	£0	£0	£85,050	£85,050	£85,050	£255,150	£1,162,350	£1,417,500
- <i>Westhampnett/NEC (part)</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£226,800	£226,800
- <i>Chichester City North</i>	£0	£45,360	£68,040	£68,040	£0	£181,440	£0	£181,440
- <i>Other identified sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£23,814	£23,814	£0	£23,814
- <i>Chichester parish housing</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£227,934	£227,934
Chichester city total	£0	£45,360	£153,090	£153,090	£108,864	£460,404	£1,617,084	£2,077,488
Chidham & Hambrook	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Fishbourne	£0	£28,350	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£17,010	£45,360
Funtington (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Lavant (part)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Oving (inc Shopwyke SDL)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Southbourne								
- <i>Southbourne village</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£45,360	£45,360	£17,010	£62,370
- <i>Elsewhere in parish</i>	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350	£0	£56,700	£0	£56,700
Southbourne total	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350	£45,360	£102,060	£17,010	£119,070
Tangmere (including SDL)								
- <i>Tangmere SDL</i>	£0	£0	£0	£85,050	£85,050	£170,100		£170,100
- <i>Non-strategic NP sites</i>	£0	£0	£0	£0	£13,608	£13,608		£13,608
Tangmere total <sup>1</sup>	£0	£0	£0	£85,050	£98,658	£183,708	£940,000	£1,123,708
West Thorney	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Westbourne	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£28,350	£28,350
Westhampnett (part of SDL) <sup>2</sup>	£0	£0	£32,900	£32,900	£32,900	£98,700	£65,800	£164,500
<b>E-W Corridor sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£73,710</b>	<b>£214,340</b>	<b>£299,390</b>	<b>£285,782</b>	<b>£873,222</b>	<b>£2,770,304</b>	<b>£3,643,526</b>
<b>Manhood Peninsula</b>								
Appledram	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Birdham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0

	Projected CIL receipts							
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Total 2016-2021	Total 2021-2029	Total 2016-2029
Donnington	£0	£0	£18,144	£0	£0	£18,144	£0	£18,144
Earnley	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
East Wittering & Bracklesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£147,420	£147,420
Hunston	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£11,340	£11,340
North Mundham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Selsey	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Sidlesham	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Itchenor	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
West Wittering	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
<b>Manhood Pen sub-total</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£18,144</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£18,144</b>	<b>£158,760</b>	<b>£176,904</b>
<b>Plan Area (North)</b>								
Lynchmere	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£27,000	£27,000
Kirdford <sup>3</sup>	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£31,500	£15,750	£141,750	£47,250	£189,000
Loxwood <sup>3</sup>	£0	£0	£63,000	£72,450	£0	£135,450	£0	£135,450
Plaistow & Ifold	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£27,000	£27,000
Wisborough Green	£0	£0	£20,790	£0	£0	£20,790	£41,580	£62,370
<b>Plan Area (N) sub-total</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£115,290</b>	<b>£103,950</b>	<b>£15,750</b>	<b>£297,990</b>	<b>£142,830</b>	<b>£440,820</b>
<b>PLAN AREA TOTAL</b>	<b>£31,500</b>	<b>£105,210</b>	<b>£347,774</b>	<b>£403,340</b>	<b>£301,532</b>	<b>£1,189,356</b>	<b>£3,071,894</b>	<b>£4,261,250</b>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Tangmere Parish annual CIL receipt would be capped at £117,500 per year

<sup>2</sup> Westhampnett Parish annual CIL receipt would be capped at £32,900 per year

<sup>3</sup> Neighbourhood plan already in place so 25% CIL receipts already guaranteed

6.4 The table 10 below shows the total cost of projects by priority category which were put forward for CIL funding. This identifies a funding gap which means that the projects need to be prioritised for CIL funding.

**Table 10: Total cost of projects by priority category put forward for CIL funding**

	Short Term (2016-2021)	Medium - Long Term (2021-2029)	Total across Local Plan Period
Critical Project Costs	£0	£0	£0
Essential Project Costs	£8,025,000	£34,120,000	£42,145,000
Policy High Project Costs	£265,000	£8,648,000	£8,913,000
Desirable Project Costs	£1,920,000	£600,000	£2,520,000
Total Project Costs	£10,210,000	£43,368,000	£53,578,000
<b>Assuming CIL Income*</b>	<b>£8,006,040 less</b>	<b>£21,094,560 less</b>	<b>£29,100,600 less</b>
This includes the Parish proportion, and includes a 5% deduction for the administration of the CIL.	<b>£400,302 = £7,605,738</b>	<b>£1,054,728 = £20,039,832</b>	<b>£1,455,030 = £27,645,570</b>
Additional Funding Required	£2,604,262	£23,328,168	£25,932,430

The table 11 below shows the projects selected to be funded from Chichester's proportion of the CIL in this first five year IBP period by year.

**Table 11: Projects selected for CIL funding from the long list in table 3**

Year 2016/17	Year 2017/18	Year 2018/19	Year 2019/20	Year 2020/21
Expected CIL income 126,000	Expected CIL income 617,400	Expected CIL income 2,338,560	Expected CIL income 2,683,800	Expected CIL income 2,240,280
Less 25% = 94,500	Less 25% = 463,050	Less 25% = 1,753,920	Less 25% = 2,012,850	Less 25% = 1,680,210
Less 5% = <b>88,200</b>	Less 5% = <b>432,180</b>	Less 5% = <b>1,636,992</b>	Less 5% = <b>1,878,600</b>	Less 5% = <b>1,568,196</b>
<b>Amount available to CDC for CIL spend once 25% Neighbourhood proportion and 5% admin costs are deducted</b>				
<b>£88,200</b>	<b>£432,180+£43,200= £475,380</b>	<b>£1,636,992+£355,380= £1,992,372</b>	<b>£1,878,600+£872,372= £2,750,972</b>	<b>£1,568,196+£1,530,972= £3,099,168</b>
<b>Projects selected for funding</b>				
Ambulance project 533 £45,000	Smarter choices E-W corridor project 350 £120,000	School places E-W project 330 Chichester £1m	School places Bournes project 331 £1m	School places Manhood Peninsula project 332 £1m
		Smarter choices E-W corridor project 350 £120,000	School places north of district project 536 £100,000	Medical Centre W of Chichester Project 398 £1.3m
			Smarter choices E-W corridor project 350 £120,000	RTPi screens project 355 £150,000 project
				Smarter choices E-W corridor project 350 £120,000
				Local land drainage East Beach Sea Outfall project 293 £100,000
				Brandy Hole Copse project 196 £10,000
Balance to be banked and carried forward into year 2017/18 £ 43,200	Balance to be banked and carried forward into year 2018/19 £355,380	Balance to be banked and carried forward into year 2019/2020 £872,372	Balance to be banked and carried forward into year 2020/21 £1,530,972	Balance to be banked and carried forward into year 2021/22 £419,168

6.5 The ability to identify appropriate funding sources is therefore essential given the anticipated funding gap. CIL receipts should only be considered as one source that is available to fund infrastructure and not the only tool. Appendix D provides a review of funding sources but the onus must be on individual stakeholders to explore opportunities for cost efficiencies under delivery and/or funding sources that will reduce the call upon CIL Monies.



# 7 Implementation, Monitoring & Governance

## Introduction

7.1 A clear framework and shared understanding of infrastructure priorities between delivery partners will be required to effectively implement and monitor spend and receipt of CIL monies. The IBP sets out the relationship between the development trajectory and infrastructure provision to provide a pro-active approach in mitigating the pressures arising from growth. The IBP seeks to identify the funding gap that exists and the requirement to identify additional funding sources as well as consideration of alternative options for delivery and implementation.

7.2 The IBP is a 'living' document and will be consistently reviewed in order to respond to emerging development proposals and growth requirements. As noted previously the IBP does not therefore represent an exhaustive list of defined projects but is a reflection of the current understanding that is expected to be refined with additional projects or amendments that reflect alternative approaches to project delivery under future IBPs.

7.3 The community at large, the development industry and infrastructure delivery commissioners will benefit from greater certainty about what infrastructure will be provided and its timing.

## CIL Governance

7.4 Implementation of the IBP and effective allocation of CIL receipts requires a clear governance structure to facilitate effective delivery and monitoring. The IBP Joint Member Liaison group was established on 2 June 2015 by CDC Cabinet. Its purpose is to consider and endorse the draft Chichester Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) on an annual basis.

7.5 The IBP identifies funding sources and responsible delivery agencies, in order to support the development growth identified in the Local Plan to 2029. The IBP is drafted by a joint CDC/WSCC officer working group. The Joint Member Liaison Group considers the draft for stakeholder consultation and then recommends the final version in the light of that consultation.

7.6 Membership is open to elected members of WSCC and CDC. It was agreed that the joint member liaison Group would not be a formal decision-making joint committee and so it would not be necessary that the two councils should have equality of representation. It would be for each Council to determine its mix of executive and non-executive members without being so large as to be unwieldy. Chichester has appointed the Leader of the Council the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning and a member from the Development Plan and Infrastructure Panel. WSCC has in mind to appoint one member of its Cabinet and the Chairmen of the two County Local Committees.

7.7 The member liaison group will meet in September 2015 to consider and endorse the draft IBP for consultation with stakeholders, including developers, infrastructure providers and parish councils. It would then meet again in December 2015 to make any amendments resulting from the consultation.

7.8 CIL Regulation 59C states that a local council (Town, City, Parish Council) must use CIL receipts passed onto it in accordance with regulation 59A or 59B to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area, by funding – (a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or (b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.

7.9 The City, Town and Parish Councils should note that if they have not spent the CIL allocations made to them within five years of receipt the District Council will ask for the monies back (see CIL Regulation 59E(10) for details). The exception to this is where a City, Town or Parish Council has identified 'up front' the need to fund an infrastructure project, where the CIL contributions accrued within the five year period are insufficient to fund the project, but it can be demonstrated that there is a realistic prospect of the project being delivered during the timeframe of the Local Plan.

7.10 If the City, Town or Parish Council does not feel that it has the necessary experience to manage their proportion of the CIL spend, it is imperative that they indicate this to the District Council at the earliest opportunity. In this is the case, the District Council would reserve the option to make a charge for managing the CIL on their behalf.

7.11 Final decisions on the allocation of CIL would then be made by CDC Full Council on the recommendation of Cabinet, in accordance with the endorsed IBP and as part of the process of preparing and approving the Council's own revenue budget and capital programme.

7.12 The Council's capital programme would include the District Council's own infrastructure provision and planned payments of CIL towards the infrastructure of other Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners. It would not include infrastructure of other providers fully funded from other sources such as S106. It would be for Infrastructure Delivery Commissioners to manage cash flow for their infrastructure provision, including before CIL is paid over.

7.13 If the need arises for major changes to the IBP to be made outside the decision-making cycle, the Joint Member Liaison Group will be consulted and CDC's normal decision making procedure can be followed

### **Monitoring**

7.14 The IBP will be monitored through the Authority's Local Plan Monitoring Report, published annually in December. This will include a record of payments through S106 and CIL, as well as tracking development. The IBP will also be subject to scrutiny from the Corporate Governance and Audit Committee.

7.15 The Governance structure, process and timeline for the production of the first IBP is set out in the diagram below.



# 8 Conclusions

## Introduction

8.1 This IBP has set out the current understanding of infrastructure required to support the anticipated levels of growth during the first five years of the Local Plan 2016- 2021. Projects have been summarised by spatial area and project type with a clearly defined approach to project classification and prioritisation.

8.2 This IBP is critical in establishing the agreed focus for spend during the first five years, and provides vital information for all infrastructure providers, to assist their spending plans, as well as providing assurance to the public about what infrastructure will be provided within this period.

## The Current Situation

8.3 It has been the purpose of this IBP to capture the current understanding of all infrastructure projects considered necessary to support the delivery of the Chichester Local Plan, and set out an approach to prioritising projects from the full list as candidates for funding support through the Chichester Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which is expected to come into force on 1 February 2016. Despite a clear approach to infrastructure prioritisation being set out and an initial attempt to model infrastructure both by level of priority and timeframe for delivery there remains a significant funding gap in the short, medium and long term. This is detailed across chapter 6 which presents the current cashflow and spending plan. Whilst the deficit is not unexpected, future iterations of the IBP need to scrutinise the cost breakdown of infrastructure projects, their ability to meet the legal tests set out for CIL funding. This will be facilitated by a more refined appreciation of the development trajectory as time progresses with further details of project delivery known. This greater level of detail will benefit future decision-making as it will show greater detail on the candidate projects for funding support, the ways in which the project will be delivered and managed and any link between CIL funding support and leveraging in other private/public funding sources.

8.4 This document therefore provides the means to further define and inform the next steps, guiding the approach towards management of CIL receipts across the first five year rolling IBP programme.

8.5 In exceptional circumstances, some projects might be funded from other sources, in advance of sufficient CIL reserves, whilst other projects may have to wait until sufficient CIL reserves have been collected. All CIL receipts will be put into an interest bearing account until they are spent. However, the costs associated with the administration of the CIL (up to 5%) will be drawn upon as needed, and the City, town and parish councils portion will be handed over bi-annually in accordance with the CIL regulations.