



**Wigan Local Development Framework
Infrastructure Delivery Plan
Evidence Review**

June 2009

**Wigan Council
Environmental Services**

Contents

Title	Table
A. International	
B. National	
<u>PPS12 – Local Spatial Planning</u>	B1
<u>Circular 05/2005</u>	B2
<u>CLG Infrastructure Delivery - Spatial Plans in Practice: Supporting the reform of local planning</u>	B3
<u>Shaping and Delivering Tomorrow's Places: Effective Practice in Spatial Planning</u>	B4
<u>PAS implementing your LDF: the integration of infrastructure and development in plan-making (seminar findings)</u>	B5
<u>The Community Infrastructure Levy</u>	B6
<u>POS Infrastructure planning and the Community Infrastructure Levy – an advice note</u>	B7
<u>Sustainable Communities Act: Local Spending Report England 2006 - 07</u>	B8
C. Regional	
<u>NWDA North West Utilities Infrastructure Study</u>	C1
D. Sub Regional	
E. Local	
<u>Wigan Council Capital Programme</u>	E1
F. Other Relevant Documents (e.g. Best Practice Examples)	
<u>Moving from piecemeal to strategic: securing infrastructure in Chelmsford / Chelmsford Draft Developer Contributions SPD</u>	F1
<u>Joint infrastructure planning: South Bedfordshire and Luton, Surrey, Swindon and Tower Hamlets – case studies</u>	F2

Table B1	
Title	PPS12 – Local Spatial Planning
Proponent body	CLG
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Statutory
Date produced	July 2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>Planning Policy Statements set out the government's policies on different aspects of spatial planning in England. This PPS replaces previous PPS12 Local Development Frameworks. It sets out what the key ingredients of local spatial plans are and the key government policies on how they should be prepared. It places a greater emphasis on delivery and states:</p> <p><i>"4.8 The core strategy should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed for the area, taking account of its type and distribution. This evidence should cover who will provide the infrastructure and when it will be provided. The core strategy should draw on and in parallel influence any strategies and investment plans of the local authority and other organisations"</i></p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>Key General Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes explicit the need for LDF (specifically Core Strategy) to be closely integrated with SCS, • Stronger emphasis on collaborative working (with LSP, neighbouring LAs and delivery stakeholders), and need for stronger corporate lead; • Less prescriptive planning preparation procedures; LPA has more flexibility to decide which DPDs to produce, and who, how and when engagement takes place (wide and continuous engagement which should be 'proportionate to the scale of issues involved'); • Stronger emphasis on role of Core Strategy and need for forward looking infrastructure planning (Infrastructure / delivery planning process should inform Core Strategy and form part of robust evidence base); • Inclusion of Strategic Sites in Core Strategy; • Introduction of a publication stage prior to the submission of a DPD for examination; • Repackaging tests of soundness – Procedural elements now dealt with through legal requirements check. To be sound a Core Strategy should be JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE and consistent with NATIONAL POLICY. <p>Submission document to be published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Strategy DPD; • the SA report; • a consultation statement (setting out who was involved, how they were involved in the plan and a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed); and • any other supporting documents relevant to the preparation of the development plan document. <p>Core Strategy Submission Check-list:</p> <p>Structure – need to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Vision is evidence based, conforms with RSS and closely relates to SCS; • Strategic Objectives focus on how key issues will be addressed and provide link between high level vision and detailed strategy; • Includes a Delivery Strategy for achieving these objectives; • Strategic sites are outlined on key diagram; • Clear arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the strategy are included; • Plan period is at least 15 years. <p>Legal Requirements – need to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in accordance with LDS, SCI and Regs; • SA/SEA forms part of evidence base and informed the evaluation of alternatives to support the ascertain that the plan is the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives; 	

- Has regard to national policy and conforms with RSS without repetition of higher level documents;
- Core Strategy is aligned and co-ordinates with SCS;

Test of Soundness - need to ensure Core Strategy is:

- **Consistent with NATIONAL POLICY;**
- **JUSTIFIED i.e.–**
 - founded on robust evidence base (demonstrate evidence of suitable participation, research / fact finding);
 - most appropriate when considered against reasonable alternatives (supported by SA/SEA);
- **EFFECTIVE i.e. -**
 - Deliverable –
 - Strategy should be based on sound infrastructure delivery planning* and set out how much, where, when, how and by whom development will be delivered and to ensure essential partners are signed up to it;
 - ensure there are no regulatory barriers,
 - be coherent with neighbouring authority Core Strategy w.r.t cross boundary issues.
 - Flexible – be able to show how to handle contingencies. Core Strategy should show what alternative strategies have been prepared to handle uncertainty and what would trigger their use. Should not rely or review of plan to deal with uncertainty.
 - Able to be Monitored – Core Strategy should contain clear arrangements for monitoring and reporting results. Delivery Strategy should contain clear targets of measurable outcomes and provide a basis upon which contingency plans within the strategy will be triggered.

*Core Strategy needs to be supported by sound infrastructure delivery planning – should be part of robust evidence base and LA needs to be able to demonstrate that the physical, social and green infrastructure required to deliver the strategy has been fully considered and should be able to identify as far as possible:

- Infrastructure needs and costs;
- Phasing of development;
- Funding sources; and
- Responsibility for delivery

Opportunities

Sets the framework for local infrastructure planning to support the provisions of the Core Strategy

Issues and constraints

How could the LDF respond?

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B2	
Title	Circular 05/2005
Proponent body	CLG
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Statutory
Date produced	2005
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>The purpose of this Circular is to provide revised guidance on the use of planning obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as substituted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991. Sections 46 and 47 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 give the Secretary of State the power to make regulations to replace s106, but the Secretary of State has not yet taken these powers, and so the Circular does not concern these sections.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>The principal objective of the planning system is to deliver sustainable development, through which key Government social, environmental and economic objectives are achieved.</p> <p>Circular 05/2005 is the current national policy advice relating specifically to planning obligations and sets out the improvements that the Government would like to see in the current system pending the introduction of further future reforms.</p> <p>In dealing with planning applications, local planning authorities consider each on its merits and reach a decision based on whether the application accords with the relevant development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where applications do not meet these requirements, they may be refused. However, in some instances, it may be possible to make acceptable development proposals which might otherwise be unacceptable, through the use of planning conditions or, where this is not possible, through planning obligations.</p> <p>Planning obligations (or "s106 agreements") are private agreements negotiated, usually in the context of planning applications, between local planning authorities and persons with an interest in a piece of land (or "developers"), and intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Obligations can also be secured through unilateral undertakings by developers. For example, planning obligations might be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to prescribe the nature of a development (e.g. by requiring that a given proportion of housing is affordable); or to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development (e.g. loss of open space); or to mitigate a development's impact (e.g. through increased public transport provision). <p>The outcome of all three of these uses of planning obligations should be that the proposed development concerned is made to accord with published local, regional or national planning policies. The obligations created run with the land.</p> <p>It makes clear that it is appropriate to seek financial or other contributions to compensate for loss or damage caused by a development, or to mitigate the impact of a development and especially encourages the use of formulae and standard charges as a means of streamlining the planning obligations process and making it more predictable and transparent.</p> <p>The Circular sets out five tests that a planning obligation must be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> relevant to planning necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms directly related to the proposed development fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and reasonable in all other respects. <p>The use of planning obligations must be governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. It is therefore not legitimate for unacceptable development to be permitted because of benefits or inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Similarly, planning obligations should never be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share</p>	

in the profits of development, i.e. as a means of securing a "betterment levy".

Opportunities

Section 46 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which provides for the levying of planning contributions has been brought into force but the relevant Regulations which are to set out the scope of the power have not been made. This guidance therefore allows for the making of planning contributions as planning obligations pending the making of such regulations.

Issues and constraints

Emerging Community Infrastructure Levy legislation may supersede this circular.

How could the LDF respond?

That any developer obligations DPD policy and / or SPD should be couched within the existing legislative framework as detailed in this circular, until such time as any new Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations come into force.

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B3	
Title	CLG Infrastructure Delivery - Spatial Plans in Practice: Supporting the reform of local planning
Proponent body	CLG
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Non-statutory
Date produced	June 2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>This report presents the findings of the fifth thematic study (TS5) prepared as part of the Spatial Plans in Practice (SPiP) Study. It is focused on the role of spatial plans in the delivery of infrastructure requirements resulting from the reformed spatial planning process.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>Key case study findings:</p> <p>Ashford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth area – significant urban extensions proposed which requires significant levels of infrastructure provision (highways, health, education and community facilities); • Special purpose agency established, and partnership working between Agency, LA and private sector developers resulted in only tangible example of a Local infrastructure Group (LIG); • CS policies relating to a 'strategic tariff' which it is hoped will support a contractual audit trail relating in specific commitments. <p>Liverpool:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on regeneration and significant development, major landowners in a powerful position; • little evidence of co-ordination of strategy development or infrastructure analysis – no infrastructure plan; • Partnership is piecemeal – landowners interact with political leaders and Chief Exec of Council; • Links with LSP are strong. <p>Redcar and Cleveland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent example of adopted core strategy – Implementation Plan is key component with cross references with policy commitments in the CS with desired outcomes, indicators for monitoring implementation, delivery and lead agencies involved. Commended by Inspector at EiP. • Development of partnership approaches and consideration of cross-boundary issues were positive aspects, relationships between LDF and LSP developing; • Some difficulties in engaging developers, and keeping them involved, as well as timing / synchronisation issues between LDF and other Council strategic functions and externally <p>Walker Riverside (Newcastle upon Tyne) AAP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong community regeneration focus – effective partnership working considered essential • Established a Walker Riverside board – key players (internal and external) invited to sit • Co-ordination with partners seemed straight forward, but engaging private sector problematic • Consideration given to funding, however Council owned land therefore easier to control and facilitate developments – problems with timing /synchronisation with partners strategies proved a challenge <p>Key Conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LDF process not simply judged on steering documents through the statutory procedures to adoption, but whether the resulting policies and proposals make a difference to the quality of places and people's lives; • There is a gap between government expectations and current practice, in some cases even basic knowledge and understanding of issues. Need for continued effort in terms of dissemination, education, and culture change across local government and infrastructure providers 	

Key Recommendations

Identification and prioritisation of infrastructure requirements:

- Avoid simple shopping list approach. Need to prioritise potential infrastructure requirements when preparing LDF documents

Content of LDF documents:

- Avoid common weaknesses at submission which include failure to provide sufficient detail on infrastructure required, not identifying key delivery agencies and partners, insufficient consideration / evidence that key partners are committed to delivery, not have regard to existing strategies of key partners, including overly 'aspirational' or unrealistic policies and proposals
- LDF should set out clear statements relating to delivery requirements, via identification of agencies and setting targets for monitoring
- Need to monitor whether infrastructural requirements are subsequently being delivered e.g. through AMR or 'infrastructure programme' - a living document agreed jointly with delivery partners
- LPAs need sufficient evidence of joint-ownership of infrastructure proposals. 'Statements of commitment' should be secured with delivery partners (can be used as evidence w.r.t test of soundness relating to delivery)
- LPAs need to consider relationships between LDF and other local / regional plans and strategies
- Recognise the importance of community involvement / consultation with key stakeholders
- LDF documents should give consideration to level of risk that some infrastructure will not be forthcoming and ways that this might be mitigated or addressed

Working with delivery partners:

- Involvement of key partners is essential
- Working more closely on a more formalised basis with partners via the establishment of local infrastructure programmes (LIPs), local infrastructure funds (LIFs) and local infrastructure (management) groups (LIGs) to facilitate improved co-ordination and delivery of infrastructure provision
- LA's role of 'ringmaster' co-ordinating actions of partners and delivery of infrastructure requirements through LDF
- More committed approach to forming partnerships with developers required – planners need a better understanding of the development process and property finance
- Current expectations re. infrastructure delivery via private sector unrealistically high. LPAs need to be reasonable in consideration of the extent to which private sector can fund necessary LDF infrastructure requirements

Potential approaches and funding mechanisms

- Developer contributions will have significant role to play in delivery – but need careful thought to ways in which developers can be more readily encouraged to make commitments to fund infrastructure. Local derived 'strategic tariffs' may be one solution
- Links between LA and LSP particularly important – potential for LAAs / MAAs to provide a means of co-ordinating activities and funding

Issues for central government

- Need to encourage development contributions,
- Substantial long-term financial commitments required – central government and key national agencies(e.g. Highways Agency) need to provide longer-term financial commitment to funding infrastructure
- Currently some synchronisation difficulties between visions and timescales of Lads and delivery partners

Opportunities

Issues and constraints	
How could the LDF respond?	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B4	
Title	Shaping and Delivering Tomorrow's Places: Effective Practice in Spatial Planning
Proponent body	Published by RTPI (produced by UCL & Deloitte)
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Non-statutory
Date produced	2007
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>Effective Practice in Spatial Planning project was commissioned by RTPI, CLG, JRF and GLA to examine how spatial planning is being delivered by those involved in formulation of RSS and LDF as result of P&CP Act 2004. Focuses on outcomes rather than processes and involved practising planners, LA Chief Executives, Councillors and other public agencies. The relevant sections, w.r.t infrastructure planning, are Chapters 4 – Delivering Spatial outcomes, Chapter 5 – Barriers to Success and Chapter 7 – Recommendations. Please note that this report was published prior to the revised PPS12 publication, therefore issues relating to old PPS12 have not been summarised on the assumption that the report's findings were used to inform the review of PPS12, and already covered in current policy framework.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>Exec summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little common understanding what spatial planning means in practice. • Study found that the public sector is becoming more integrated between agencies including health, police, business support and voluntary organisations and revealed the vital and central role of planning in the fast changing environment. • Case Studies demonstrate effective joint working between public, private and voluntary sector partners – use of specialists to facilitate discussion across public sector were important elements of effectiveness. • For spatial planning to be effective, need to concentrate on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outcomes before processes; ○ Users, partners and places; ○ Local community needs and preferences from the outset. <p>Delivering Spatial Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most effective approach – development of common implementation group for region or LA which is linked to wider public sector programmes such as LAA. Best approaches are systematic. • Spatial planning as a mechanism to draw together public sector capital programmes and longer term service delivery strategies <p>The essential elements of effective spatial planning at the local level must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning within LA linked to SCS and part of LAA/MAA; • Firm political and corporate leadership required; • Common evidence base and information repository shared between public sector partners and accessible to public; • Delivery is defining feature - key role of development management; • Establish a Local Infrastructure Programme, together with Local infrastructure Fund and managed by a Local Infrastructure Group to deliver places through effective resource management and coordination - Aim is to draw together all public sector capital investment in the locality together with other funding generated from fees and charges, planning gain supplement, roof tax, lottery and EU funding – better monitoring and management of financial resources; • A common public sector delivery programme will be useful mechanism to support delivery and manage public sector resources; • Other public agencies need to be fully briefed and need to be aware of the duty to cooperate; • Active horizontal and vertical integration between strategies, policies and resources for regions, sub-regions, localities and communities; • wider variety of financial vehicles to achieve delivery need to be explored; • develop cross-boundary delivery mechanism or vehicle where appropriate; • Provision of new skills and training for planners (project management) and LA finance and legal professionals involved in planning process. 	

Opportunities	
Recommendations to LAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure joint working on SCS and LDF Core Strategy, preferable through joint team; • Establish a Local Infrastructure Group (LIG) which translates the SCS, LDF and other planning requirements into a Local Infrastructure Programme (LIP) which is committed and resourced through the Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF). LIG should be tied to LAA; • Establish a more formalised approach to managing planning gain and other funds being derived through planning process, inc. identifying requirements as part of SCS and LIP process; • Place all items within s.106 agreements, planning gain, tariff, roof tax or similar devices on a public Community Gain Requirements registrar and Community Gain list; • Include delivery dates and trigger points within Community Gain Register and show when delivery has been taken place; • Put all finance and assets paid through planning gain in a separate account within LA and prepare an annual report on use of capital; • When negotiating planning gain, include % fee for implementation monitoring with the first instalment to be paid to LA, and then at regular intervals throughout lifetime of agreement; • Appoint a Community Delivery Auditor to monitor the delivery of all planning gain agreements from the proceeds of the management levy on each agreement; 	
Issues and constraints	
Barriers to Success - general <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of understanding in wider public sector about role of spatial planning – in many cases this is replicated within the local authority; • Roll and scope of spatial planning not always well understood by planners at local level – particularly covering local distinctiveness, evidence based approaches and resources for delivery, resulting in emerging plans being unduly inward focussed; • Planning culture – different view points and understanding; practitioners are setting out on different journeys not reaching same endpoint; • Concern regarding provision of health facilities was through use of DoH capital charge requirements which bear down on new facilities provided by planning gain even when first 3-years of running costs were also provided – no easy way to fund these charges under current arrangements; • Financial mechanisms (e.g. CPO) can be prohibitive where land values are marginal; • Lack of consistency and transparency in how planning gain and s106 agreements are managed; • Delivery - no control over private sector development phasing; • Advice – too much advice from different sources 	
Barriers within the local authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty of ensuring Chief Execs and Executive members recognise the key role that spatial planning has, and therefore ensuring SCS and Core Strategy are joined up; • Some planners unaware of scale of reform required – need to overcome insularity and work towards forging partnerships; • Lack of adequate highways expertise at local level – in local situations where new clusters of housing development requires highway delivery through s.106 agreement, LAs often have no funding to prepare small scale schemes to see them through to implementation once funding is amassed. Possible solutions would be to pool expertise with neighbouring authorities or buy in private sector expertise / collaborate with private sector; 	
How could the LDF respond?	
Take on board findings and recommendations when formulating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Schedule to demonstrate deliverability of the LDF Core Strategy	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B5	
Title	PAS implementing your LDF: the integration of infrastructure and development in plan-making (seminar findings)
Proponent body	Planning Advisory Service (PAS)
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Non-statutory
Date produced	January / February 2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>Sine 2004, the emphasis on the delivery of spatial plans and, in particular, the links between plans and infrastructure provision, has been significantly strengthened. In January and February 2008 the PAS ran a series of seminars across the English Regions focusing on LDF implementation. Representatives from a wide range of Local Authorities, Government Offices, Regional Assemblies, the HBF, Highways Agency and Environment Agency attended the workshops. This report summarises discussions on the integration of infrastructure and development in plan-making.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>6 steps to good infrastructure planning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Realising the role of LDFs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be clear about where development will go and monitoring framework should be in place. • Infrastructure is an expanding term • Big gaps in understanding within stakeholder organisations w.r.t LDFs • LDF needs to be central to the Council • Plenty of time should be allocated for infrastructure planning 2. Collaborating with stakeholders and service providers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes LA, transport authorities and operators, statutory undertakers, and organisations responsible for health, education, social and community facilities • need to coordinate with other organisations and work at strategic level • LSP should be tasked and engaged in infrastructure planning - suggests carry out joint consultations for SCS. LAAs provide opportunity for more strategic thinking • Workshops / one-to-one meetings more effective than written communication • Providers are likely to receive requests from many LPAs • Providers are more used to commenting on planning applications and are unfamiliar with dealing with alternatives and strategy preparation • Difficulties in getting to the right person / building relationships • Helpful if LAs understood stakeholder's investment strategies, business plans and funding timeframes and how stakeholder perceived the LA • Utilities companies' asset management plans only cover 5yrs – does not cover plan period • Future employers should also be involved in infrastructure planning 3. Developing a Spatial strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an integrated approach to infrastructure planning with other LPAs esp w.r.t large sites where cross boundary issues may arise • establish infrastructure delivery steering groups with other LPAs / key stakeholders • Should narrow down options to the strongest strategic locations and appraise this in detail • Advantages to working with landowners and developers – can focus on particular aspects of infrastructure. Creation of a developer forum would be advantageous • RSLs can be key delivery partners • AAPs could be used as a way of involving agencies in infrastructure planning – easier for agents to grasp specific issues. • Difficult to engage with transport authorities. There was little coordination between local transport plans and Core Strategy DPDs in smaller LAs • Some Primary Health Care Trusts have short timescale for their plans – difficult to get information about their plans and programmes. 	

4. Identifying required levels of provision
 - service providers have standard means of measuring provision, but must differentiate between deficit and needs created by development
 - Transport most difficult – need close integration of LDF and LTP
 - Evidence about services needs to be matched to what could be delivered. Carry out audit of existing infrastructure
 - Solid evidence base is key
 - Infrastructure information is often fragmented
5. Finding the funding for infrastructure
 - Need to work out, with providers, the cost of provision per unit
 - Different methods for different facilities and services – standard tariff is simplest to collect (tariffs should be based on solid evidence and properly thought out)
 - Public funds and developer contributions should be used together to maximise funds
 - Developers should be amongst stakeholders
 - Establish what is essential and what is desirable
 - Consider having a different approach for urban / brownfield areas and greenfield areas
 - Should allow ample time when consulting on an infrastructure SPD (>6wks)
 - Timing of development relative to infrastructure is key – developer in better position to contribute to infrastructure from development receipts; could less afford in advance of development – consider infrastructure costs w.r.t timing DPD production / phasing development.
 - Lack of government funding major issue – preparation of infrastructure delivery plans for LDFs will expose funding gaps
6. Coordinating implementation
 - Continued engagement throughout planning process is critical

Opportunities

Collaborating working, good communication and solid evidence are all essential to infrastructure planning.

Issues and constraints

How could the LDF respond?

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B6	
Title	The Community Infrastructure Levy
Proponent body	CLG
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	January 2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>This document summarised the provisions contained in the Planning Bill for the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Bill allows for regulations to empower local councils to apply a Community Infrastructure Levy on new developments in their areas to support infrastructure delivery. The Planning Act 2008 now contains the powers for the introduction of the CIL; the details of which will be set out in regulations. The draft regulations were due in spring 2009, but as yet still pending (May 2009). LDF infrastructure delivery planning should take into account this guidance and should be used to inform the development of a CIL for the Borough when the Regulations come into force.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering the right infrastructure is critical to sustainable economic development, in particular housing. CIL forms part of a wider package of funding for infrastructure CIL cannot be expected to pay for all the infrastructure required, but make a significant contribution. The effect of the clauses in the Planning Bill is to require CIL to be spent on infrastructure to support the development of an area. CIL will be a standard charge - could be levied as a certain amount per dwelling or per square metre of development, following the example of existing LPA's 'tariff' schemes. the level of CIL must be set to ensure it supports and does not prevent development. <p>Background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply of housing is still not keeping pace with rising demand – 3 million new homes needed by 2020. Alongside new housing, need to provide for the economic development. Providing supporting infrastructure is vital to ensure that these new homes and jobs are sustainable - studies have identified the central importance of transport for growth. Therefore, a substantial proportion of the levy receipts will be spent on transport infrastructure. CIL is not just about transport and strategic infrastructure, includes social and green infrastructure Substantial public sector investment aimed at ensuring the sustainability of our communities over the coming years. <p>Why should development pay for infrastructure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning obligations only negotiated for larger developments - many medium-sized and smaller developments currently do not contribute anything at all. Almost all development impacts on the need for infrastructure, services and amenities, so it is only fair that such development pays a share. Existing planning obligations - some criticism regarding delaying the planning process and for reducing its transparency, certainty and accountability – CIL will introduce standard charges and formulae to calculate developer contributions, therefore will provide clarity and certainty. <p>The Planning Bill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIL will also evolve as charging authorities and developers become more familiar with the new approach. The legislation will put in place new safeguards for those paying and collecting CIL which are not available under the existing legislative framework for negotiated agreements (more accountability for money raised). <p>How the charging authority will set the CIL</p> <p>Two main steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identifying what infrastructure is needed and how much it will cost; and 	

- working out what contribution each development should make to that cost.

Robust arrangements are needed for independent testing of CIL – therefore the infrastructure planning underpinning CIL needs to be embedded in the development plan system.

LA will need to assess and cost the infrastructure that is needed to support the development of their area - they should, as part of the development plan process:

- have regard to infrastructure plans and the Regional Economic Strategy;
- only include items of infrastructure that are likely to enable, facilitate or mitigate the impact of development in the area;
- have regard to the likely yield from the CIL given anticipated development and likely development viability;
- only include items that have a reasonable prospect of happening within the plan period;
- have regard to the level of funding likely to be available from other national and regional funding sources – the expectation being that the CIL will be additional and, particularly for larger pieces of infrastructure, in many cases will only provide part of the funding required;
- prioritise those pieces of infrastructure likely to make the biggest contribution to enabling development to take place in a sustainable way.
- produce a draft charging schedule setting out the rate and/or formula determining how the levy might be calculated in their area:
- process of setting charges should be embedded within the development plan process. However, the process needs to be flexible enough to react quickly to changing market conditions and needs to include proper expert testing of the charging schedule.
- Developers applying for planning permission will be able to consult the published schedule and establish how much they will have to pay.
- There might be a case for allowing charges to vary within charging authorities to reflect specific local conditions,

CIL as a funding source for infrastructure

- Purpose of CIL is to contribute to the costs of the infrastructure needed to support the development of an area - should not be used for general local authority expenditure, nor to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision, unless these will be, aggravated by new development.
- Does not need to be spent entirely new infrastructure - could be used to facilitate better use of existing infrastructure to increase capacity.
- Negotiated planning obligations should continue to enable affordable housing to be delivered on-site - not initially intend to include affordable housing within the scope of what may be funded from CIL.
- CIL should be 'plan led'.
- Standard charging approaches such as the CIL spread the burden more fairly and evenly, and result in a more predictable flow of income,
- Flexibility - option of using CIL to cover expenditure already incurred, or reserving CIL receipts for expenditure that may be incurred in the future.
- Other funding streams could be useful for 'pump priming' money into infrastructure projects before receipts from CIL come on stream and help to prevent delays in the delivery of the infrastructure required to unlock planned growth.
- CIL on its own will not be able to meet the entire cost of a major infrastructure project - Core public funding will continue to bear the main burden; **infrastructure planning therefore needs to take account of all of the funding streams available to local communities.**
- Spending of national agencies (e.g. EA, HA), benefits a local or sub-regional area in a particular part of the country, rather than being of national benefit. Accordingly, these bodies should be able to receive funding from CIL revenues.
- CIL must be spent on infrastructure to support the development of an area - safeguards in relation to how CIL is spent will be put in place to ensure accountability and transparency.

Sub-regional infrastructure can often be the most critical therefore important that the CIL is able to contribute to it.

Setting charges appropriately

- standard charges need to reflect the viability of development in the local area - CIL

should unlock, not inhibit development, therefore land values and development costs need to be included in calculations – ensure CIL liability does not reduce the amount of affordable housing delivered through negotiated agreements.

The future of planning obligations

- Section 106 will be retained – CIL not mandatory and planning obligations will continue to provide a means of securing developer contributions
- Where a CIL is implemented, planning obligations under section 106 will complement CIL.
- Focus on three areas:
 - planning obligations may be the only suitable tool to cover certain non-financial, technical or operational matters;
 - developers should continue to negotiate directly with the local planning authority to deal with the site-specific impacts of developments
 - affordable housing should wherever possible be provided on-site - affordable housing should continue to be provided through negotiated planning obligations.
- Seek views on whether a statutory boundary should be drawn between what is covered by CIL and what is covered by negotiation.
- Will continue to encourage local planning authorities to use planning conditions rather than planning obligations wherever possible.

Paying CIL

- Envisages that, CIL will be payable at the point of commencement of development.
- CIL should be levied on most types of development, including both residential and commercial development.
- criteria-based approach towards deciding whether there should be any exemptions from CIL - assuming householder development and some PD will be exempt.

What local planning authorities should do in the meantime, and transitional arrangements

- LAs encouraged to continue work on developing standard charges, reflecting current law and policy, but bear in mind the new policy direction now being set out, so that they are ready to take advantage of the new power to charge CIL.
- ensure that there is a good evidence base both on infrastructure needs and priorities, and on the changes in land value that occur when planning permissions are granted in an area - need to have a good understanding of those variations if they are to produce charging regimes which promote rather than prevent development. It builds on existing responsibilities for infrastructure planning.
- Regulations will empower, rather than require, them to introduce a CIL - encourage local planning authorities to impose any standard charges using CIL rather than through planning obligations policies.

Opportunities

See above

Issues and constraints

How could the LDF respond?

Develop a sound evidence base and ensure work on infrastructure delivery planning can support the development of an area based CIL for borough

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B7	
Title	Infrastructure planning and the Community Infrastructure Levy – an advice note
Proponent body	Planning Officers Society
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Non-statutory
Date produced	February 2009
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>Primary purpose of this guidance note is to assist LPAs in understanding the importance of Infrastructure Planning, and getting the message across; in the first instance to key internal decision makers such as corporate management teams and the council's executive. With their support, the involvement of the LSP and a range of services providers is possible; without it the task becomes very difficult.</p> <p>The advice is designed to assist planners in explaining the role and significance of infrastructure planning to key decision makers and can be used to inform the development of the infrastructure delivery plan to support the LDF.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>PPS12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> places far greater emphasis on planning as a delivery mechanism and the critical role of infrastructure planning; local authority as 'place shaper' in context of SCS, LSP, LAA / MAAs – link corporate partnership leadership roles and planning explicit = major shift in planning function; <p>Core Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clear requirement for Core Strategy to be the prime delivery mechanism for overall vision for area; needs to be underpinned by infrastructure planning; must include a delivery strategy for achieving strategic objectives, and arrangements for managing as well as monitoring delivery – strategy needs to set out when, where, and by whom these actions will take place; Need to set out what physical, social and green infrastructure will be required to support future development; Need to evidence both the need and how it is to be provided, and demonstrate proper discussions with key partners and delivery agents – GOs and PINs taking much greater interest in this aspect. <p>Aligning Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present, little integration between plans of the providers; LAs need to prepare integrated infrastructure plans for their area; to do this successfully, partner organisations and service providers need to be involved, with objective of aligning strategies and programmes – will need to demonstrate the value of end product to entice partners (e.g. joined up strategies will be useful to demonstrate need, support funding bids and prioritise projects); Only through bringing together programmes of all partners that gaps in provision, phasing and funding can be identified; Need to align strategies starting with SCS and carried through to LAA and future MAAs – infrastructure planning process provides further opportunities to align strategy in delivery programmes – should be facilitated by LSP; <p>CIL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Act 2008 contains powers to introduce CIL (Regs pending) – will capture wider range of development, therefore sharing burden, and break direct link between existing obligations and the development, so infrastructure spending can be more strategic; LAs will be empowered, but not required to set up charge for most developments; CIL will not replace existing mainstream funding; LA's will need to utilise CIL alongside other funding streams; Should be direct and explicit link between CIL charging schedule and the LAs infrastructure planning; <p>Infrastructure Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is process of identifying what is needed to implement the Core Strategy and SCS and underlie any future CIL; Setting out a list of projects, with responsibility for their implementation and timescale will provide a coherent and coordinated programme; 	

- **Not just planning requirement** – key strategic document for LSP and delivery agents and should be a collaborative process across partners and service providers with an agreed **common evidence base**;
- Grounded at strategic level in Core Strategy, supported by a flexible implementation framework;
- May extend beyond LA boundaries;
- Is a continuous process, which requires an on-going partnership governance arrangement;

Benefits of Infrastructure Planning

- Is route map for delivery of community's vision;
- Will be valuable to all partners when bidding for funds for projects;
- Taking LDF forward will be dependent on having infrastructure planning to support it;
- **Policies for planning obligations / CIL must be supported by sound infrastructure planning**;

Who to involve

- Wide range of partners, agencies and service providers (both public and private sector) – may need to 'sell' the benefits of partnership working to them (N.B. public sector duty to cooperate) – **most convincing argument** should be that it will enable them to plan their **investment more efficiently and effectively** and assist funding bids;
- **Ideally infrastructure planning should be managed through LSP** – where this is not the case, planners still need to make progress to support LDF but can use process as catalyst in developing LSP role;
- **Essential that there is a corporate commitment at the highest political and officer levels**;

Implementing the Plan

- Needs to be **practical, realistic and flexible**;
- Aligned with SCS and Core Strategy looking **15 years** ahead – **broken down in 5 year phases**, therefore first phase can be reasonably firm, less certain further in future;
- Must be a **live document** with right governance structures – keep the plan rolling forward and concentrating on next 5-years;
- Must be actively managed, regularly reviewed and monitored with contingency planning;
- Coordination delivery may benefit from **setting up Local Delivery Vehicles**;

Opportunities

Advice to Planners

- Infrastructure planning is **not an optional extra** – essential to develop a sound Core Strategy;
- CIL charging schedule will be based on infrastructure planning – LPA should consider how to secure valuation advice and sensitivity testing to support future CIL;
- Be mindful of CIL regs and whether they will restrict S.106;
- Effective infrastructure planning **should be owned by LA corporately and by the LSP – not just a planning document or activity**;
- Delivering infrastructure needs money – **S106 / CIL can provide significant funds – compelling argument which should convince others**;
- **Needs involvement and commitment** from wide range of agencies and providers;

w.r.t infrastructure planning for LDF:

- **Not seen as one-off exercise** – continued review, monitoring and implementation;
- **Collaborative approach** to LDF – partnership rather than consultation, with common ownership of delivery programme;
- **set up an inter-agency group** – ideally a sub-group of LSP;
- need to understand how different agencies operate – some have 3-yr funding programmes so need to concentrate on getting agreement on longer-term solutions;
- put together a **schedule** of Council and partners **capital grants**;

w.r.t preparing for CIL:

- ensure senior colleagues, members and Chief Exec are briefed on CIL;
- consider pros and cons of CIL against continuing with S106;
- will need new set of governance arrangements for collection, spending and auditing funds – set up in advance (needs to be clear and transparent processes);

Issues and constraints

How could the LDF respond?	
Use guidance to inform local infrastructure planning to underpin the LDF	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table B8	
Title	<p><u>Sustainable Communities Act 2007: Local Spending Report England 2006 - 07</u></p> <p>(other relevant links: <u>Sustainable Communities Act 2007</u> & <u>Sadiq Khan publishes first-ever Local Spending Report – press release</u>)</p>
Proponent body	CLG
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	April 2009
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>The Sustainable Communities Act 2007 places a requirement on the Secretary of State to make arrangements for the production of local spending reports. The first report - <i>The Sustainable Communities Act 2007: Local Spending Report England 2006-07</i> has been developed with regard to responses to the consultation and contains the following data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2006-07 expenditure by local authorities, strategic health authorities, ambulance trusts, NHS trusts, and primary care trusts; • 2006-07 expenditure on benefits and pensions by the Department for Work and Pensions; <p>This may provide information relating to the expenditure within Wigan Borough and contribute to the infrastructure audit of the area, therefore supporting the infrastructure planning process.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
N/A	
Opportunities	
N/A	
Issues and constraints	
N/A	
How could the LDF respond?	
No need to summarise information here; use data in this report to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and establish a local public sector expenditure baseline	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table C1	
Title	North West Utilities Infrastructure Study
Proponent body	NWDA
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	Non-statutory
Date produced	August 2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>The Study examines the issues and constraints relating to utilities infrastructure and supplies in the North West. The aims of the study were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the process through which utilities investment is allocated and procured and set the role of key stakeholders Establish how resource allocation processes can be influenced Identify specific and / or geographical constraints and issues which are impacting upon regional economic development now, and in the future Start to make suggestions on how these issues may be overcome either through dialogue, planning processes or financial investments 	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>North West is unique as has two electricity distribution networks, owned and operated by two different Distribution Network Operators (DNOs)</p> <p>Key findings (relevant to planning system): -</p> <p>The disconnect between planning process for utilities and the development planning process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investment planning process for DNOs tied into 5-yearly Pricing Control Periods (PCPs), with consultation lead in 1.5 – 2years before PCP coming into force; Investment planning process is completely separate to the strategic planning process, historically not aligned with RES, RSS and Sub-Regional Action Plans; Given fundamental reliance one has upon other, need to ensure there is better two-way understanding, engagement and shared investment planning in future, especially under LDF; <p>Tensions between regulatory framework and economic growth requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulatory framework for utilities based on relatively straightforward supply-and-demand control model, using price as key controlling mechanism over 5-year periods; DNOs not allowed to deviate from agreed price control or invest in infrastructure on a speculative basis to serve new developments; DNOs are relatively restricted in their ability to respond to new initiatives or sudden changes during 5-year period – this can work counter to the forces that govern economic development. Control system does not fully enable DNOs to take account of particular local issues; Some utilities are trying to find alternative solutions; regulator response has been lukewarm; <p>The costs of delivering the necessary utilities infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilities costs have increased since privatisation; Amount of planned economic growth over next 5-10yrs is significant – will require investment in adjacent utilities infrastructure; Widely believed that previous public ownership system lacked investment in physical infrastructure leading to ‘asset sweating’ (squeezing more demand on existing networks) which has become commonplace; Consultees felt that asset sweating had been so prevalent in region, that they are being asked to fund infrastructure which should have been provided by DNOs – consultees would have less issue with principle of contributing towards new infrastructure if they could be assured it would benefit region, not generate private sector profit for DNOs; There is believed to be a lack of transparency in applying what should be a uniform regulatory framework (regarding cost uncertainty); <p>Consequences of lack of transparency and accountability in the utilities market:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Length of time and lack of transparency involved in eliciting response to any enquiries from DNOs was reported to be significant – causes frustration to public and private sectors; 	

- Lack of certainty or accountability on procurement and delivery of utilities infrastructure was leading to additional costs and programme delays being incurred on projects;
- This could have adverse impacts, ultimately on the financial viability of schemes;

Potential utilities constraints in the North West (Not all DNOs responded, therefore analysis relatively limited and caveated accordingly)

Key Findings (relevant to Greater Manchester / Wigan):

Electricity:

- High utilisation rates in part of Greater Manchester, however report does not specify Wigan as an area with potential issues (focuses on growth points and HMR areas).
- Electricity DNOs able to model impact that proposed regeneration and development plans would have on their networks to identify potential constraints – not required under statute and cost of modelling would be responsibility of third party requesting it;
- Investment is based on using customer-base as baseline – over and above this applicant seeking new connection would pay for connection rather than DNO – therefore no business case for DNO's to invest

Gas:

- Absence of information

Potable Water

- North West has adequate capacity – some shortfalls in isolated areas (N/A Wigan)

Wastewater

- Limitations on wastewater treatment capacity in several areas, - South / West Manchester identified as area of concern regarding further growth in demand;
- United Utilities' investment focus is in continuing to bring older systems up to modern standards

Telecommunications

- No particular geographic issues

Factors specific to North West region:

Constraints:

- Age of utilities infrastructure – some infrastructure is approaching or at the end of its usable life, and requires considerable investment to cope with planned demand

Opportunities:

- Development of renewable energy technologies and production – significant potential natural assets in region (Wigan not specified);
- Opportunities to roll out of newer technologies – specifically next generation telecoms;
- Building on existing strengths – DNOs working with public sector to share skills;
- Utilities capacities – some key concerns in region, but few and confined to specific locations rather than abundant and widespread, especially when compared to SE England, therefore asset for region.

Key Conclusions

Conclusion 1 – level of mutual understanding and trust between utilities and key stakeholder in economic development arena needs to improve. Need to ensure:

- Better alignment of utilities and development policy
- Public sector resources in utilities infrastructure are being properly and efficiently procured;
- Appropriate level of utilities infrastructure is delivered in a timescale and cost that facilitates planned economic growth;
- Better mutual understanding on how development planning and investment system works to align strategic planning processes.

Conclusion 2 – investment planning in utilities needs to be better aligned with planned economic growth

- Need to be a review of current utilities regulatory framework to better align investment plans with planned economic growth;

- Key public sector stakeholders, esp. LPAs, need to have the ability and expertise to engage with utilities DNOs to determine the impact developments would have on utility networks and prevent abortive costs being incurred.

Conclusion 3 – significant investment is needed in the region's utilities infrastructure to meet the requirements of planned economic growth.

Opportunities

Seek dialogue with utilities to ensure constraints can be identified and mitigated

Issues and constraints

Utilities 5-year investment plans could constrain infrastructure delivery if not better integrated with strategic spatial planning processes

How could the LDF respond?

Ensure DNOs / utilities are properly engaged in LDF preparation process and seek to secure Statements of Commitments through infrastructure planning to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table E1	
Title	Wigan Council Capital Programme
Proponent body	Wigan Council
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	2009 update
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
<p>The Capital Programme is produced primarily as an internal working document for elected Members and officers. It identifies agreed capital schemes, showing the total cost of schemes and the projected phasing of those schemes over current and future financial years.</p> <p>The Capital Programme reflects the results of the 2008/09 third review of the capital programme for capital spending and resources, which, together with changes to the anticipated programme for 2008/09 to 2011/12, were reported to Cabinet on 19th February 2009.</p> <p>In addition there will be further investment requirements as new programmes and projects with dedicated funding are brought forward. Any approvals subsequent to these will be included in the 2009/10 first review of the programme, which is expected to be reported to Cabinet in August 2009.</p>	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
N/A	
Opportunities	
N/A	
Issues and constraints	
How could the LDF respond?	
No need to summarise information here; use data in this report to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and establish a local public sector expenditure baseline	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table F1	
Title	<u>Moving from 'piecemeal' to strategic: strategic infrastructure in Chelmsford & Chelmsford Draft Developer Contributions SPD</u>
Proponent body	PAS article / Chelmsford Borough Council
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	2008
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
Article examines how Chelmsford Borough Council is taking an exciting and innovative approach to securing infrastructure through its planning contributions supplementary planning document. The Chelmsford Core Strategy developer contributions policy accompanied by the Draft Developer Contributions SPD could be a useful best practice example for Wigan to establish a more holistic approach to securing infrastructure provision through developer contributions.	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>Aim: To move away from a piecemeal approach to a strategic approach to major infrastructure to meet borough-wide needs - the draft SPD covers all aspects of planning obligations to achieve local strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>Re-defining infrastructure Considered SPD to be vital to deliver the substantial infrastructure required</p> <p>Adopted Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (Feb 2008) contains Core Policy CP4 – Securing Infrastructure - defines infrastructure in it's broadest sense and, together with development control policies, provide hook for the SPD with a wide and strategic remit;</p> <p>The SPD policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires all developments to make a reasonable financial contribution towards off-site community and strategic infrastructure, rather than just site-related infrastructure. • sets out to maximise contributions without hindering development. • does not cover affordable housing, which is the subject of a separate SPD. • Contribution charges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ per dwelling basis for residential development ○ net additional floor space for commercial development. <p>This approach to thresholds ensures that the cumulative impact of smaller development is assessed and appropriate contributions are made.</p> <p>SPD to be used as a standard approach for all development. However, if a developer can prove that the full planning contributions render the scheme unviable, they have to submit a full 'open book' appraisal that will be independently assessed.</p> <p>Production of SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal goal was to identify what, where and when infrastructure was needed. • Working with infrastructure providers and prepared detailed infrastructure trajectories that aligned with housing trajectories • Appointed consultants to undertake viability testing and define geographic areas called contributions zones, which showed where infrastructure was needed most to support and deliver development. • Developed a schedule for financial contributions for each of the contributions zones. (listing both strategic and off-site community infrastructure and priorities for delivery) • Also makes use of the London Commuter Belt (LCB) Development Control and Appraisal Toolkit to use default assumptions on viability. • Received legal advice throughout the preparation of the SPD (Council's own legal service and counsel). • Developed in partnership with key stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Internal Council departments; ○ Infrastructure providers supplied the costings for the infrastructure schemes; ○ Established an informal local delivery vehicle (LDM) - brought the existing 	

infrastructure providers together and ensured that their delivery programmes were aligned to development growth planned within LDF

Using two consultation stages

Due to complexity of subject, two stages of consultation were used during the drafting process. First stage - held workshops with developers and main service providers. Broad support for principles, however, there were objections to some specific details of the proposed approach.

The revised draft (consulted on in Oct 08) addressed concerns raised at first stage:

- Made it clear that the scope of the SPD would be within the existing legislative framework (i.e. planning obligations) rather than the proposed community infrastructure levy regime.
- Provided more detailed justification for the geographic contribution zones to demonstrate strategic infrastructure related to development sites.

The Role of the Local Delivery Vehicle

- Consists of a strategic steering group, an executive delivery board and project teams.
- Business plan will cover a five year period and will set out priorities for the delivery of infrastructure. Annual financial updates of the plan will monitor receipt of standard charges and evaluate cash flow
- Will be responsible for managing all strategic standard charge contribution pools and allocating monies to specific projects.

The Role of the Council

- Ensure planning policies are implemented through planning consents
- Financially administer all contributions and release monies to project teams that are identified through the business plan.

Opportunities

The benefits

The SPD provides a transparent, certain and equitable mechanism for contributions from development. This is instrumental in ensuring that strategic infrastructure is aligned with future development growth.

The geographic zones provide a physical connection between planned infrastructure and proposed development. They also give a strategic context for infrastructure delivery.

The participation of service providers and other stakeholders was useful in establishing good relationships. These will be invaluable for the local development vehicle.

The SPD allows for more meaningful and structured discussions with developers on planning contributions at the pre-application stage.

Issues and constraints

The challenges

SPD was one of the most challenging documents produced. One of the key challenges has been balancing the need to maximise contributions against encouraging development. The preparation process has also been set against a backdrop of a dramatically changing market.

Other challenges have included:

- ensuring infrastructure is aligned with housing delivery
- ensuring compliance with a changing planning contributions regime
- seeking to ensure that contributions do not make development unviable
- producing practical guidance that provides increased certainty
- collating robust costings on infrastructure projects from service providers.

How could the LDF respond?

Need to ensure

- Get the right policy hook within a Core Strategy DPD beforehand, and listing infrastructure projects within that policy, is important in developing the SPD.
- Ensure infrastructure trajectories aligned with housing trajectories to help accurately target where financial contributions are needed.

Implications for the sustainability appraisal

Cross references (General)

Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table F2	
Title	<u>Joint infrastructure planning: South Bedfordshire and Luton, Surrey, Swindon and Tower Hamlets – case studies</u>
Proponent body	I&DEA
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	February 2009
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
These case studies demonstrate how four local areas are working to achieve joint infrastructure planning, through the LSP, LAA, LDF and other key partners. Best Practice examples can be drawn upon when devising a Wigan infrastructure planning framework.	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
<p>South Bedfordshire and Luton – LSP and joint committee (legally established entity that functions as planning committee for both areas) commissioned a social infrastructure study as a result of a clear message arising from the joint SCS / Core Strategy consultation about the need to deliver this alongside future housing growth. Objectives for study included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed outline of the current infrastructure provision in the area, inc. surpluses, deficits and inadequacies; • Identification of the future infrastructure requirements to 2021 and 2031, expressed spatially; • An action research component focussing on major development. <p>Surrey – Set up Infrastructure Capacity Study, which is a 3-yr project that has strong links with the LSP; it was set up in response to RSS growth forecasts and concerns about existing under-provision of infrastructure in county</p> <p>Swindon – set up an infrastructure delivery board, which reports to Council and LSP and it's work is driven by SCS and LDF Core Strategy which both have the same adopted long-term vision. LSP and planners work jointly to sort out and unplug obstacles to delivery planning.</p> <p>Town Hamlets –Council and LSP working closed to align their strategic policy and delivery message. Core Strategy and refresh of SCS and its LAA coincided, which provided planners with the opportunity to think more spatially and address how demand from new infrastructure can be meet. They are mapping infrastructure need and demand because consultation responses stated that access to existing infrastructure and services is difficult in some communities, and because of high levels of projected population growth.</p>	
Opportunities	
<p>Benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a common understanding of what and where the most significant local infrastructure issues are – a number of the case study areas commissioned joint studies to achieve this; • develop a delivery focus for public sector partners; • help to lever more financial resources into an area, and potentially create more efficient use of the existing resources of partners; • help to meet the requirements of the forthcoming Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) by identifying the infrastructure needs of the local area and working in partnership to meet these needs, deliver outcomes and achieve value for money. <p>Lessons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a solid evidence base and the identification of community concern about future infrastructure provision is an important first step to securing the commitment of LSP partners; • moving beyond evidence gathering and planning to delivering infrastructure may well need a reconfigured structure that puts the LSP at the heart of corporate efforts to achieve this; • working in partnership is complex and needs time and energy to ensure that partners 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> continue to stay committed and involved; getting service providers to think about future infrastructure requirements over the medium- to long-term can be challenging, but this can be overcome by identifying the benefits of taking a long-term approach; within the existing performance framework each area needs to develop a model for joint infrastructure delivery that reflects their specific circumstances and requirements. 	
Issues and constraints	
How could the LDF respond?	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)

Table	
Title	
Proponent body	
Status (e.g. statutory, non-statutory)	
Date produced	
Why is it relevant to the LDF?	
Key messages, requirements & objectives	
Opportunities	
Issues and constraints	
How could the LDF respond?	
Implications for the sustainability appraisal	
Cross references (General)	Cross Reference (LDF Topic Papers)