

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

24 FEBRUARY 2014

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Report prepared by Michael Murphy

1. INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

1.1 Issue for decision

1.1.1 That the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, attached as Appendix A, be approved for public consultation alongside the Maidstone Borough Local Plan.

1.2 Recommendation of the Head of Planning and Development

1.2.1 That the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, attached as Appendix A, be approved for public consultation alongside the Maidstone Borough Local Plan.

1.3 Reasons for Recommendation

1.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF: 156) requires local planning authorities to demonstrate that the policies in the local plan will be delivered in a sustainable way. To this end, there is now an increased emphasis on the need to identify infrastructure required to support future growth resulting from additional housing and employment during the Plan period to 2031.

1.3.2 This report is due to be considered by the Planning, Transport and Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 18th February. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies the infrastructure required to meet the spatial objectives and growth anticipated in the council's emerging local plan. It includes not only infrastructure schemes that will be provided by the council but also those for which other bodies (public and private) are responsible. As such, it is closely linked to objectives set out in the council's Integrated Transport Strategy and takes account of Kent County Council's infrastructure and investment finance model, which determines the infrastructure required for areas such as education, community learning and adult social care services.

1.3.3 The IDP is an evidence base which supports the local plan and helps to demonstrate that the local plan is both realistic and deliverable, and can

therefore be successfully implemented. This is of particular relevance to the housing and employment site allocations included in the draft local plan. The IDP identifies:

- **What** infrastructure is required and **where** it is required to deliver the local plan (particularly the housing site allocations);
- **Who** is responsible for delivery;
- **How** the infrastructure will be delivered through the identification of delivery mechanisms and funding sources; and
- **When** infrastructure will be delivered, with phasing and estimated costs in broad terms.

1.3.4 The NPPF requires councils to work together to address strategic priorities across boundaries and to consider development requirements which cannot be wholly met within their own areas. The council has exercised its duty to co-operate during the formation of the local plan by discussing and negotiating with neighbouring district councils, Kent County Council and a number of other infrastructure service providers and public bodies to update and amend the previous draft IDP that went out for Regulation 18 public consultation with the then Core Strategy in August/September 2011.

1.3.5 The revised IDP (attached as Appendix A) has taken account of a range of programmes which impact on spatial planning and includes revised infrastructure schemes and estimated costs for the areas of transport, education adult social care, health and open space. The total cost of new infrastructure considered necessary to support anticipated growth in the local plan is estimated in the IDP as £75m. As is reflected in the number of transport schemes included in the IDP, congestion is a major issue in the borough and represents one of the council's greatest challenges in ensuring a deliverable local plan. It is likely that the full transport package will total approximately £30m, which is a large percentage of the overall infrastructure cost to the borough council.

1.3.6 It is difficult to make a more accurate estimate of infrastructure costs at present because the objectively assessed housing need (19,600 dwellings) for the borough has only recently been approved by Cabinet (January 27 2014), and the site allocations that officers are proposing towards meeting this need have yet to be approved, but will go to Cabinet on 24 February. The total estimated cost of the infrastructure delivery plan is based on information received from service providers and stakeholders during informal consultation in the summer when the estimated housing need for the borough was approximately 14,000 dwellings, and also recent informal consultations with respect to a provisional supply figure of 17,100 dwellings, based on the proposed accepted SHLAA sites. Further amendments to the IDP are therefore inevitable as it is an evolving document and requires input from numerous stakeholders, both internal and external. The IDP will be

rigorously reviewed and monitored regularly going forward to ensure that it includes the most up to date information.

- 1.3.7 The forthcoming public consultation on the draft local plan affords another opportunity to consult with stakeholders and service providers to update the IDP based on an agreed housing target and spatial distribution of development for Maidstone Borough. Stakeholders and service providers are particularly interested in this stage of the plan process because there is a greater degree of certainty to the council's planning strategy when it is consulting on an approved draft plan. Consultation at this stage also affords an opportunity to gather more information on public realm schemes that the council intends to take forward in the future. Officers are currently working on scheme designs and estimated costings for a number of these schemes.
- 1.3.8 The IDP enables the council to identify possible mechanisms for delivering infrastructure. One of the most important mechanisms is the community infrastructure levy (CIL), which is the subject of a separate report on this agenda. CIL does not have to fully fund all the infrastructure schemes listed in the IDP. The infrastructure schemes that will be funded through CIL originate in the IDP and are listed in a Regulation 123 list (see separate CIL report on this agenda for further information).
- 1.3.9 Based on residential development with a deliverable housing target of 17,100, the potential income from CIL could be in the region of £42m, with potentially £10m of this being passed to local (parish) councils, leaving around £32m for the council to fund infrastructure with. This is a calculated scenario and the final figures are subject to change as is considered in the CIL report. Further funding streams (such as New Homes Bonus, land asset sales, Local Enterprise Partnership funding and other central government grants) will also go towards closing the gap between the total estimated costs of infrastructure in the IDP and the capital and funding that the council can put towards meeting these costs.
- 1.3.10 Government expects that there will be a funding gap between what the CIL and other funding streams can realistically provide for and the total costs of identified infrastructure schemes in the IDP. Where the total estimated costs cannot be met, it is likely that the council will have to prioritise infrastructure schemes in order of importance and cost effectiveness. This exercise will have to be undertaken in collaboration with Elected Members once more detailed information is available following public consultation on the local plan.
- 1.4 Alternative Action and why not Recommended

1.4.1 The Council has a duty to produce an infrastructure delivery plan, which forms an important part of the evidence base underpinning the delivery of the local plan.

1.5 Impact on Corporate Objectives

1.5.1 The overarching purpose of the IDP is to identify what infrastructure is needed to support anticipated growth set out in housing and employment site allocations in the local plan. The IDP is key in ensuring that the local plan is deliverable, and that Maidstone grows in a sustainable way, providing not just homes and jobs, but all the other elements that collectively make decent places to live, work and spend time.

1.6 Risk Management

1.6.1 Good practice for infrastructure planning requires the identification of risk of non-delivery of proposed critical infrastructure, in order to ensure that the local plan is deliverable. If the IDP is not robust and is considered inadequate with regard to supporting anticipated growth in Maidstone, the Secretary of State could reject the submitted local plan and find the document unsound during Independent Examination. This risk will be assessed once further consultation with stakeholders is completed after public consultation on the draft plan

1.7 Other Implications

1.7.1

1.	Financial	X
2.	Staffing	
3.	Legal	X
4.	Equality impact needs assessment	
5.	Environmental/sustainable development	X
6.	Community safety	
7.	Human Rights Act	
8.	Procurement	X
9.	Asset management	X

- 1.7.2 Financial. The IDP needs to accurately list the infrastructure schemes considered necessary to support anticipated growth in the local plan, and the costs of each scheme where this information is available. The document will provide the evidence for funding bids and will help with the prioritisation of infrastructure schemes which will have financial consequences for the council.
- 1.7.3 Legal. Legal guidance will be needed where section 106 obligations are also involved in infrastructure delivery in addition to the CIL.
- 1.7.4 Environmental/sustainable development. Infrastructure identified in the IDP is necessary to make new development environmentally sustainable and therefore acceptable.
- 1.7.5 Procurement. When the CIL has been adopted, the council will itself deliver infrastructure, which in turn will involve procurement.
- 1.7.6 Asset management. With the delivery of infrastructure, the council is likely to gain assets, these will need to be managed.
- 1.8 Relevant Documents
 - 1.8.1 None.
 - 1.8.2 Appendices
 - 1.8.3 Appendix A – Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
 - 1.8.4 Background Documents
 - 1.8.5 None.

IS THIS A KEY DECISION REPORT?

Yes

No

If yes, this is a Key Decision because: Policies, plans and strategies.

Wards/Parishes affected: All wards and parishes.