

Rugby Borough Council LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Final version Core Strategy

June 2011

Chapter 5 – Built Infrastructure Chapter

Evidence Base

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development. (PPS1)

Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (PPS4)

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport. (PPG13)

Circular 05/05: Planning Obligations.

Warwickshire County Council: Strategic Transport Modelling.

Coventry Solihull Warwickshire Partnership: Review of Sub-Regional Economic

Development and the Development of Mechanisms for Infrastructure Delivery (2009).

Rugby Borough Council: Annual Monitoring Report. (AMR)

Introduction and Background

- 5.1. In line with the proposed growth of Rugby Borough provision must be made, where appropriate in advance of development, to improve the existing level of physical and social infrastructure to support the Borough's needs. This section of the strategy sets out how different types of infrastructure (ranging from roads and utilities to community facilities) will support the growth and how it will be protected and provided.
- 5.2. National policy seeks to ensure that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community. Through the objectives of PPS1 and PPG13 the integration of transport and planning should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of urban and rural living whilst reducing reliance on the car. PPS4 acknowledges the importance of local services and facilities to their communities and the complementary roles they play to the town centre.
- 5.3. The needs of the rural area are of equal importance as those within the urban area and it is therefore essential that services are retained and enhanced where appropriate to meet the needs of the local community.

Policy CS10: Developer Contributions

Where it is necessary to mitigate against the impact of a development proposal; planning permission will only be granted when a legal agreement, or planning obligation is entered into with the Council, in line with the requirements of Circular 05/2005 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

In the first instance infrastructure contributions will be sought "on site". However where this is not possible an off site (commuted) contribution will be negotiated.

The type, amount and phasing of contributions sought from developers will be related to the form and scale of the development, its potential impact on the site and surrounding area and the levels of existing infrastructure and community facilities. The financial viability of the development will also be a consideration.

Where relevant, contributions may be made to a wider 'pot' of funds where multiple developments have cumulative impacts and require combined comprehensive mitigating measures. Where appropriate, infrastructure should be delivered in advance of development.

The Planning Obligations SPD outlines the procedures of Rugby Borough Council in the negotiation of planning contributions which should be read in conjunction with this policy.

Explanation

- 5.4. Planning Obligations are key to ensuring that the impacts of development are mitigated against where infrastructure needs arise from development. The delivery of the required infrastructure is dependent on partnership working between a variety of public and private sector agencies. Through such partnerships it is intended that the LDF will inform the investment strategies of key agencies.
- 5.5. The Community Infrastructure Levy came into force in April 2010. This new approach to developer contributions will allow the Council to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in the Borough. This money can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure which is needed as a result of development. This approach has the support of the Borough Council as it will provide greater certainty for all stakeholders involved in the planning process.
- 5.6. It is important to emphasise that a proposal, which is generally unsatisfactory in planning terms, cannot be justified by other benefits that do not satisfactorily address the planning concerns.

Policy CS11 - Transport and New Development

Development will be permitted where sustainable modes of transport are prioritised and measures mitigating against the transport impacts which may arise from that development or cumulatively with other proposals are provided. This shall be achieved where appropriate through the submission of a transport assessment and:

- Contributions to transport modeling work;
- The provision of travel plans to promote sustainable travel patterns for work related trips; and:
- The entering into of bus and/or freight partnerships with the County Council and/or third parties.

The thresholds above which transport assessments will be required and the relevant car parking standards for all development types are set out in the Planning Obligations SPD. Where development proposals fall within the designated Air Quality Management Area, the transport assessment should set out how detrimental impacts on air quality will be mitigated.

Explanation

5.7. Policy CS11 promotes the use of sustainable transport modes where any proposed new development causes any unacceptable impacts upon the Borough's transport network. In applying for planning permission the Council will, where appropriate, require developers to submit transport assessments or statements outlining the impacts of the development and the package of measures that will be put forward to mitigate against any unacceptable impacts.



RUGBY BOROUGH COUNCIL



COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY



PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

SEPTEMBER 2012







2. Evidence

Any CIL rate that the Council sets must not be so high that they effectively stifle any development that may come forward. Equally, the Council must also be mindful that the CIL is collected to financially assist infrastructure to support the growth in the Borough. As such the evidence to support the PDCS is split into infrastructure requirements and land viability assessments that inform the CIL rates produced. As such, the Council has relied on the following sources of evidence to produce its PDCS:

- infrastructure requirements and analysis of the funding gap evidence to show there is sufficient deficiency in infrastructure funding to justify the proposed CIL rate; and
- viability assessment of development to show what level of CIL could be introduced without putting the overall development of the area at serious risk. Separate residential and non residential viability evidence documents have been produced.

Following a description of the evidence, this PDCS sets out the proposed CIL rates and zones which are considered appropriate and viable for the Borough.

2.1 Infrastructure Requirements

The CIL receipts accrued will help to support new development identified within the Core Strategy that will be built out through the Borough over the plan period. The CIL Regulations require that in order to produce a Charging Schedule a Council must first identify the infrastructure which the CIL receipts will assist to deliver.

The Core Strategy requires the delivery of at least 10,800 dwellings between 2006 and 2026. As of 1st April 2011, 3322 dwellings had been completed in the Borough. As the Gateway Rugby sustainable urban extension outline planning application has been granted approval, subject to the section 106 agreements being signed, it has therefore been removed from consideration for the purposes of the CIL.

Therefore the infrastructure requirements of the remaining 7046 dwellings without permission inform the CIL. For calculating the impact of residential development on infrastructure it is assumed that each new dwelling will have an average of 2.35 people living in it. This average comes from the 2001 Census.

As part of plan making the Council produced, in partnership with stakeholders and other delivery bodies an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to support the growth allocation within the Core Strategy. The IDP forms the starting point for identifying infrastructure requirements for the purposes of the PDCS. Additional evidence was sought for gaps in the IDP, specifically with regard the Primary Care Trust and Warwickshire Police.

2.2 Demonstrating a Funding Gap

The below table identifies the infrastructure types and the total costs currently anticipated to deliver the specific infrastructure identified. It also indicates how much, if any, alternative funding will contribute towards delivering that infrastructure. The residual

funding gap is then identified which CIL receipts from liable developments will help bridge.

Infrastructure	Estimated total cost	Expected funding / secured developer contributions	Funding gap
Transport	£8,080,000	None	£9,180,000
Education	£8,381,296	Unknown	£8,381,296
Police	£3,885,217	None	£3,885,217
PCT	£3,618,744	None	£3,618,744
Open Space	£13,052,552	None	£12,736,364
Leisure Facilities	£1,413,532	£63,677	£1,349,855
TOTAL FUNDING GAP			£39,151,476

Please note there was an error in the above table in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule that was published for consultation on Friday 28th September 2012. The error has now been rectified above.

Only the infrastructure that is likely to be funded through CIL is included in the above table. Where it is already known, or it is very likely that infrastructure items will be funded and delivered onsite as part of new development through Section 106 agreements, those infrastructure items have not been included in the above table, or the estimated contributions have been deducted off the infrastructure cost.

The CIL Infrastructure Study provides more detail on what is anticipated to be delivered through site specific S106, the anticipated infrastructure requirements and subsequent gaps to be delivered through CIL. This is available to view alongside the PDCS at: www.rugby.gov.uk.

The above funding gap, by its very nature is not an exhaustive list and will inevitably change through time, through the permission of new developments but also the identification or amendment of infrastructure requirements. Notwithstanding this, the sole purpose of the CIL funding gap is to demonstrate a shortfall in funding known infrastructure required to support new development coming forward in the Borough.

As required in the CIL Regulations, the existence of this considerable funding gap is therefore justification for the introduction of CIL in Rugby Borough. CIL will be an appropriate tool and an important source of funding to help plug this gap.

Do you agree that the Infrastructure Study shows that there is a sufficient justification for introducing CIL?