



**Parkwood**  
Consultancy Services

# Monmouthshire County Council

## Infrastructure planning and funding and relationship with Place Plans – Part 1

### Final Report

**July 2016**



## Document details

**Project Ref:** 31152

**Report Title:** Infrastructure planning and funding and relationship with Place Plans

**Doc Ref:** Final report

**Date:** July 2016

**Prepared by:** Mark Felgate – Regional Head of Planning

**Revision:** R02

## Contents

- 1 Introduction ..... 1**
- 2 Background ..... 2**
- 3 Context ..... 3**
- 4 Whole Place approach in Monmouthshire ..... 4**
  - 4.2 Whole Place Plans in Monmouthshire..... 5
  - 4.3 Key findings from the Whole Place Plan approach ..... 9
- 5 Good practice from Local Authorities within Wales in respect of infrastructure planning and community involvement ..... 11**
  - 5.1 Plan and evidence review ..... 11
  - 5.2 Review of Wales authorities with CIL in place or under consideration ..... 15
- 6 Good practice from Local Authorities within England in respect of infrastructure planning and community involvement ..... 17**
  - 6.2 Key findings from approaches to community spending..... 22
  - 6.3 Key finding in respect of general CIL funding and prioritisation ..... 23
- 7 Approach to joint planning with other local authorities ..... 24**
  - 7.2 Key findings from joint approaches to infrastructure spending ..... 28
- 8 Setting the context for governance recommendations..... 30**

## Tables

- Table 4.1 Identified infrastructure requirements..... 6
- Table 4.2 Capital projects..... 8
- Table 5.1 Plan and CIL status and infrastructure planning ..... 11

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Monmouthshire County Council want to better understand the relationship between infrastructure planning, CLIL and other funding and community engagement and are seeking advice as to how best approach the setting of priorities and governance arrangements.
- 1.1.2 The approach to community participation has become increasingly important, with Government seemingly moving away from a central model of control to more local bottom up governance, where local communities, voluntary groups and lower tier authorities have an increasing role in decision making.
- 1.1.3 Whilst there are numerous examples of good practice and techniques to encourage consultation, through the use of (for example) toolkits and workshops there should also be consideration on how communities can be empowered to make their own decisions and the responsibilities and outcomes that result from this approach. Allied to this is how traditional decision making bodies may have to adjust their roles in encouraging an empowered local community.
- 1.1.4 However, at the same time as moving to community focused governance, the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal (CCRC Deal) , which includes Monmouthshire (as well as Cardiff, Newport and seven other surrounding authorities), have been awarded city deal status. It is unclear at present how the deal will work but the initial announcements suggest that a regional plan and associated regional infrastructure priorities will take centre stage – how much ‘community’ involvement there will be in deciding priorities is unknown. Added to this (and the relationship between the two is unclear) the Welsh Government will introduce the National Development Framework, setting broad planning policy for the Wales and proposes a set of regional plans, to be called Strategic Development Plans (SDP). The later (SDP) in particular is of particular relevance, especially in relation to the CCRC Deal and also the potential to be the antithesis of aspirations for a more community led approach to development and infrastructure planning
- 1.1.5 The Council commissioned this research with funding support from Welsh Government. The research reviews current approaches towards community participation in infrastructure planning and delivery in Monmouthshire and ‘best’ practice elsewhere in both Wales and England.
- 1.1.6 A further report (Part 2) will use this research as the basis for making recommendations to Monmouthshire as to how it could approach infrastructure delivery and governance arrangements, setting out how these relate to national priorities and local community involvement and decision making.

## 2 Background

- 2.1.1 The Council adopted the Monmouthshire Local Development Plan (LDP) on 27 February 2014. The adopted LDP includes policy toward the provision of infrastructure and development contributions.
- 2.1.2 The Council currently relies on Policy S7 to inform decisions on infrastructure planning and the 'Approach to Planning Obligations Interim Policy', which was agreed by Council on 27 June 2013. Whilst the latter does not have the status of adopted SPG as it has not been subject to a public consultation it does set out an approach to guide negotiations between the Council and applicants on the negotiation of Section 106 planning obligations.
- 2.1.3 The Council has also resolved to prepare Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule. The preparatory work for this includes an infrastructure assessment and plan and a viability assessment.
- 2.1.4 The viability assessment work has recently been updated to inform the Draft Charging Schedule. This has resulted to small changes in the proposed CIL rates.
- 2.1.5 The infrastructure plan is an important part of the CIL process as it informs the Regulation 123 List and provides the starting point for discussions in respect of priorities for funding. The Regulation 123 list sets out what the Council will spend its CIL on and is important as it is there to demonstrate how the Council is to avoid 'double dipping' i.e. using S106 and CIL money from a development to fund the same piece of infrastructure.
- 2.1.6 A substantial amount of work has already been carried out on infrastructure requirements in connection with the LDP. This includes a Draft Infrastructure Plan (IP), including infrastructure necessary for delivering the LDP strategic sites. It also includes potential 'place-making' and other infrastructure projects by settlement to enable initial consideration of the options that could be included in the IP, particularly if CIL funding is to become available.
- 2.1.7 Further work has been carried out to the Infrastructure Plan as an addendum. This updates the 2013 version by providing an overview of what categories/types of infrastructure will be (part) funded by CIL and what will be brought forward through S106. The infrastructure projects have been reassessed and reflect the latest position on requirements, costs and timing, funding sources and the funding gap.
- 2.1.8 The Council consulted on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) between Thursday 12th February and Thursday 26th March 2015. A report on the PDCS consultation went before Council on 10 March 2016 with consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) 24th March 2016 to 5th May 2016. The aim to have the levy in place by the end of 2016.

## 3 Context

- 3.1.1 The approach to planning and infrastructure planning is evolving in Wales. The Planning (Wales) Act 2015 brings with it, amongst other new approaches, the potential for joined working between authorities on strategic planning matters, which could include infrastructure, through the creation of SDPs. Added to this is the Wales Infrastructure Investment Plan which sets out funding priorities for major infrastructure and the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal.
- 3.1.2 At a more local level Welsh Government has expressed a desire to build upon bottom up approaches to planning and delivery (which arguably is in conflict with the national and regional approaches set out in the preceding paragraph). Whilst they have not set out formal guidance on how this is to be achieved there are references within the consultation on planning reforms carried out in 2013. In particular paragraph 6.48 states:
- “SPG in the form of Place Plans produced by the community could fulfil a number of roles. It could specify the finer grain detail to be considered at detailed planning application stage, ensuring that development reflects local distinctiveness. It could also be used to identify priorities for investment in community infrastructure, ensuring that best use is made of any funds obtained through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts.”*
- 3.1.3 Whilst this is not formal guidance, it does acknowledge that the linkage between Place Plans, CIL and infrastructure priorities is important. In responding to this recognition, Monmouthshire considers that through engagement with its communities, using the existing Whole Place approach that these linkages should be explored for the betterment of its communities and delivery of sustainable growth in the area.
- 3.1.4 Whilst ‘Place Plans’ did not find their way as formal development plan documents within the Planning (Wales) Act, they continue to be an important tool within Monmouthshire through the Whole Place approach, but with a much wider remit than just spatial planning .
- 3.1.5 The Whole Place approach aims to help communities in Monmouthshire to become strong, resilient and sustainable by working in partnership with them to develop a deliverable area plan. The initiative strives to look at how a whole area approach to public services can lead to better services at less cost. It identifies and tries to avoid duplication of work between organisations and the community. Its aim is to change and improve services and efficiency locally. As part of this approach Monmouthshire has a Whole Place Team which is working with communities to help them identify their priorities and support them in delivering projects. It is therefore much wider than the SPG Place Plan approach identified by Welsh Government, which appears to have more of an emphasis on design and land use planning. By combining the spatial approach to Place Plans with service delivery elements promoted through the Whole Place approach the positive effect on local communities should potentially be far more powerful.

## 4 Whole Place approach in Monmouthshire

- 4.1.1 The focus of this report is to assess whether local communities are involved in decision making around infrastructure delivery. However, in order to comprehend the effect of Whole Place approach on infrastructure planning it is important to understand the broad concept.
- 4.1.2 The Whole Place concept is designed to capture public value and its contributors in a central place. The approach in Monmouthshire is built upon the 'Total Place' concept which seeks to position the community and its needs within the heart of all decision making.
- 4.1.3 Total Place itself has evolved from various government initiatives aimed at localising decision making and bringing together government functions and trying to look at an area or an issue as one, rather than through silo departments. Previous attempts include joined-up government, local area agreements and multi area agreements. Total Place, whilst a fairly obvious and simple concept of public services working together to deliver best value and avoid duplication and waste, has itself been subject to various incarnations through different programmes and projects over the past six years. Total Place has again moved on with City deals and the devolution agenda now at the forefront of delivering this customer/citizen focused approach through joined up services and funding.
- 4.1.4 Monmouthshire is the only local authority in Wales to take forward the Whole Place approach, although with recent announcements of a City Deal for the Cardiff region this could be set to change. The Whole Place approach has come about in Monmouthshire in response to uncertainty and instability in the public sector and ongoing budgetary constraints. Monmouthshire receives the lowest financial settlement from Welsh Government per head of population in Wales. This is compounded by not being eligible for the vast majority of public sector funding streams and no access to EU structural funds. Therefore it is challenged to deliver more for less through more collaborative approaches and community empowerment and ownership.
- 4.1.5 In looking at the relationship between Whole Place Plans approach and the statutory Planning functions of Monmouthshire it is important to emphasise that each have very different responsibilities. Whole Place Plans are bottom up approaches designed and driven by citizens and communities – they are the responsibility of those who create them i.e. the community and they are not bounded by top down policies and procedures in the way in which they are approached. Whereas the statutory Planning of the Council is bound by top down regulation and procedures set by Welsh, UK and European government. That is not to say that they cannot work together or learn from one another, but it must be remembered that each works within a very different context.

## 4.2 Whole Place Plans in Monmouthshire

- 4.2.1 Monmouthshire currently has two Whole Place Plans – Severnside Whole Place Plan, which covers the areas of Caldicot, Magor, Undy, Rogiet, Caerwent, Sudbrook and Portskewett and Bryn y Cwm Whole Place Plan which covers Abergavenny and its surrounds.
- 4.2.2 A third plan around the Lower Wye area, including Chepstow is in early stages of production with a fourth to cover the area of Central Monmouthshire due to commence shortly.

### Severnside

- 4.2.3 The Severnside Whole Place Plan has been in operation for around 4 years, with a review and revised version issued in 2015.
- 4.2.4 The delivery of the 'Plan', to date, has been overseen by the Severnside Programme Board which is comprised of representatives of the county, town and community councils, Churches, Caldicot Town Team, Caldicot Comprehensive School, Monmouthshire Housing Association, Gwent Police and the Health Board.
- 4.2.5 The Plan identifies seven key areas of change that the community wish to tackle within the Severnside area. These are:
- Community health and wellbeing - improving community health through better access to joined-up health and wellbeing services with an emphasis on care of vulnerable members of the community
  - Tourism and enterprise - working collaboratively to promote the Severnside area's considerable tourism and enterprise offer, and to maximise the area's enterprise opportunities
  - Caldicot town centre regeneration - working in partnership with the Caldicot Town Team and with investors and developers to deliver a thriving town centre
  - Community spirit - enhancing community involvement and participation through a range of targeted projects and development of shared facilities
  - Community services - proactively protecting and enhancing the provision of public services, ensuring that they are properly targeted and tailored to cater for identified local need
  - Transport accessibility - developing an integrated approach to transport in the Severnside area including cycle, rail, metro and motorway links
  - 21st century education and community campus - realising the potential of the Caldicot Comprehensive re-development project to provide maximum possible educational benefits for the town and the wider area



4.2.6 Within these broad areas a range of priorities have been identified, some of which could be classed as infrastructure requirements and are set out below:

Table 4.1 Identified infrastructure requirements

Theme	Infrastructure item
Community spirit	New community centre for Magor & Undy
	Enhanced community facilities at Caldicot including provision of a combined theatre/cinema
Accessible transport	A safe cycling network
	New train station at Magor
	Metro links to Magor and Caldicot
	New motorway link at Rogiet
	Severn Tunnel Parkway facility
Caldicot town centre regeneration	Completion of the linkage development from the Asda site to Caldicot town centre
21 <sup>st</sup> century education and community campus	Completion of the Caldicot comprehensive redevelopment project on time and on budget
Tourism and enterprise	Improvements in the attractions and offers available for key sites including Caldicot Castle, Roman Caerwent, Magor Marsh Reserve, Blackrock Picnic Site, Dewstow Gardens, David Broom Equestrian Centre, Severn Tunnel and Pumping Station.
	Provision of safe quality, sustainable walking, cycling and other affordable leisure and sports facilities (including the coastal path).
Community services	Provision of enhanced facilities for young people in Severnside

4.2.7 The identification of the themes and the key priorities to deliver change within those themes has not undergone any formal prioritisation exercise (e.g. cost benefit analysis), but, as is the point on the whole place approach, have been drawn from the thoughts of citizens and groups within Severnside. They were put together by the Programme Board following a detailed analysis of the area from available data and community consultations and it is believed

by them that they meet with community and stakeholder agreement and will enable Severnside groups and citizens to work together to achieve their vision.

4.2.8 The plan also makes clear that its intention is:

*“not to seek to capture all the different initiatives that can and will play a part in the area’s progress over coming years but instead to deliberately focus on those areas and on the initiatives that have the greatest potential to bring about positive change and to act as a catalyst for greater benefits in the future.”<sup>1</sup>*

4.2.9 Therefore the prioritisation has come about through the local groups and communities putting forward what they think are the most important areas to focus on and where they believe that the greatest opportunities exist to bring about positive changes.

4.2.10 Whilst the revised Plan for Severnside identifies the themes and priorities for change it does not currently provide any detail as to how it intends to deliver on its vision for Severnside. Although it does state that some of the activities within each theme are already defined and ongoing. One of the most important factors in seeking community buy in is to deliver on what that community has identified needs to happen. Many communities have been subject to endless strategies and action plans without ever seeing any meaningful change – this leads to at best apathy and at worst mistrust and lack of confidence.

4.2.11 The Seven for Severnside Plan does not currently set out specific deliverables, however it does recognise the need to monitor the progress of the plan through population and project delivery measures (i.e. testing whether the changes and projects identified through the themes and priorities have led to a discernible improvement against an identified baseline). The Plan also suggests that each of the themes will have a dedicated team and team leader, tasked with identifying and delivering short, medium and long term targets. However these have yet to emerge and it is not entirely clear as to how this will work.

4.2.12 As the groups have not yet emerged and therefore no delivery plan or targets are in place, it is understandable that the funding to deliver the priorities has yet to be clarified. These are clearly the next major stages in the Plan’s development and also a major test of the process as the funding providers, whether they be Monmouthshire, Welsh Government or other funders will need to have confidence in the approach in order to dedicate scarce funding resource.

4.2.13 A final consideration of the Severnside Plan is to what extent it has been used to inform Planning in Monmouthshire. In terms of the Local Development Plan, which was adopted in 2014, much of the preparatory work had been undertaken prior to the Whole Place Plan approach gaining any momentum; therefore the opportunity for interaction has been limited.

---

<sup>1</sup> Para 4, page 14 ‘Seven for Severnside Whole Place Community Plan’ Nov 2015

4.2.14 The majority of the infrastructure identified in the Place Plan is also included within the Monmouthshire Infrastructure Plan, which whilst not a development plan document does demonstrate the infrastructure items required to fully deliver the aspiration of the Development Plan. Their inclusion (whether by design or not) is a result of many of the infrastructure items identified by the local community already being an aspiration for Monmouthshire Council and other delivery bodies involved in production of the infrastructure plan.

### **Bryn-y-Cwm**

4.2.15 The Bryn-y-Cwm Whole Place Plan was produced in 2013, a review is currently being considered.

4.2.16 The delivery of the Plan is over seen by the Programme Board which is currently made up of 9 members representing partner groups in and around Abergavenny. They are guided by the Plan's vision from which its actions and priorities arise:

*“Abergavenny and District – An area with a vibrant market town and superb local environment that looks after everyone, offers quality life experiences to all its residents and welcomes visitors with open arms”*

4.2.17 The Plan identifies four priority themes:

- Abergavenny Town Centre and the wider business environment
- Make sure no one gets left further behind / community cohesion
- Strengthening education and business links
- Creating a sustainable settlement

4.2.18 Within these broad areas a range of projects have been identified. A recent Programme Board Paper (22nd Feb 2016) has usefully split these projects into 'research', 'revenue' and 'capital'. Within the capital projects there are number that would be classified as infrastructure:

Table 4.2 Capital projects

Theme	Infrastructure item
Abergavenny Town Centre and the wider business environment	TC12 Lion Street and Market Street - Enhancements between the supermarket and the eastern entry to Brewery Yard in Abergavenny.
Making sure no-one gets left further behind/Community Cohesion	CC6 Park Street – Plan to open a multi-use Community Resource Centre in refurbished local primary school.
Strengthening education and	EB5 King Henry VIII 21st Century Schools Vocational Block - New build or refurbishment

business links	(200m2), focus on construction, green economy and catering/customer service
----------------	---

4.2.19 It is notable that the number and range of infrastructure projects identified in Bryn-y-Cwm Whole Place Plan is significantly less than Severnside. Many of the projects identified in the Bryn-Y-Cwm plan are around research and capacity building and not physical improvements. This different approach could be for a number of reasons but it is considered that it is largely due the type of groups involved in the process and the identified lack of infrastructure investment into the Severnside area in the past.

4.2.20 As with Severnside no formal prioritisation has taken place and the projects that have been identified are drawn from a scoping workshop and a baseline research report. It is not entirely clear who had responsibility for identifying the projects but as they are set out in the Plan it is assumed that they were confirmed by the Programme Board.

4.2.21 The Plan does identify the delivery partners and potential funding sources. In terms of the identified infrastructure projects the town centre projects are to be funded by S106/278 contributions and delivered by the town team and town centre officer, the multi use community resource centre will be led by the Abergavenny Community Trust and funded through Lottery, and the development of the learning block funded and delivered by the 21st Century schools programme.

4.2.22 However, there is no evidence to suggest that a review of these project priorities and delivery has been undertaken or whether any have been achieved. It is noted that the Programme Board have recognised that some of the projects have no lead and are lacking accountability. Measures are in hand to improve reporting and leadership.

4.2.23 As in Severnside the LDP was too far down the line for any significant collaboration between the Whole Place Plan and the LDP. However, as with Severnside the infrastructure projects identified within the Place Plan are all included within the Infrastructure Plan.

**4.3 Key findings from the Whole Place Plan approach**

4.3.1 It is clear from the experience of the Whole Place Plan approach at Severnside and Bryn-y-Cwm that good governance structures are key to implementing the projects identified in the Plans. In both areas a lack of structure and skills has meant that Programme Boards have struggled to oversee the delivery of the Plans and in particular monitor their progress.

4.3.2 In each area there is recognition that whilst some progress has been made, especially in terms of building relationships between citizens and the delivery agencies such as the Council, actual community led projects have been more limited. The successful projects relating to infrastructure provision have

generally come about because they were already in consideration by Monmouthshire or Welsh Government.

- 4.3.3 In terms of the relationship between Place Plans and LDP there is certainly a benefit to a more joined approach. In the recent past there has been little or no linkage other than identifying infrastructure projects. This is mainly to do with the timing but as reviews are considered, there is opportunity to improve the linkage and gain from the local capacity building which has occurred through the whole place approach. However, whilst better linkages are desired, tensions will always exist between the statutory functions of the Council, often directed at a Welsh Government level and more local decision making.
- 4.3.4 It should be noted that Monmouthshire Council is currently reviewing community governance arrangements, which will include looking at the Programme Boards and their relationship with Area Committees. This may change the approach to Place Planning and its governance.

## 5 Good practice from Local Authorities within Wales in respect of infrastructure planning and community involvement

### 5.1 Plan and evidence review

- 5.1.1 In order to discover and tease out best practise in respect of infrastructure planning and relationship with local communities a website review of every local authority in Wales has been undertaken to establish what level of infrastructure planning has been undertaken. In particular the aim of the search was to establish whether clearly identifiable infrastructure plans, prepared and issued either separately as part of the evidence base for LDPs and CIL or wholly contained within delivery or similar sections of the LDP. It is accepted that some authorities may have prepared individual schedules or strategies for specific infrastructure items but it was beyond the scope of this work to identify this type of approach.
- 5.1.2 In reviewing each authority it was considered that the status of their Plan and approach to CIL was important contextual information as this will have an influence on the range of information provided.
- 5.1.3 The following tables sets out for each authority the status of their Plan, whether or not they have or intend to introduce CIL and the approach to consolidated infrastructure plans.

Table 5.1 Plan and CIL status and infrastructure planning

Authority	LDP adopted	CIL?	Infrastructure Plan or evidence of infrastructure planning
Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council	2012	Not pursuing	There is no formal infrastructure plan, however Chapter 9 in the LDP does set out the main infrastructure requirements arising from site allocations and potential funding sources.  No infrastructure priorities are identified
Bridgend County Borough Council	2013	No recent evidence of CIL being pursued	There is no formal infrastructure plan, however Appendix in the LDP does set out some infrastructure requirements arising from site allocations and potential funding sources. There are also some SPD of mixed vintage covering various infrastructure needs.

			No infrastructure priorities are identified
Brecon Beacons National Park Authority	2013	Not pursuing CIL	There is no formal infrastructure plan, and no infrastructure priorities are identified
Caerphilly County Borough Council	2010 UDP new LDP version currently on Deposit until May 2016	Yes, charged since 2014	Within the Deposit Replacement Plan in Appendix 20 there is an Infrastructure Plan, which identifies requirements costs, delivery period, funding and lead agency. The delivery period does suggest a priority in the provision; however there is little explanation as to how that has been determined other than it being in line with the associated housing trajectory.
The City of Cardiff Council	2016	Yes, PDCS	Infrastructure Plan prepared for LDP. The Plan sets out the infrastructure needs of Cardiff to support growth, including costs and potential funding sources. Some prioritisation included around whether infrastructure is required to enable development or to support development and through identifying timeframes for delivery.
Carmarthenshire County Council	2014	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP
Ceredigion County Council	2013	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP
Conwy	2013	Yes - DCS	Infrastructure requirements identified as part of CIL evidence base. However no evidence of priorities or community involvement.
Denbighshire County Council	2013	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP
Flintshire County Council	2011 UDP	CIL viability study published 2014	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the <u>UDP</u>

Gwynedd Council and Isle of Anglesey County Council	2015 Deposit (Joint with Anglesey)	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP
Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council	2011	Yes, charged since 2014	There is no formal infrastructure plan, however Appendix in the LDP does set out some infrastructure requirements arising from site allocations. No prioritisation.
Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council	2016	No evidence of CIL being pursued	Infrastructure Plan prepared to support LDP. Some prioritisation included, as well as broad costs and sources of funding. Also references to infrastructure requirements, specifically identified in policy, within delivery section of LDP, including funding/delivery body and phasing.
Newport City Council	2015	Yes - DCS	Infrastructure requirements identified as part of CIL evidence base. Priorities broadly identified. Also references to infrastructure requirements, specifically identified in policy, within delivery section of LDP.
Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority	2010	No evidence of CIL being pursued	There is no formal infrastructure plan, and no infrastructure priorities are identified
Pembrokeshire County Council	2013	No evidence of CIL being pursued	A delivery study (supporting) the LDP sets out broad infrastructure needs on a site by site basis. However no indication of priority.
Powys County Council	Deposit 2015	CIL viability study published 2014	LDP sets out some infrastructure needs on a site by site basis. However no indication of priority.
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council	2011	Yes, charged since 2014	Infrastructure requirements identified as part of CIL evidence base. Appendix in the LDP does set out some infrastructure requirements arising from site allocations with an indication on timing.
Snowdonia National Park Authority	2011	No evidence of CIL being	There is no formal infrastructure plan, and no infrastructure priorities



		pursued	are identified
City and County of Swansea	2008 UDP	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP preparation work
Torfaen County Borough Council	2013	No evidence of CIL being pursued	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP preparation work
Vale of Glamorgan Council	Submitted 2015	Indication that CIL will be pursued but no evidence of progress	Infrastructure Plan prepared to support LDP. Some phasing included, as well as broad costs and sources of funding
Wrexham County Borough Council	2005 UDP	CIL viability study published 2014	No evidence of any infrastructure plans either separately or within the LDP preparation work

- 5.1.4 It is clear from this review that the majority of local authorities have not undertaken any formalised consolidated infrastructure planning. This may be in part to do with the limited WG guidance on infrastructure planning locally. Bringing together the information on infrastructure requirements is crucial in enabling informed decisions on priorities and understanding the interrelationship between often competing (in terms of funding) needs.
- 5.1.5 Where Plans have been prepared there is often a correlation with CIL. That is, where CIL is being pursued a more rigorous assessment of infrastructure requirements has been undertaken. This is driven by CIL regulations that require local authorities wishing to bring in CIL to demonstrate infrastructure funding gaps and provide clarity as to expectation on the Regulation 123 list which sets out the types of infrastructure that CIL will fund. A further requirement of the regulations is to ensure there is no double counting between CIL items and those sought from S106 and a limitation on the number of S106s that can be used to fund individual items of infrastructure. The latter is a regulation that is in force whether or not CIL is in place.
- 5.1.6 Whilst recognising the limitation of a web search it was considered that there was little evidence to show that any interaction has taken place between local communities and the local authority in terms of identifying infrastructure and prioritising which requirements are most important. In fact there little evidence of any prioritisation other than linking to housing trajectories.

## 5.2 Review of Wales authorities with CIL in place or under consideration

- 5.2.1 In recognition of the lack of published information, further research was undertaken to discuss the roles of communities and general approaches to infrastructure planning where CIL is already in place.
- 5.2.2 In Wales only three authorities are currently charging CIL – Caerphilly, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhondda Cynon Taf. A further three authorities, Cardiff, Newport and Conway are in the advanced stages towards adopting CIL. Three examples of approaches are reviewed as follows.

### **Cardiff**

- 5.2.3 In Cardiff an Infrastructure Plan was prepared as part of the evidence to support the Local Development Plan. The Council undertook consultation with key infrastructure providers including its own service areas. Whilst there was no direct community involvement within that process, officers were of the view that many of the service providers had prepared strategies or guidance, which in some cases had included community involvement in terms of identifying needs.
- 5.2.4 The broad Infrastructure Plan highlights that much of the infrastructure needs arising from new growth is centred at the strategic allocations. Within each of these areas Masterplans are being prepared in conjunction with the Council and local communities to provide a framework for delivery. Through this process there will be opportunity for local Community Councils and the wider community to identify infrastructure needs within both the new and adjacent existing areas that are being affected by growth.
- 5.2.5 In terms of these strategic sites Officers are recommending that the Council do not seek CIL on those sites and instead rely on S106 agreements for infrastructure delivery, with prioritisation determined through that process.
- 5.2.6 CIL will be applied across other areas but the CIL 'pot' will be much more limited in terms of potential receipts if the strategic sites are zero rated. In response it is likely that any income received will be used to fund a limited number of projects, likely to be transport related, to avoid spreading the funding too thinly to be of any use. The 123 list will be used to identify these projects and this will be approved through Cabinet, though discussions are currently ongoing with service providers.

### **Newport**

- 5.2.7 Like Cardiff, Newport prepared an Infrastructure Plan as part of its evidence base to the LDP. However, unlike Cardiff, most of Newport's housing supply was already permitted and thus infrastructure provision already addressed. Therefore the infrastructure requirements set out relate to about a third of the anticipated growth over the plan period.

- 5.2.8 In undertaking their infrastructure planning Newport generally relied on internal consultation with service providers and responses received through the plan making process, albeit these were limited. There was little response by either developers or the local community in respect of infrastructure provision.
- 5.2.9 The Infrastructure Plan has formed the basis of the draft Regulation 123 list. Prioritising has been undertaken by officers identifying which infrastructure items will unlock growth and those that create place and community, with the former identified as the top priority.
- 5.2.10 The Council are considering options around governance and how spending will be attributed. Early thoughts are to engage with service providers and invite them to bid for funding for the projects identified on the 123 list. Members would then decide which bids to support. Alternatively or in parallel Members may be asked to suggest projects, with guidance from officers. However, as Newport is yet to have a CIL in place the arrangements are still to be finalised.

### **Caerphilly**

- 5.2.11 Caerphilly is one of the few authorities with a CIL in place in Wales. In much the same way as the other authorities, infrastructure needs have been identified through the plan making process and replicated in the Regulation 123 list as appropriate.
- 5.2.12 At present, although CIL has been in place for around 2 years the collection of funds has been limited. This is largely due to relatively low rates and limited growth. Therefore whilst there is a substantial list of infrastructure requirements the Council does recognise that it is unlikely that CIL will fund all of it as receipts continue to be limited.
- 5.2.13 When CIL funding is received the authority is currently saving it so it can make a meaningful contribution to infrastructure provision. It is understood that Members will be involved in determining the priorities for spending when it is considered there is sufficient money in the 'pot' to make a difference.

## 6 Good practice from Local Authorities within England in respect of infrastructure planning and community involvement

- 6.1.1 Involvement from local communities in decision making in respect of infrastructure planning has gained traction in England through a combination of the introduction of neighbourhood plans and the requirement to apportion CIL receipts for the exclusive use of local communities.
- 6.1.2 The reality of these approaches is that it has forced local authorities to more actively engage with their local communities in an effort to line up local priorities with those of the local authority. In particular where neighbourhood plans are in place in areas with substantial growth and a CIL, the neighbourhood plan area will potentially be set to receive significant funding which could be crucial to delivery.
- 6.1.3 Whilst a number of local authorities now have CIL in place, many are still in their infancy and therefore not advanced in their processes and procedures around community involvement and governance. Therefore for the purposes of this research several front running Local Planning Authorities who implemented CIL charging schedules early were identified. Having had time to allow the schedules to bed-in, each offered examples of different systems put in place to deliver community level infrastructure projects; particularly the mechanisms for transferring the statutory 15% of total CIL collection or 25% of area-specific collection in the case of adopted Neighbourhood Plan Areas.
- 6.1.4 The four case study areas; Poole Borough Council, Exeter City Council, Plymouth City Council, and Shropshire Council demonstrate a broad range of approaches, ranging from council controlled competitive bidding to significant devolution of 80% of CIL income to the local level. The examples chosen also offer examples of both Parished authority areas, where there are organised council bodies to receive funds and non-parished area which have no clear body responsible for receiving and spending CIL funds. As well as identifying how each of these Charging authorities has approached the neighbourhood/local portion of the CIL, the report also sets out how priorities for spending have been identified for the remaining part of the CIL 'pot'.

### Poole

- 6.1.5 **Poole neighbourhood funds** - Poole Borough Council adopted their CIL charging schedule in January 2013. The council currently hold all the funds and now have in excess of £150,000 fund set aside (as per statutory requirements) for, community-led infrastructure projects. The borough is an unparished urban area, with no 'made' Neighbourhood Plans. There are currently two designated Neighbourhood Plan Areas; one area is half-way through the plan preparation process and the other is just getting started.

- 6.1.6 The Council is still trying to agree on governance arrangements to allocate the 'neighbourhood' sums already collected and future levy receipts. It has proposed to set up a CIL Neighbourhood Working Party made up of officers and Councillors with cross borough representation. Councillors can put forward their proposals for CIL funded projects in their respective wards and the working party as a whole can decide upon the priority of these projects and where the CIL funds will be allocated. Through discussions with local people and Council Officers it would be the Councillors responsibility to establish what infrastructure needs there are in their ward. Representatives from the Borough's Neighbourhood Forums should also form part of the group to ensure that any cross boundary needs between Neighbourhood Forums and Wards can be discussed and resolved where necessary.
- 6.1.7 Having decided upon the allocation of funds towards the appropriate projects the CIL Neighbourhood Portion Working Party shall put forward their proposals to Planning and Regeneration Services including Building Consultancy. The proposal will then be signed off by the Service Unit Head allowing the release of funds by Financial Services for their spending.
- 6.1.8 Poole's approach is clearly member, rather than local community led and whilst it offers benefits in terms of familiarity of the process, as it conforms with normal council business, it does not offer a locally driven apportionment of the levy and runs the risk of Councillor 'pet' projects being funded, rather than those derived from the local community. However it is understood that the Council is reconsidering its proposed approach and that more community involvement could be considered.
- 6.1.9 **Poole other CIL funding** - In terms of the remaining CIL funds, the Council have a statutory responsibility to allocate the funding towards projects that enable development to conform to the Habitat Regulations.
- 6.1.10 If there are still any funds left then the Council have resolved to incorporate those funds into the Capital Programme, which at present is prioritising repayments for a newly constructed bridge. This is a corporate priority, with no formal consultation or local community involvement.
- 6.1.11 Whilst infrastructure requirements have been identified as part of the plan making process, the majority of these requirements, unless they relate to Habitats mitigation or the bridge will not receive any funding from CIL, this includes infrastructure such as open space and education.

### **Plymouth**

- 6.1.12 **Plymouth neighbourhood funding** - Plymouth City Council implemented a CIL charging schedule in 2013 and has adopted an innovative approach to transferring CIL funds to the community level. The council is unparished and is therefore able to be more flexible in its approach.

- 6.1.13 Plymouth has made use of the popular 'Crowdfunder' concept which allows individuals or groups to pitch a project or idea in the hope of securing investment from groups or individuals. In collaboration with Plymouth University, the council has created its own 'Crowdfunder' site where community groups, individuals, local businesses and local enterprises can pitch projects and the most popular are chosen for match-funding from the council using the 15% of CIL funds allocated to local-level projects. The council will fund 50% of the cost of projects costing £5,000 or less which address environmental issues, skills, community activity, local business start-up and healthy lifestyles.
- 6.1.14 The council has set aside £60,000 of anticipated CIL income to invest in 'Crowdfunder' projects. Since March 2015, the council has identified 6 projects to match fund, including a creative arts centre for children in Devonport, an open air cinema in the city for the summer, and a drop-in centre for the deaf.
- 6.1.15 Plymouth's approach is a good example of bottom up apportioning of the levy – the local community decides what it wants and seeks the funding – the downside is that only those who are social media savvy are likely to benefit. The Council will need to be aware of whether any disproportionate funding is happening and take measures to address should this be the case.
- 6.1.16 **Plymouth other CIL funding** - In terms of the remaining CIL pot, the Council has set a clear method to identify its spending priorities. The fundamental aim is that the use of CIL should be plan-led. Plymouth's CIL charging schedule was considered against the current Core Strategy and therefore it is considered important that any spend reflects the mitigation of development impacts that fall within the Localism Act 2011 definition of infrastructure. To that end five principles were established:
- Principle 1: CIL is used to help meet the infrastructure needs and priorities necessary for the sustainable development of Plymouth, as set out in the city's planning strategy and associated delivery plans.
  - Principle 2: CIL is used to mitigate infrastructure impacts of development which have in the past been mitigated through the Section 106 process.
  - Principle 3: CIL is used to help fund infrastructure improvements where the Section 106 process would be ineffective in meeting these needs.
  - Principle 4: The effectiveness of CIL will be optimised through prioritising its use as a match funding / gap funding source, linked to other infrastructure funding.
  - Principle 5: The effectiveness of CIL will be optimised through prioritising its use on projects which help unlock further growth.
- 6.1.17 The principles guided the 123 list which outlines four broad areas for spending and in April 2016 the Council, through its City Council Investment Board

agreed to allocate £2,345,000 of CIL funds to the following Regulation 123 List projects:

- £850,000 for City Centre Public Realm.
- £245,000 for the European Marine Site.
- £300,000 for the Central Library.
- £950,000 for North Prospect community infrastructure.

6.1.18 The Council has therefore followed through with its initial prioritising which informed the 123 list based on those core principles. It is clear that the limited number of projects identified and the wait to collect sufficient funding in the 'pot' has resulted in some significant funding being allocated, avoiding spreading funding to thinly and achieving little.

### **Exeter**

6.1.19 **Exeter neighbourhood funding** - Exeter City Council implemented a CIL charging schedule in December 2013. The urban council is unparished and therefore retains full control of CIL funds set aside for community-level projects. The exception to this is the Neighbourhood Plan area of St James'. However, The Neighbourhood Forum in this case has chosen to forgo their right to 25% of CIL proceeds from development within their neighbourhood plan area and has instead opted to take their share of the 15% of funds drawn from development across the whole council area which is then divided equally between all the community areas in Exeter.

6.1.20 The council is currently preparing to implement mechanisms for transferring CIL funds to the local-level, centred on the formation of community groups and a city-wide community forum. Officers are beginning to aid previously defined community group areas in preparing Community Development Strategies for their areas including a list of local projects considered priorities for funding. As part of this process, with the help of a 'facilitator', community groups will undertake an audit of existing facilities to identify gap in infrastructure provision in their area, forming the basis of each priority list.

6.1.21 Representatives from each community group will come together at a Community Forum to make collective decisions in a competitive bidding format to devise one list of projects they wish to fund with CIL money allocated to them. In this case, it may be the case that all 15% of funds collected across the council area will be directed to one project considered critical by the forum rather than distributed evenly. This is in contrast to Parished council areas where each parish is entitled to their share of the 15%.

6.1.22 The council intends to maintain control of the community fund, releasing funds on a project-by-project basis rather than an annual payment to the forum. However, there will be little interference by the council regarding the priority projects identified by community groups and the forum.

- 6.1.23 **Exeter other CIL funding** – In Exeter, like Plymouth and Poole there is a statutory requirement to top slice the CIL receipts to fund mitigation of the impact of development to meet Habitats directive. In Exeter's case this accounts to 8% of the CIL pot, though this would be dependent on the receipts and level and location of development.
- 6.1.24 In common with Poole it is the corporate priority, this time redeveloping the bus station in the city centre for provision of a new swimming pool, which is the driver for allocating CIL funds. Whilst the governance report for CIL recognises that other strategic funding for education and transport projects may be required it is focusing on a single project in the first five years of CIL receipts.

### **Shropshire**

- 6.1.25 **Shropshire CIL funding** - Shropshire Council was one of the very first Local Planning Authorities to implement a CIL charging schedule in January 2012. There is one 'made' Neighbourhood Plan at Much Wenlock, and 2-3 more Neighbourhood Plan Areas at various stages of plan preparation.
- 6.1.26 The local authority is divided into community areas comprising main settlements and their hinterland, with the Town or Parish Council acting as the lead administrative body. Unlike the other case studies, where there is a clear divide between the neighbourhood proportion and the remaining amount, CIL income in Shropshire is substantially devolved to this community level.
- 6.1.27 In most cases (where there is no neighbourhood plan) – 5% of the CIL receipt is retained by the Council for administration costs and 15% is passed directly to the Parish or Town council as per the Regs (neighbourhood fund). Of the remaining funds, 90% is also set aside for Parish and Town Councils (CIL Local Fund) and the remaining 10% is retained by Shropshire for strategic projects. Strategic allocation sites are not liable for CIL and their infrastructure costs are generally met by S106 agreement.
- 6.1.28 Each Community Area (18 in total) has a formal 'Place Plan' detailing the communities' aspirations and includes a pre-agreed list of 'critical, priority and desirable' infrastructure projects for each area. The Place Plans have all been prepared in conjunction with the Council (including members) and key service providers and signed off at full council meeting. The Place Plans also identify funding sources for the infrastructure, including CIL and its component parts i.e. neighbourhood fund, local CIL fund and strategic fund.
- 6.1.29 The CIL income (apart from the neighbourhood fund) are held by the Council and monitored using a Xacoms software package. Funds are administered on a project by project basis following the preparation and approval of a Project Plan. The responsibility for signing off this money is shared between senior officers and members, with any amount over £5,000 requiring approval by the portfolio holder, members and officers.



- 6.1.30 In some instances, where they feel able to take on the responsibility, the funds will be transferred to the Town Council who will then take charge of procurement. Others are unable or do not wish to get involved in this process and leave this to the Council who then pay the delivery bodies directly. This will also often be dependent on the size of the project; with some community areas spending more regularly on small and medium-sized projects and others choosing to 'save up' for big ticket items.
- 6.1.31 The latest published figure, which show CIL income and spending from January 2012 – 31st March 2015 sets out that of the circa £2.4m collected, £265,000 has been passed to the Parish and Town Councils as part of the statutory neighbourhood proportion, of the remaining funds only £133,000 has been spent (mainly administration), with around £1.8m in the bank, yet to be spent.
- 6.1.32 A report from December 2015 suggests that only three CIL projects had been funded from the CIL local fund. The report also recognises that the Place Plans approach had been burdensome to both the Council and the Town and Parish Councils and that there was confusion around priorities for infrastructure. This may partially explain why such little funding has happened as the Place Plans do set out an extensive number of projects which has proven difficult to identify which should come forward first.
- 6.1.33 Another issue highlighted is that where non-allocated large development sites have been located outside the local urban area but have an impact on service provision that crosses parish borders. This situation requires collaboration between Town and Parish Councils, and the sharing of CIL income. However, this has proved challenging in some cases.
- 6.1.34 Shropshire Council is due to review its CIL charging schedule and funding mechanisms shortly. The current system was implemented in the period after the publication of the Localism Act and is very much in the spirit of the act. Now up for review, it is implied that there may be some effort to retain a greater percentage of future funds to secure adequate funding for strategic and cross-parish infrastructure projects.

## **6.2 Key findings from approaches to community spending**

- 6.2.1 Local Authorities without Parish Council areas are afforded significantly more freedom regarding the distribution of CIL funds to the community level. This has enabled some to come up with innovative systems utilising online marketplaces to prioritise community-based projects, such as in Plymouth. However, such mechanisms have to be put in place in order to devolve the funding to the community and this requires time and effort. In some cases, this has led to the local authority sitting on significant funds of money whilst they decide upon and implement a system for distribution.
- 6.2.2 In Shropshire, clear foundations for community project prioritisation were put in place and allowed the council confidence to devolve the majority of CIL

income to community level. However, where strategic infrastructure has been required to deliver large development sites, the council has been left with limited power to direct funds to the infrastructure required and struggles to encourage neighbouring Parishes and community areas to cooperate.

### **6.3 Key finding in respect of general CIL funding and prioritisation**

- 6.3.1 It was clear that in three of the examples the regulations around Habitats Directive are in part driving the approach. As a statutory requirement the Council have little choice in the matter because of the CIL regulations that define much of the habitat mitigation as infrastructure and therefore subject to pooling restrictions. If CIL is not used to mitigate then the Council would be required to use its own funds or refuse planning permission.
- 6.3.2 Two of the Councils have chosen single items of infrastructure to fund with CIL. Whilst in one respect this focus means that they are not spreading funds and will achieve the funding target more quickly, it also means that only a limited part of the community will benefit and there has been limited 'community' input (or buy in) into the prioritisation exercise. These single infrastructure projects risk the perception of being considered as the local member's 'pet' projects.
- 6.3.3 In Shropshire it would appear the reverse has happened with too many projects identified, with no clear steer on which should be receiving funding. The involvement of the local community and the long list of identified projects may have caused some of this issue, with a risk of nothing receiving funding because of lack of clarity and funding spread over too many projects. In time, unless carefully managed this could lead to resentment and lack of future engagement.
- 6.3.4 The approach in Plymouth, whereby the priorities are Plan led, and a variety of infrastructure projects identified, but not so many as to make the funding meaningless, would seem to be a good approach. The Plan process was enshrined within community led consultation, so the projects selected should match with the aspirations of both the local community and the Council.

## 7 Approach to joint planning with other local authorities

- 7.1.1 Whilst no formal arrangements currently exist for joint planning, there is a general direct of travel within Wales that suggests that this will be in place within the next few years. Whilst full boundary changes have been considered these look to be on hold for the time being. However it is likely that through either the introduction of an SDP and/or the CCRC Deal aspirations that some form of joint regional level of planning will be introduced. Therefore examples of how infrastructure planning and in particular governance arrangements are working at this higher level is important. Whilst these examples are all in England they do offer interesting and useful practice that could be applicable to Monmouthshire.
- 7.1.2 Examples of best practice for cross-boundary working relating to CIL and joint infrastructure requirements were sought. Three partnerships engaging in joint working of this kind were identified as 'leading lights'. Consultation with three of these 'leading lights' in joint working sought to draw out key lessons learned from various experiences of joint working particularly focusing on methods of cross-boundary project prioritisation and spending, monitoring mechanisms and effective governance arrangements. The three case study partnerships; Greater Norwich Growth Partnership, West Northamptonshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU), and Cambridgeshire and Peterborough JSPU offer varied experiences of joint infrastructure working, both in terms of the partnerships' approach to project prioritisation, spending and monitoring, and their success.

### **Greater Norwich Growth Partnership**

- 7.1.3 The Greater Norwich Growth Partnership is made up of Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council, and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The Norwich partnership arguably offers the most advanced and well established example of cross boundary infrastructure working.
- 7.1.4 The Norwich planning authorities have a strong history of joint working previously on the RSS, particularly relating to the management of the Capital Growth Funding awarded to the RDA to realise the ambitious growth plans set out in the RSS. Since the revocation of the RSS the three constituent planning authorities, supported by the county and local LEP, have worked together to produce a Joint Core Strategy (adopted in 2011), a joint Infrastructure Delivery Plan, a joint SHMNA (also incorporating Breckland DC and North Norfolk DC in recognition of the wider geographic reach of the Norwich HMA), and jointly produced CIL Charging Schedules. As was the case previously with the Capital Growth Funding, a key role of the partnership has been to secure and manage the Greater Norwich City Deal Funding to bring forward the growth ambitions of the JCS.

- 7.1.5 The Partnership and Growth Board (key decision-making body for the partnership) is funded and overseen by the county council, who are recognised as the major infrastructure provider and is attended by the Chief Executives of the constituent district authorities. The board was initially set up by the county council to manage the Capital Growth Funding used to pursue the ambitious growth plans set out in the RSS. More recently, the partnership board has been used in a similar capacity, in conjunction with the LEP, to secure and manage the Greater Norwich City Deal Funding to bring forward the growth plans of the JCS.
- 7.1.6 Prioritisation of infrastructure projects was frontloaded in Norwich. Appendix 7 of the JCS contains a categorised list of key projects identified and agreed on by the constituent authorities. These projects are divided into three categories based on whether the infrastructure is fundamental to delivering key elements of the JCS or are required to deliver the overall vision of the strategy but would not represent a barrier to physical growth. This list has in turn provided the basis for the Joint Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- 7.1.7 Collective CIL charging is seen by the partnership as key to delivering the growth set out in the JCS. Though each district council represents an individual charging authority, the CIL charging schedules have been jointly prepared and evidenced. All three charging authorities have also signed a Growth Partnership Constitution, a legally binding agreement, that commits the charging authorities to pool CIL funds (other than statutory commitment, i.e. Neighbourhood Plan areas) in order to fund the infrastructure priorities set out in the JCS and IDP. This agreement is recognised by the partnership to be key to the successful joint working relationship. In committing to the sharing of CIL money, there is a shared understanding between the authorities that each area will, over the course of the plan period, be provided with the infrastructure required in their area.
- 7.1.8 The 123 infrastructure list in the Joint Core Strategy provided the basis for setting the strategic infrastructure programme for the plan period in the form of a Joint Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The 123 list and delivery plan are continually updated as projects change or are completed. As the infrastructure plan is intrinsically linked to the JCS, its remit is limited to JCS authority areas; Norfolk County authorities lying outside this area take responsibility for their own infrastructure funding. It is recognised that the JCS area represents a functional economic region centred around the city of Norwich, and that there is a more tenuous relationship with non-JCS Norfolk authorities. As such, it was advocated that to include these authorities in joint infrastructure funding and delivery arrangements would offer little benefit as the overarching objective of the Growth Partnership is to manage and enable the growth of Norwich as a city region.
- 7.1.9 Each year, using the strategic 123 list and IDP as a starting point, each JCS district prepares an Annual Business Plan. The Annual Business Plan sets out the authorities' predicted funding requirements for projects they need to secure growth in line with the strategic development plan. The plans are signed off

on a district level at full council meeting and taken to the combined Growth Board where chief executives of each district, the county council and the LEP determine the projects that will be supported for the coming year. These strategic priorities for funding are set out in a single annual infrastructure delivery plan, prepared by officers and agreed by politicians, which is then taken back to district level to be formally ratified by each council; it is necessary at this stage for the decisions of the Growth Board to be ratified at district level as the Growth Partnership does not have equal statutory powers.

- 7.1.10 The Growth Board meet on a 6 monthly timetable; once to prepare the annual plan, and once to check the progress of the projects funded. CIL funds allocated in the annual plan are administered by officers on a project-by-project basis. The pooled CIL fund is held by the County on behalf of the Growth Partnership. Districts are liable to pay into the fund every six months.
- 7.1.11 CIL funding for local level community projects are dealt with on a district by district basis. It was highlighted that there is little need to discuss projects of this scale at cross-boundary level as the projects are predominantly small in scale and their geographic impact limited to community areas. It was also noted that whilst such projects may seem comparatively insignificant in the context of large strategic infrastructure project planning, they are high value to local communities. As such, it makes more sense to consider the prioritisation of community-level projects at district level.

### **West Northamptonshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU)**

- 7.1.12 The West Northamptonshire JSPU is up of Daventry District Council, Northampton Borough Council and South Northamptonshire District Council. Whilst joint working between the three constituent authorities has enabled the production and recent adoption of the Joint Core Strategy, cross-boundary infrastructure working appears less advanced than at Norwich.
- 7.1.13 The JSPU is governed by the Directors of the constituent District Councils in addition to the county council and a Director of Joint Planning, who sit on a Steering Board. Councillors from all districts also come together at a Joint Members Committee.
- 7.1.14 Similarly to the Norwich case study, the JCS contains a list of pre-agreed infrastructure priorities. Those in the Core Strategy are predominantly strategic 'showstopper' projects required to deliver the growth ambitions of the plan. The three authorities also share an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that is broadly based on the JCS project priorities.
- 7.1.15 It is noted that the strategic projects that cross the administrative authority boundaries are primarily water and highways based. Indeed, the Northampton Greater Management Scheme, directed by the Highways Authority in conjunction with the county and district councils, is tasked specifically with the maintenance and upgrading of the A45 corridor between Junction 15 of the M1 and Great Billing Interchange. This stretch of

road is already used heavily by those within the borough and those from adjacent districts commuting into Northampton and will come under increasing strain as a result of the planned development in the JCS.

- 7.1.16 Now the JCS has been adopted, the JSPU is turning its attention to CIL charging schedules. As has been done in Norwich, the constituent authorities jointly prepared and evidence their charging schedules. Each charging schedule was adopted at the end of September 2015, however, they will not be implemented until April 2016 to align with the start of a new financial year.
- 7.1.17 Currently development obligations arrangements (£106) are organised on a largely autonomous basis. This disjointed approach to negotiation and monitoring has already been raised as an area of concern by the County Council, particularly how such arrangements might translate into CIL collection. As such, there is recognition that there would need to be an element of pooling of CIL moneys in order to fund those cross-boundary highways and water projects, in addition to new schools with cross-boundary catchment areas.
- 7.1.18 A strong working relationship between the JSPU and utilities and service providers was highlighted as particularly beneficial in identifying and delivering priority joint infrastructure projects.

### **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit**

- 7.1.19 The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough JSPU is made up of Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, East Cambridgeshire District Council, Fenland District Council, Huntingdonshire District Council, Peterborough City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 7.1.20 Cambridgeshire has a strong history of joint working. However, this has previously been focussed on strategic housing development due to the Cambridgeshire Horizons project and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. Though this case study offers some important lessons about cross-boundary governance and relationships, this partnership has only recently begun to address joint infrastructure funding and provision.
- 7.1.21 The governance arrangements relating to strategic housing delivery appears fairly sophisticated in Cambridgeshire. Strategic cross-boundary development applications are devolved to a Joint Development Control Committee which acts as the determining authority for cross-boundary development. Where applications involve Section 106 agreements, the Joint Development Control Committee negotiate one agreement on behalf of the authorities.
- 7.1.22 In addition to strategic residential development schemes, more recently, the constituent authorities have begun to work jointly on large infrastructure projects and funding. It was noted that this was in part due to the availability of infrastructure funding sources such as The Local Growth Fund and other LEP funding sources targeted at strategic infrastructure projects. National

competition for such funding has provided the impetus for joint infrastructure prioritisation in order that the wider functional area might be successful in gaining funding for key large scale projects with a stronger joint bid.

- 7.1.23 It was noted that, on the whole, there is a good working relationship between the district authorities and county. However, where funding is scarce the relationship becomes more strained. The example of potentially pooling CIL money was cited as becoming increasingly difficult promote to constituent councils as more funds are being given over to Neighbourhood groups etc.

## **7.2 Key findings from joint approaches to infrastructure spending**

- 7.2.1 Whilst no formal arrangements are yet in place for Monmouthshire in respect to joint working or city region planning, there are still a number of lessons that are applicable to the current circumstances. At present details are limited on the role and content of both SDPs and the CCRC Deal – however it is likely that function could be similar to the emerging crop of joint plans in England, some of which have been referred to here.
- 7.2.2 In the examples a strong working relationship between the County Council, as a key infrastructure provider, and District authorities is evident. Each felt that support and buy-in from the County played an important part in the success of the partnership arrangement. In West Northamptonshire this is extended to cross-boundary service providers, such as the emergency services and to the LEP in Greater Norwich. Involving the LEP in the partnership is key as the LEP represents the driver of infrastructure funding opportunities that the partnership would wish to take advantage. In Monmouthshire's case, whilst there is no three tier structure (Parish/District/County) or LEP, arguably the Welsh Government does represent both an upper tier of decision making in respect of infrastructure and also the holder of funds for infrastructure provision. Relationships with Welsh Government are key to Monmouthshire to attract funding and provision within the County. The same applies with the CCRC Deal, whereby Monmouthshire will need to establish strong relationships with its neighbours to ensure it is a beneficiary of both funding and any devolved power. In terms of an SDP, strong working relationships with partners will be critical to ensure Monmouthshire's interests are not lost within a wider city centric agenda.
- 7.2.3 A legally binding constitutional agreement committing charging authorities to pool CIL money is one of the most important drivers of the Great Norwich Growth Partnership's success. It was highlighted that in order for this system to work, there needed to be a level of trust between the authorities that they would get the infrastructure they needed. Clearly the CCRC Deal will be the driver for ensuring appropriate governance and constitutional arrangements are in place. If an SDP is introduced it is unclear how any relationship with CIL will be dealt with, but it is likely some 'regional' proportion will be required. It will be key for Monmouthshire to ensure that they are fully involved within the process.

7.2.4 Pre-agreement of a formalised infrastructure priority list is a common feature for all three best practice examples and allows individual charging authorities to have confidence that funding decisions are made according to a technical assessment of the need rather than politically driven. Again it is likely that the SDP or CCRC Deal will set the context for infrastructure priorities and funding and Monmouthshire will need to make sure that its interests are represented. However it will be important that the smaller more localised infrastructure needs are not lost – these are as important as a large project such as M4 realignment.



## 8 Setting the context for governance recommendations

- 8.1.1 This report has reviewed a number of approaches to community involvement in infrastructure planning, approaches to prioritising both infrastructure provision and funding and methods of governance around spending and in particular CIL.
- 8.1.2 There are a number of uncertainties around infrastructure requirements and funding. In particular the effect of the introduction of SDPs or CCRC Deal, potential for Council mergers and CIL review at the national level. However, as Monmouthshire intend to introduce CIL within the next 12 months they must decide upon a governance structure, based on good practice elsewhere, Monmouthshire's individual circumstances and flexibility to account for potential future changes as practicable.
- 8.1.3 Monmouthshire already has a Whole Place Plan approach in operation and is looking to expand it to cover more of the County. Moving forward the governance review of the Place Plan approach needs to be taken into account in any governance structure around CIL and S106. The lessons learnt through the Place Plan approach can be usefully reviewed and considered when looking at CIL governance structures.
- 8.1.4 The approach to infrastructure planning and identification of priorities across Wales generally follows two approaches. The first is disappointing in that there is no proper consideration. The second is through service providers generally identifying needs and where prioritisation happens it is generally determined by a combination of officer and members. Generally infrastructure planning has occurred where there has been a consideration around adopting CIL, as the CIL regulations require a degree of infrastructure planning as part of the process.
- 8.1.5 With limited take up of CIL across Wales there a lack of good practice, especially as the authorities that have adopted CIL have had relatively small CIL returns and therefore little requirement to consider in detail.
- 8.1.6 Infrastructure planning and CIL take up is far more prevalent within England and there is more practice to draw upon. There are some clear messages around carefully anticipating what CIL funds maybe available and using that as the basis for infrastructure priorities and CIL governance. Working closely with neighbouring authorities and service providers is also key as well as local community buy in to the process.
- 8.1.7 The second part of this report should consider all these factors in setting out governance options and recommending an appropriate approach for Monmouthshire.