

West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan Examination

Hearing Statement for Matter 16: Any Other Matters



Prepared by West Dorset District Council and
Weymouth & Portland Borough Council

November 2014

Matter 16: Any Other Matters

Agenda Item 16.1: Is there adequate convergence between the phasing of development and the provision of critical elements of infrastructure?

- 1.1 The councils have engaged with infrastructure providers and developers to establish the provision and delivery of the appropriate infrastructure. Site-specific infrastructure requirements are set out in schedules 1C and 2C of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (CD/CIL18) and where appropriate referenced in the site-specific policies of the Submission Plan. Further evidence about the needs of site-specific proposals is referenced in CD/SUS8.
- 1.2 Paragraph 6.2.3 of the Submission Plan recognises where infrastructure will need to be provided as part of the development proposal. Planning obligations will be necessary to secure infrastructure on the larger more complex development sites listed below. These sites are excluded from a CIL charge.
 - Littlemoor Urban Extension
 - Chickerell Urban Extension
 - Land at Crossways
 - Land at Vearse Farm, Bridport
 - Markham & Little Francis, Weymouth
- 1.3 This list was included in the Submission Plan in response to concerns raised at pre-submission stage about the potential for development proposals to pay twice for the same piece of infrastructure.
- 1.4 The councils' approach, that is to ensure that critical infrastructure is brought forward in advance of, or at the same time as the development when negotiated through a planning obligation, is set out in criterion (ii) of Submission Plan Policy COM1. This policy criterion also sets out the process for delivering infrastructure through the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 1.5 Engagement with stakeholders and developers demonstrates the councils' approach is appropriate. Consultation has not established a need to provide critical elements of infrastructure before any development has commenced. Policies in the Submission Plan, for example BRID1, ensure that the development is appropriately phased to ensure necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures are delivered in advance of occupation. Necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures shall be secured through planning obligations.

- 1.6 The councils have consulted with the Highways Agency and a statement of common ground (SOCG/5) has been agreed. This confirms that residual impacts on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) can be dealt with through a planning application, and that the impacts will be capable of mitigation through the use of planning conditions, requiring specific improvements to be implemented and funded by the site developer.
- 1.7 Wessex Water have confirmed that they will review the sites in detail with capacity appraisals to include network modelling where necessary, and seek the use of planning conditions to ensure that all necessary upgrades can be completed with shared funding arrangements for off-site connecting works and downstream capacity improvements.
- 1.8 The councils have also consulted extensively with Dorset County Council who have a key role as a service provider for much of the critical infrastructure necessary to support development – such as schools. The County Council concur that the Submission Plans' proposed approach for seeking site specific requirements through s106 and general requirements through CIL is appropriate to ensure that the delivery of the associated infrastructure is coincident with the phasing of development.
- 1.9 The councils will continue to engage and work collaboratively with the County Council and other service providers to review infrastructure requirements and regularly update the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in response to monitoring.
- 1.10 The councils' approach shows that there is adequate convergence between the phasing of development and the provision of critical infrastructure.

Agenda Item 16.2: Are the delivery mechanisms and agencies' responsible clearly defined and agreed?

- 2.1 Paragraph 6.2.2 of the Submission Plan identifies planning obligations (S106 agreements) and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the two main mechanisms for delivering infrastructure to support new development.
- 2.2 Paragraph 6.2.3 recognises that the nature of development, i.e. size and scale will have a bearing on the delivery mechanism used. For instance on the larger, more complex strategic sites, some forms of infrastructure will need to be provided as part of the development and secured through a planning obligation. Infrastructure for smaller, less complex development sites will be met through the use of the CIL, or through planning obligations where the infrastructure is not covered by the CIL charge.

- 2.3 Submission Plan Policy COM1 sets out the councils' policy approach to delivering community infrastructure. Infrastructure is expected to be delivered on-site in larger developments, or if not practicable to do so by means of financial contribution. The Submission Plan policy approach takes into consideration the scale and needs of the development as well as the provision of existing community infrastructure, viability testing and the requirement for ongoing maintenance.
- 2.4 The agencies responsible for the delivery of infrastructure are clearly set out in table 1.1 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (updated September 2013) (CD/CIL18). Table 1.1 also describes the type of facilities and services that these agencies are responsible for.
- 2.5 Schedules 1C and 2C provide an indicative list of the infrastructure required for the larger, more complex strategic sites and which is necessary to enable the grant of planning permission. These schedules also list the appropriate delivery agencies and the timescales for delivery. Infrastructure required for the sites listed in schedules 1C and 2C will be secured through a planning obligation, requiring the developer to enter into a section 106 agreement and as such are excluded from a CIL charge – this approach clearly shows that that these development proposals will not pay twice for the same item of infrastructure.
- 2.6 Other infrastructure needed to support development but not particular prerequisites linked to the delivery of development sites, are found in schedules 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B of the IDP. These schedules also set out timescales for delivery and the relevant delivery agencies.
- 2.7 The IDP was subject to public consultation at pre-submission stage. Agencies listed in table 1.1 were consulted during the pre-submission consultation. Minor modifications were made to the list of agencies in the IDP in response to the representations made. A revised IDP (September 2013) was subject to public consultation during consultation on the Submission Plan - no significant issues were raised. The councils also contacted service providers in October 2014 to obtain further updates and these have been incorporated into the most up to date IDP (CD/CIL18).

Agenda Item 16.3: What is the position regarding the policies map – it has been suggested that the LP should have one comprehensive map which does not rely on allocations in earlier plans

- 3.1 The maps section of the Submission Plan (pages 170-173) currently lists the policies for which specific geographical areas are relevant, and where maps showing those

areas can be found. This list will be replaced by a comprehensive policies map and will be prepared as part of the final printed Local Plan; given the size of the plan area it is likely that several maps will be required. The map will include new features such as development site allocations and also include features from the existing maps which are either carried forward or updated.

- 3.2 The map will also include changes that arise from preparation of neighbourhood plans, for example, the Cerne Abbas Neighbourhood Plan has now been examined and is subject to a referendum and council approval. The neighbourhood plan proposes changes to the development boundary in Cerne Abbas and includes a new boundary for the village of Godmanstone. If the plan is agreed these changes will also be need to be incorporated into the new policies map.