

DRAFT

Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update



Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Background and IDP Update	1
3. Local Plan Context	3
4. Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan	3
5. Engagement with Infrastructure and Service Providers	4
Infrastructure Providers.....	4
Site Developers/Promoters	4
Infrastructure Delivery Schedule	5
6. Social Infrastructure	5
Health	5
Education	6
7. Physical Infrastructure	7
Roads	7
Strategic Highways.....	7
Local Highways.....	8
Public Transport.....	9
Sustainable Transport.....	9
Utilities	9
Electricity.....	9
Gas.....	10
Water Infrastructure.....	11
8. Green Infrastructure	12
Open Space.....	12
9. Funding and Delivery	12
Appendix 1: Education – Pupil Yields and Estimated Costs.....	1
Appendix 2: Infrastructure Delivery Schedule – All Local Plan.....	1
Appendix 3: Infrastructure Delivery Schedule – Site Specific.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) establishes what additional infrastructure and service needs are required to support the level of development proposed in the Rutland Local Plan. The IDP will help ensure that the identified additional infrastructure and service needs are delivered in a timely, co-ordinated and sustainable way.
- 1.2. A draft IDP was jointly commissioned by South Kesteven District and Rutland County Council in October 2018. The IDP was prepared by AECOM for both areas and was published by South Kesteven alongside their Local Plan when it was submitted for Examination in January 2019. This report was not seen or approved by Rutland County Councillors. Based on discussions undertaken by AECOM with infrastructure and service providers in 2018/2019 the draft IDP:
 - Provided a baseline position establishing current infrastructure provision and identifying any shortfalls; and
 - Set out infrastructure and service requirements in respect of the council's proposed growth strategy contained in the Rutland Local Plan Review Focussed Consultation (2018). However, other than the proposed new garden community at St George's Barracks and the Stamford North urban extension (part of which (Quarry Farm) falls within Rutland) the draft IDP did not consider or identify infrastructure requirements for individual development site allocations proposed for inclusion in the Pre-submission Rutland Local Plan.
- 1.3. The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the IDP and to reflect the growth strategy and development proposals included in the Pre-submission Rutland Local Plan.
- 1.4. This update report draws together the latest evidence and information available to the council with regard to identifying the key site specific infrastructure requirements for the site allocations included in the Pre-submission Local Plan. These are also reflected in the updated schedule of infrastructure requirements.
- 1.5. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule will also be used to inform the council's Annual Funding Statement. This will set out details of developer contribution¹ receipts and projects and the infrastructure that has or will be provided using this funding.

2. Background and IDP Update

- 2.1. Identifying infrastructure over the period of the local plan can be difficult as few infrastructure providers actively plan for that length of timeframe (15 years) and, therefore, identification of infrastructure needs in the later years of the plan period is subject to a degree of speculation. In addition, infrastructure needs may be influenced by changes in technology and changes to the arrangements for the planning and delivery of infrastructure.
- 2.2. As such planning for infrastructure is a continuous and iterative process and the IDP will be a "evolving" document that will be updated at appropriate stages during and beyond the plan making process to reflect the latest available information on infrastructure requirements and provision.

¹ from the Community Infrastructure Levy, Section 106 and Section 278 Agreements

- 2.3. Infrastructure can be grouped into three main areas:
- Physical infrastructure such as: transport infrastructure (roads, public transport, cycling and walking routes), gas and electricity infrastructure, water provision and treatment, sewerage works;
 - Social infrastructure such as: primary and secondary schools, healthcare, emergency services, libraries, sports and recreational facilities, community facilities, cultural services; and
 - Green infrastructure such as: open space, allotments, formal and informal green space, green and blue corridors.
- 2.4. Different types of infrastructure are also required to support different scales of development within an area:
- On site infrastructure is necessary to enable the delivery of a specific development. This includes roads, walk/cycleways, gas pipes, electricity cabling, water supply and waste water disposal;
 - At a neighbourhood level infrastructure is required to mitigate the impact of the development and support the day to day needs of the new population. This can include schools, community facilities and GP surgeries, sports facilities; and
 - At a strategic level, larger pieces of infrastructure to support development growth across a wider area or a strategic site. This can include electricity sub-stations, strategic highway network improvements, hospitals, sewerage treatment works.
- 2.5. It is important to note that the IDP is a mechanism to identify the future infrastructure requirements of development proposed in the Pre-submission Local Plan. It does not seek to address deficiencies in existing infrastructure provision although there may be circumstances where supporting growth might be most effectively achieved through upgrading of existing facilities, for instance through extending existing schools.
- 2.6. Therefore, the projects listed in the draft IDP relevant to Rutland have been updated to focus this IDP update on the new infrastructure that will be key to the delivery of the planned growth set out in the Pre-submission Local Plan or the successful development of individual allocations rather than improvements to or remedying deficiencies in existing provision.
- 2.7. This IDP update, therefore, considers the following infrastructure types:
- Transport (highways, sustainable and public transport)
 - Health care
 - Education
 - Water supply and treatment
 - Electricity
 - Gas
 - Open space
- 2.8. For all other types of infrastructure, the information provided in the draft IDP remains the most up to date available.

3. Local Plan Context

- 3.1. The Consultation Draft Local Plan was published in July 2017 for consultation. This proposed that Oakham and Uppingham would take the majority of the planned housing and employment growth over the plan period with lesser development directed to Local Service Centre (LSC) villages.
- 3.2. The potential for the re-development of St George's Barracks, North Luffenham was identified in the Consultation Draft Local Plan but at that time there was insufficient information available for it to be included as a specific allocation in the Local Plan. However, as more information became available on the constraints and opportunities the potential re-development of the St George's site offered, the Council undertook an additional stage of consultation (August and September 2018) on the possible allocation of this site. This consultation focused on changes to the spatial distribution of growth across the County and the specific policy changes that would be required should the site be allocated.
- 3.3. The draft IDP, therefore, considered the infrastructure requirements based on the inclusion of St George's Barracks site, Quarry Farm (Stamford North) and a reduced number of allocations in Oakham, Uppingham and LSC villages.
- 3.4. Following consultation in 2017, the site selection methodology was revised and all sites reassessed. This has resulted in some sites included in the draft Local Plan not being taken forward and new sites included as allocations in the Pre-submission Local Plan. This IDP update, is therefore, based on the housing and employment site allocations included in the Pre-submission Local Plan.
- 3.5. The Council's strategy for infrastructure planning in the Pre-submission Local Plan is to optimise existing infrastructure, directing development to the most sustainable locations, reducing the need to travel to access services and facilities and seeking the delivery of new infrastructure in a timely manner where required to support development (Strategic Objectives 1 and 10 and Policy SC4 (Developer Contributions)).

4. Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan

- 4.1. The Pre-submission Local Plan establishes the strategy for the pattern and scale of development across the County, including the provision of 200 dwellings (as a minimum requirement) in Uppingham. As the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan group has indicated a desire to determine their own allocations through a review of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan, the Pre-submission Local Plan does not make any allocations in Uppingham.
- 4.2. The IDP update, therefore, has considered and includes the infrastructure requirements resulting from the minimum housing requirement for Uppingham set out in the Local Plan but not the requirements for individual sites. The specific requirements of individual sites will therefore need to be identified and considered through the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Review as part of the process of allocating sites for development.

5. Engagement with Infrastructure and Service Providers

5.1. In preparing the IDP, two approaches were taken.

Infrastructure Providers

5.2. Discussions and meetings have taken place with a variety of infrastructure providers to gain an updated understanding of what infrastructure is needed. This gave an opportunity to discuss specific infrastructure requirements of the growth strategy and site allocations, any changes to infrastructure requirements and investment projects and proposals programmed to take place that could impact on the development allocations.

5.3. To update the draft IDP, each infrastructure provider was contacted requesting their further engagement on the IDP. They were provided with a spreadsheet that outlined the allocations being considered for inclusion in the Pre-submission Local Plan together with details for each of these sites including expected housing and/or employment yield within and beyond the plan period. They were also provided with a relevant extract from the draft IDP schedule of infrastructure projects. Infrastructure providers were asked to:

- review the details and confirm whether the identified infrastructure projects remained current or provide updated details if the projects had progressed/further information was available;
- identify any additional infrastructure requirements or service delivery projects relating to the allocations either on a site specific basis or broader settlement context; and
- identify any infrastructure investment projects/proposals programmed to come forward during the Local Plan period (to 2036) that would not necessarily be directly related to the proposed allocations.

5.4. At the draft IDP stage, the infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of development was assessed at a relatively high level. In updating the IDP, some utility providers were able to provide a more detailed assessment of their respective networks to identify any gaps in infrastructure to support the planned growth or reinforcement works required to ensure supply to specific sites. It should be noted, however, that precise utility requirements for individual allocations can only be determined through developers making a specific development enquiry to the utility provider.

Site Developers/Promoters

5.5. Meetings have been held with site developers/promoters of proposed allocations in the Local Plan, particularly St George's Barracks and Quarry Farm (Stamford North), to discuss progress on bringing sites forward.

5.6. Where site promoters have provided technical or other information related to infrastructure requirements this has been used to update the infrastructure schedule where appropriate.

5.7. In addition to the above, the Council has undertaken a number of supporting evidence studies which include infrastructure information and requirements. These include matters related to transport and recreation and, where appropriate, they have informed the preparation of the IDP.

Infrastructure Delivery Schedule

- 5.8. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule sets out details of infrastructure projects, the lead agencies that would be involved in implementation, an overview of the risks and contingencies associated with each project and, where known, delivery timescales, costs and potential sources of funding.
- 5.9. For certain types of social and green infrastructure the draft IDP included modelled requirements based on forecast demand arising over the Local Plan period. On the basis that the infrastructure requirements arising from the specific site allocations have been considered, the modelled requirements have not been included in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to avoid any potential for double counting of infrastructure requirements.
- 5.10. The infrastructure schedule will inform the council's annual Infrastructure Funding Statement. In preparing the Statement, the identified infrastructure projects will be prioritised for the allocation of available developer contribution funding: this process is separate to the preparation of the IDP.
- 5.11. Appendices 2 and 3 identify the infrastructure needs that will underpin the implementation of the Local Plan growth strategy as a whole (Appendix 2) and from individual housing and employment allocations, or cumulatively across a number of sites in the same area (Appendix 3).

6. Social Infrastructure

- 6.1. This section provides an update on health and education infrastructure following discussions with the relevant service providers. There has been no change to the position/requirements of other community service infrastructure as set out in the draft IDP (2018).

Health

- 6.2. Since the draft IDP was prepared, the projects to enhance primary healthcare facilities at Market Overton and Somerby Surgeries have been successfully completed.
- 6.3. Oakham Medical Practice continues to experience issues related to capacity. The current building was designed for a clinical capacity of 12,000 registered patients with the present registered population being in the region of 16,000 patients. Capacity is managed through the use of temporary buildings and space within the Rutland Memorial Hospital. An independent external review, commissioned by East Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group (ELR CCG), provided options for consideration for Oakham Medical Practice. This review recommended three potential solutions:
- Re-build the current building to ensure it is fit for its current and future registered population;
 - Build a new practice building on a separate site releasing the current site for alternate uses;
 - Incorporate Oakham Medical Practice into any re-development of Rutland Memorial Hospital.

No decision has been taken regarding which option is preferred as further work is on-going.

- 6.4. Uppingham Surgery report that they are nearing capacity for the population they serve. The current building opened in 2014 and has clinical accommodation on the ground floor with administrative accommodation on the first floor. Any required expansion here is likely to consist of reconfiguration of the current building.
- 6.5. Empingham Medical Centre reports being beyond capacity to treat its registered patients. This situation is compounded by patients registering with them following the closure of the Ketton branch surgery (Uppingham Surgery) and those dissatisfied with provision in Stamford. The current building could be expanded on the current footprint but this would mean building on the current surgery car park. There are two further options for the expansion of provision for patients for Empingham and the surrounding area, both of which are allied to the St George's Barracks development:
- Retain the current building and occupy part of the proposed health provision on the St George's development providing a central surgery plus branch model;
 - Occupy the proposed health provision on the St George's development and close the current building allowing the release of the current site.
- 6.6. The development of St George's Barracks will require the provision of additional primary care facilities and it is proposed that this will be provided on site as part of the neighbourhood centre. The ELR CCG have expressed their preference that primary care delivered from these facilities is done by the existing practices already working with the Rutland area subject to discussions with all four. One option, involving Empingham Medical Centre, is outlined above (paragraph 6.5).
- 6.7. The location of Quarry Farm (Stamford North) means that residents may choose to register with practices in Stamford or Rutland. Subject to further discussion with both ELR CCG and South Lincolnshire CCG it is proposed that developer contributions would be made towards improved and enhanced primary care services in Stamford (Stamford and Rutland Hospital) and/or Rutland.

Education

- 6.8. Additional demand for school places arising from housing growth is influenced by a number of factors including the location of development, the rate at which dwellings are built and children reach school age and the types and mix of housing built.
- 6.9. The council's education department have provided an estimate of the likely additional pupil numbers arising from the Local Plan housing growth (based on current pupil yields) and the estimated cost of this provision. This is set out in Appendix 1. However, the additional pupil numbers generated by the Local Plan housing growth needs to be considered against any surplus capacity in existing school provision.

Primary

- 6.10. Since the draft IDP was prepared, the expansion proposal at Oakham CofE Primary School and new Barleythorpe Free School have been put on hold due to there being sufficient primary school capacity to accommodate forecast growth in pupil numbers.

- 6.11. The development of the St George's Barracks garden community requires the provision of a new primary school (initially two form entry with potential to expand to three form entry when the site is fully built out). It is proposed that primary school provision would be made on site with the relocation and expansion of the Edith Weston Academy, which will require land to be provided for this purpose within the development.
- 6.12. Therefore, other than the proposed expansion and relocation of Edith Weston Academy to accommodate pupil numbers generated by the new garden community at St George's Barracks, no additional primary school provision is currently required.

Secondary

- 6.13. There are currently no overall capacity issues at secondary school level although the most recent school capacity forecasts indicate that there is some potential for this to change over the plan period, which would result in the need for additional capacity. The expansion of secondary school provision is to be the subject of a planned feasibility study by the council but this is still in the early stages of preparation.
- 6.14. Future IDP updates will reflect updated secondary school capacity forecasts and the outcomes of the feasibility study.

7. Physical Infrastructure

Roads

Strategic Highways

- 7.1. The A1/A606 junction, which connects the Strategic Road Network (SRN) with the local highway network, has been identified through consultation with Highways England as being likely to require improvement to address the impact of the development proposed at St George's Barracks and Quarry Farm, Stamford (as part of the larger Stamford North urban extension within South Kesteven District).
- 7.2. The A1 Access Update Report² sought to identify the appropriate mitigation strategy for traffic accessing the A1 (at the A1/A606 junction) to support the allocation of the Stamford North development. This identified that all the junctions surrounding the A1/A606, except the Sidney Farm Lane/Sidney Farm Lane Loop, would continue to operate within practical capacity (at 2036). However, to ensure future local plan growth could be accommodated mitigation measures were proposed to address capacity and enhance the performance of the junction. This included:
- Widening to the existing entries to the A606 from the A1 slip road loops to reduce blocking back to the A1;
 - Subsequent signalisation of these junctions; and
 - Signalisation of the Sidney Farm Lane/loop road junction together with mitigation measures on the approach from the southbound A1 off slip or alternatively closing this slip road.
- 7.3. Highways England produced a Technical Note³ which assessed the mitigation options identified in the Access Update Report. Whilst there was no objection in principle to the

² Land north of Stamford, A1 Access Report Update, Peter Brett, January 2018

³ Technical Note 1, AECOM for Highways England, February 2018

proposed mitigation measures the Technical Note advised that further assessment work be undertaken to address design, safety and capacity issues identified and, in respect of the possible closure of the A1 south bound off slip, further assessment was required to understand the trip reassignment implications and impacts on the wider surrounding road network.

- 7.4. The capacity of the A1/A606 junction with the projected additional traffic from St George's Barracks has been assessed using the junction capacity assessments reported in the A1 Access Update Report. A Technical Note⁴ has been produced, that shows the additional traffic generated by St George's Barracks can be accommodated within the A1/A606 junctions. The additional traffic from St George's Barracks makes only a marginal difference to the operation of the junctions (at 2036) with the exception of the A606/A1 north bound slip junction. At this junction the additional traffic results in the junction operating over capacity and would require appropriate mitigation. The Technical Note concludes that the mitigation proposed and tested (in the A1 Access Update Report) of widening the A1 northbound slip and linked signalisation, would improve junction operation and provide the additional capacity required.
- 7.5. Whilst mitigation measures have been identified and tested to accommodate the additional traffic from the Stamford North and St George's Barracks developments, further assessment work is required to develop these and address the issues identified by Highways England.
- 7.6. Development in Oakham and Uppingham is not expected to have significant impacts on the SRN, although Highways England have commented that this would need to be assessed through the planning application process for individual sites.
- 7.7. Highways England have also confirmed that due to their small scale the proposed site allocations in other settlements would not have impacts on the SRN.

Local Highways

- 7.8. A Transport Assessment (TA)⁵ has been undertaken to understand and identify any impacts on the existing local highway network (LHN) as a direct result of the new garden community at St George's Barracks.
- 7.9. The TA included future year assessments (at 2031 and 2036) of 12 key junctions on the LHN. The TA found that a number of these existing junctions would require mitigation to provide additional capacity together. These include:
- A606/Normanton Road – there would be a detrimental impact on the operation of the junction by 2031 and by 2036 the junction would be over capacity. The upgrading of the junction to a mini-roundabout was identified as being appropriate to mitigate identified impacts;
 - A6003/Lyndon Road – there would be an impact on the operation of the junction by 2031 and a detrimental impact by 2036. The TA identified a roundabout as being the appropriate mitigation measure;

⁴ St George's Barracks, Transport Technical Note, Campbell Reith, October 2019

⁵ St George's Barracks Transport Assessment, Campbell Reith, November 2018

- A606/Main Street, Empingham – there would be an impact on the operation of this junction by 2036 and the TA proposed improvements to the junction layout;
- Wytchley Road/Normanton Road – this junction would be close to capacity by 2036 and the TA identified the installation of a mini-roundabout as being an appropriate mitigation measure.

- 7.10. The St George's Barracks masterplan proposes two new northern access points onto Wytchley Road/Wytchley Warren Lane to provide separate, direct access to/from the north for residential and commercial development. As a consequence, the TA identified the need for the widening of Wytchley Road/Wytchley Warren Lane to facilitate the safe two-way passing of vehicles.
- 7.11. RCC highways have advised that for the majority of the other Local Plan allocations road accesses and junctions on the LHN are able to accommodate the scale of development proposed. Two sites (EDI/03 and LIT01) have been identified where the implementation of mitigation measures may be required but a Transport Assessment will be needed to assess the traffic impacts and, if required, identify the appropriate mitigation. These are outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (Appendix 3).
- 7.12. Whilst provision for the A6003 Caldecott bypass is not a requirement arising from the growth in the Local Plan allocations, a relief road for Caldecott may become a requirement in the future as a result of development arising from outside the County and potential development in Uppingham. Future IDP updates will reflect whether a full traffic survey and feasibility study funding is required.

Public Transport

- 7.13. The draft IDP contained a number of generic public transport projects, which have been updated.
- 7.14. Two public transport projects have been identified related to the proposed Local Plan allocations:
- Pump priming to support bus service provision during the early phases of development at St George's Barracks;
 - Support for additional school bus/taxi transport provision generated by new developments.

Sustainable Transport

- 7.15. To facilitate walking and cycling a number of sites have been identified as requiring the provision of new walking and cycling links to connect the sites to facilities. These are identified in Appendix 3.

Utilities

- 7.16. This section provides an update in respect of the following utilities: electricity, gas and water infrastructure.

Electricity

- 7.17. National Grid have confirmed that specific development proposals are unlikely to have a significant direct effect upon National Grid's electricity transmission infrastructure.

- 7.18. Western Power Distribution (WPD) are the Distribution Network Operator covering Rutland and have a duty to supply electricity to sites. Information from WPD is that for site allocations connections can be made to existing supplies although in Ketton, Uppingham and Ryhall local reinforcement of the high voltage (HV) network would be required to supply all the proposed allocations in those settlements. In Ryhall reinforcement of the HV network is currently ongoing. The completion of these works (estimated for 2020/21) will ensure there is sufficient capacity to supply the allocated sites in Ryhall.
- 7.19. Three sites are affected by electricity infrastructure which may require additional works or the diversion of infrastructure as follows:
- OAK/05, Oakham – HV diversion works
 - OAK/16, Oakham – undergrounding of 132kV overhead wires
 - COT/01, Cottesmore – 11kV diversion works required
- 7.20. WPD caveat their comments, however, in that each site would need to be considered on its own, taking into account the current network at the time a planning application was made and when more detailed development proposals, particularly for employment sites, and the likely loading requirements are known. In those settlements where reinforcement would be required if more than one site came forward this would be on a first come first served basis, with reinforcement applying to subsequent applications.
- 7.21. As an operational facility St George's Barracks is already served by an electricity supply but the scale of development proposed will require the reinforcement of the HV and extra high voltage (EHV) networks to provide additional capacity together with a new primary sub-station (either on or adjacent to the site). WPD have confirmed that the existing supply would be sufficient for an initial development phase of up to 500 dwellings. Based on the proposed build out rate for the site this would be required before 2028/29. However, this is dependent on when the employment/commercial development is brought forward. If this comes forward early in the development then the new primary sub-station will be required earlier than 2028/29.
- 7.22. The provision of electricity is a necessary infrastructure element but on the basis of the latest available information it is not considered to be a risk to development.

Gas

- 7.23. There has been no change to the position/requirements for the provision of gas infrastructure as set out in the draft IDP.
- 7.24. St George's Barracks is served by an existing gas supply. As with electricity, this supply could supply an initial development phase with reinforcement required to provide additional gas loading to support the full development. Indications are that this would be taken from the existing gas trunk main 3 – 4km to the south of the site, requiring the installation of new infrastructure to serve the development.

Water Infrastructure

- 7.25. Water and water recycling infrastructure is funded from a combination of a water company's business plan, which is funded through customer bills, and developer charges directly sought by the water company to fund connections and improvements to the supply water serving new developments and ensure the site drains effectively.
- 7.26. The majority of the County is served by Anglian Water (AW). AW operate through Asset Management Plans (AMP) covering a five year investment cycle with AMP7 running from 2020 to 2025.
- 7.27. The need for additional investment is outlined in:
- The Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) – published in December 2019. It sets out how AW will ensure that there is sufficient water resources to service customers now and in the future
 - Water Recycling Long Term Plan (WRLTP) – published in September 2018. It sets out AW's planned expenditure due to growth and climate change.
- 7.28. As identified in the WRLTP, a number of water recycling centres (WRC) are expected to require enhancement to existing treatment capacity and further investment by Anglian Water. The investment identified in the WRLTP for Rutland is included in the Infrastructure Schedule.
- 7.29. For a number of sites there will be a need to make improvements to the foul sewerage network to provide local site connections. Foul network improvements would be funded through developer connection charges.
- 7.30. Within the AW water supply area there are a limited number of sites where there is a need to make improvements to supply water to the site. However, this would not be an absolute constraint as there is an established mechanism for developer charges to be made directly for connections to the water supply network.
- 7.31. St George's Barracks is currently served by an onsite Water Recycling Centre (WRC), which has the capacity to serve an additional 1,200 dwellings before the implementation of improvement and upgrading works would be required to increase treatment capacity to accommodate the full discharge from the development. In respect of water supply, the existing network has capacity to support around 250 dwellings but major off site reinforcement will be required to supply the anticipated demand from the full development.
- 7.32. A smaller part of the County is served by Severn Trent (ST). They have confirmed that as there has been no change in the overall housing numbers planned, which were taken into account in preparing the their Water Resources Management Plan, they have no additional comments to make.
- 7.33. The allocations in Market Overton and Whissendine are within the sewerage area served by ST. ST have confirmed that the assessment in the draft IDP that these allocations are low risk for potential sewerage impacts remains unchanged.

8. Green Infrastructure

Open Space

- 8.1. The updated on-site requirements for the proposed housing allocations are set out in Appendix 3.

9. Funding and Delivery

- 9.1. Infrastructure requirements will be funded and delivered by a variety of different mechanisms. The main ways over which the planning system can have a direct influence are:
- Funding Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – the Council introduced CIL in March 2016⁶
 - Section 106 – used to secure site specific infrastructure
 - Section 278 Agreements – completed between the developer and highway authority where development requires work to be carried out on the existing adopted highway
 - Planning Conditions
- 9.2. While it is expected most if not all site specific infrastructure will be able to be funded and/or delivered by the above mechanisms other sources of funding will be available, including:
- Direct funding and provision by statutory undertakers – under their legal obligations and statutory functions. This could be secured through their capital investment programmes or through established procedures whereby the service provider works with the developer to ensure appropriate on-site infrastructure, and where necessary off-site infrastructure, is in place.
 - Central government funding pots – this provides an opportunity for service providers to bid for funding to deliver specific infrastructure projects or a package of related projects. In November 2019 the Council's bid for £29.4m Housing Infrastructure Funding (HIF) to support the redevelopment of St George's Barracks was confirmed by the Government as being successful⁷. The HIF funding would be used to fund the delivery of education provision and the implementation of off-site highways infrastructure and increased utility capacity in advance of the redevelopment of the site. This would enable the delivery of the infrastructure in advance of the trigger/timings contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.
 - Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Fund
 - Private sector funding
 - Other government grants e.g. cycle paths as per LPT4
- 9.3. Sometimes different funding sources have to be combined to pay for new infrastructure. The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule shows which funding sources could potentially contribute to each infrastructure project.

⁶ The latest CIL monitoring report can be found at <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy-cil/>

⁷ A decision on whether to accept the funding has not yet been taken the Council

- 9.4. Due to funding constraints it may not be possible to secure the delivery of all the infrastructure identified. As such, some element of prioritisation of infrastructure provision is necessary depending on the degree to which it is required to deliver development.
- 9.5. The provision of infrastructure has been categorised as either:
- Critical – delivery of identified infrastructure is critical to enable growth and without it development cannot commence;
 - Necessary – the identified infrastructure is necessary to support and/or mitigate impact arising from the development but the precise timing and phasing is less critical and development may be able to commence ahead of its provision;
 - Important – delivery of the identified infrastructure is important to build sustainable communities but timing and phasing is not critical over the plan period.
- 9.6. It is also possible that the prioritisation of specific elements of infrastructure may change over time i.e. move from 'important' to 'critical'.
- 9.7. In addition to understanding the infrastructure needs to support planned growth, it will also be important to understand the phasing of growth and what impact this may have on the need for phased funding and delivery of infrastructure. The housing trajectory will, therefore, be key to understanding when sites are expected to come forward and the impact of this on infrastructure delivery.
- 9.8. Where available the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule includes information on potential funding sources. However, where this yet to be determined the Council will continue to work with service providers and other agencies to identify possible sources of funding for infrastructure.

Appendix 1: Education – Pupil Yields and Estimated Costs

Pupil Numbers

Primary pupil yield	0.27
Secondary pupil yield	0.15

	Homes	Primary pupil yield	Secondary pupil yield	Total
Other county wide developments	1942	524	291	816
St Georges	1000	270	150	420
Total	2942	794	441	1236

Cost

Approximate cost per school place	£20,000
-----------------------------------	---------

	Homes	Primary pupil cost	Secondary pupil yield	Total
Other county wide developments	1942	£10,486,800	£5,826,000	£16,312,800
St Georges	1000	£5,400,000	£3,000,000	£8,400,000
Total	2942	£15,886,800	£8,826,000	£24,712,800

DRAFT

Appendix 2: Infrastructure Delivery Schedule – All Local Plan

DRAFT

Appendix 3: Infrastructure Delivery Schedule – Site Specific

DRAFT