

Local Development Framework

Infrastructure Delivery Programme

December 2010



Bath and North East Somerset
Local Development Framework

**Bath & North East
Somerset Council**

Contents

Section	Title	Page
1	Introduction	2-3
2	National Context	4
3	Governance	5-8
4	Summary list of infrastructure items by location	9-10
5	Detailed Schedule of Infrastructure Projects	11-78
6	Opportunities for co-location and integrated infrastructure provision including details of “Total Place” project.	79-80
7	Viability	81
Appendix A	Summary of B&NES Infrastructure Survey	82-88
Appendix B	Summary of further engagement with Infrastructure Providers	89

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this Infrastructure Delivery Programme (IDP) is to outline the key infrastructure requirements needed to support the scale of growth put forward in the Submission Draft Core Strategy, and therefore meet the requirements of national planning policy (PPS12)¹.
- 1.2 Infrastructure is essential to support the objectives of future housing provision, economic growth and mitigating climate change, and to creating thriving and sustainable communities.
- 1.3 An Infrastructure Delivery Programme is not a task that can be completed by planners alone. There is a need to draw on and influence the investment strategies and infrastructure programmes within the local authority and external.
- 1.4 The aims of this IDP are to support the Core Strategy by:
- Identifying key infrastructure requirements
 - Identifying desirable infrastructure requirements
 - Identifying when infrastructure is needed
 - Identifying which agencies are responsible for the provision of infrastructure
 - Summarising other information e.g. details of funding, risks, contingencies
 - Bringing together the sources of evidence for infrastructure requirements in one document
- 1.5 Furthermore, on adoption of the Core Strategy, the IDP can potentially become the basis for future developer contributions, either under the planning obligations regime or in the form of a Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 1.6 **This document is based on currently available information, and must be able to respond to changes in need and circumstances over the plan period, it will therefore need to be regularly reviewed and updated. Infrastructure planning involves an ongoing process of dialogue and communication with infrastructure providers and as further evidence is developed and future funding is secured, additional items may be added to this document, or the status of items may be upgraded or altered.**

¹ Key elements of PPS12: (i) Para 4.8 - Bold headline under Infrastructure heading: "The core strategy should be supported by evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to enable the amount of development proposed for the area, taking account of its type and distribution. This evidence should cover who will provide the infrastructure and when it will be provided. The core strategy should draw on and in parallel influence any strategies and investment plans of the local authority and other organisations." (ii) Para 4.10: outlines that there is a need for an "infrastructure delivery planning process" and says that "the outcome of the infrastructure planning process should inform the Core Strategy and should be part of a robust evidence base". (iii) Para 4.45 (Delivery section) repeats that the Core Strategy should be based on "sound infrastructure delivery planning" (iv) The infrastructure sheets also reflect the key criteria included in PPS12, that the infrastructure planning process should address i.e. infrastructure needs and costs, phasing of development, funding sources, responsibilities for delivery (para 4.9) and contingency (para 4.10).

1.7 This document draws upon the following key sources of evidence:

- *Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan* (West of England Partnership with the Homes & Communities Agency 2010)².
- *Responding to Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Issues in the West of England* (Roger Tym & Partners, 2009). Although this report is premised on the RSS Proposed Changes, some of the research undertaken to support this is still relevant³.
- *B&NES Infrastructure Delivery Survey* (January- March 2010). This survey led to a number of one to one meetings with key infrastructure providers and partners. Follow up discussions with key service providers were also held in 2010 to identify the infrastructure implications of the alternative spatial strategy proposed in the B&NES Draft Core Strategy. Details of this consultation with infrastructure providers can be found in **Appendices A & B**.

1.8 Bath & North East Somerset has been one 14 authorities taking part in a Planning Advisory Service Pilot study on Infrastructure Planning (October 2009-October 2010). As part of this the Council has been testing the *PAS Steps Methodology for Infrastructure Planning*⁴ and has received support from the Planning Advisory Service and Baker Associates who have been appointed to support the Pilot Authorities⁵. This guidance is now being refined reflecting of the experiences of the pilot authorities.

1.9 There are six parts to this document:

Section 2: National Context

Section 3: Governance

Section 4: Summary list of infrastructure items by location;

Section 5: Detailed schedule of infrastructure items, which is based on a combination of publicly available information and direct engagement with key infrastructure providers.

Section 6: Summary of key opportunities for co-location and integrated infrastructure provision including details of “Total Place” project.

Section 7: Viability

² Available online at <http://www.westofengland.org/media/179567/wofe%20diip%20summary%20310310.pdf>

³ Available online at <http://www.westofengland.org/media/165661/item%207.%20sub-regional%20infrastructure%20report%20and%20appendix.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/aio/109121>

⁵ See IDP Pilot Project details and quarterly learning reports from the pilot authorities <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageld=109617>

2 National Context

2.1 The recent White Paper *Local Growth: Realising every place's potential*⁶ the precursor to the “Decentralism and Localism Bill” and the October 2010 Spending Review are key to the new approach to infrastructure planning introducing the following:

- The National Infrastructure Plan
- Spending Review (including prioritisation of economically significant local transport projects and Regional Growth Fund)
- Local Enterprise Partnerships (which will have a key role in setting local investment priorities)
- Intention to introduce a new statutory duty to cooperate in plan making on local authorities, public bodies and private bodies critical to plan making, including infrastructure providers.
- Investment streams such as the new homes bonus scheme
- New borrowing powers for example tax increment financing powers
- Introduction of a Major Infrastructure Planning Unit for nationally important infrastructure projects (such as large scale wind farms and power plants), which will be the responsibility of the Planning Inspectorate.

2.2 The National Infrastructure Plan was launched on 25 Oct 2010⁷, and the first version of this Plan is due to be published in 2011. This current publication includes a statement of intent for this new approach to infrastructure planning and focuses on 5 key areas of infrastructure:

- Energy;
- Transport;
- Digital communications;
- Flood management water & waste
- Intellectual capital.

⁶ www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/docs/l/pu1068%20-%20local%20growth.pdf

⁷ www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/ppp_national_infrastructure_plan.htm

3 Governance

- 4.1 This section outlines the process in place to ensure that infrastructure needs are delivered, monitored and regularly reviewed.
- 4.2 The preparation of the Core Strategy is currently led by the Council's Planning Policy team. The cross service Development Coordination Group (DCG) and the Built Environment Leaders Group (BELG) are currently the main cross service groups that will discuss infrastructure and planning issues.
- 4.3 A cross party board has been set up to consider, in detail, the Local Development Framework - this group is known as the LDF Steering Group. It convenes as and when needed at key points in the process. In addition to this all LDF documents must be agreed by Council.
- 4.4 The LSP Executive will provide steer on key policy decisions related to infrastructure planning and an annual report will be taken to this board. Progress on the IDP will be reported to the LSP Board for partnership-wide steer as directed by the Executive Board⁸.
- 4.5 To inform the ongoing development of the IDP, at least annual contact will be maintained with Infrastructure Providers identified in the IDP, the "IDP Stakeholders Group". Contact will be made in the first instance by written correspondence, but as necessary additional telephone and face to face contact will be made. In addition joint work on infrastructure projects and/or funding bids will be undertaken.
- 4.6 Wider stakeholder involvement will be incorporated within consultation exercises associated with the Core Strategy.

Local Enterprise Partnerships

The West of England submitted a proposal to the Secretary of State for a Local Enterprise Partnership⁹, which has been accepted in principle by DCLG. In future Local Enterprise Partnerships are likely to have an increasing role in facilitating new infrastructure and accessing funding at a strategic level. The governance arrangements will need to be amended as this develops to take this new local tier of governance into account.

Monitoring arrangements

- 4.7 Annual progress on the delivery of infrastructure will be reported and the Infrastructure Delivery Programme will be amended accordingly. This will allow the following to be monitored:
 - Progress on scheme delivery and funding
 - Status and risk of infrastructure schemes
 - Update on infrastructure planned

⁸ 08.06.10 LSP Executive Report

http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Community%20and%20Living/LSP%20Board%20Papers%2008%2006%2010%20_3_.pdf

⁹ West of England Local Enterprise Partnership: Proposal to the Secretaries of State for BIS and CLG - September 2010

- 4.8 This will be referred to in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report for Planning and will be reported as outlined above.

Maintaince and Review of the IDP

- 4.9 The IDP is a living document and will need to be maintained and reviewed at regular intervals and this review will be reported annually.

Summary Table illustrating of governance arrangements for the IDP

Group	Role in relation to the IDP
Council	Local Councillors are elected by the community to decide how the council should carry out its various activities. They represent public interest as well as individuals living within the ward in which he or she has been elected to serve a term of office.
Local Strategic Partnership ¹⁰	<p>The LSP was formed in June 2002; it is made up of public services such as the Council, the Police, the B&NES Primary Care Trust and Somer Housing Group - as well as voluntary, community, and business sector representatives.</p> <p>Specific to the IDP the role of this group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To receive intermittent updates on progress at key stages and to provide strategic direction. • Board members to feed back to respective organisations on outcomes. • Board members to ensure their respective organisation is participating fully in the IDP process and providing appropriate information. • To understand high level risks associated with the IDP.
LSP Executive Board	<p>Specific to the IDP the role of this group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To champion the project and raises awareness at senior level. • To advise on the scope of the project. • To advise on priorities for development of the project. • To provide guidance to the Project Sponsor and decision makers on overall strategic direction. • To approve an implementation plan that delivers the benefits within agreed costs. • To receive regular high level progress and financial reports. • To understand the level of exposure of the Council to tangible and intangible risks. • To recommend referrals to Overview and Scrutiny Panel when appropriate. • To ensure strategic liaison with related service areas and other strategic partners.
LDF Steering Group	Cross party member working group involved in the preparation of LDF documents and their evidence base.
Development Coordination Group & Built Environment Leaders Groups	<p>Officer led cross-service groups with responsibility for discussing infrastructure and planning issues. Specific to the IDP the role of this group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To advise the LPA on process and outputs. • To review project risks and advise on any new/changed risks having regard to the wide perspective of the group.
IDP Stakeholder	This is a group who will be involved in delivering, funding and identifying infrastructure needs - involving a range of stakeholders and

¹⁰<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/communityandliving/LocalStrategicPartnership/Pages/Local%20Strategic%20Partnership%20-%20Structure%20Chart.aspx>

Group	<p>organisations. Stakeholder group meetings will be held as necessary. Contact to be maintained with the LPA on at least an annual basis. Specific to the IDP the role of this group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide information from individuals' organisations or service areas to inform the IDP. • To participate in workshops to build shared understanding of each others' capital projects and infrastructure requirements. • To participate in discussion on potential for co-location and co-ordinated infrastructure provision. • To participate in discussion on service delivery changes and new requirements. • To participate in the update and annual review of the IDP
Local Planning Authority	<p>Responsibility for preparing and maintaining an IDP to support the Local Development Framework, working with all other parties. Specific to the IDP the role of this group is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prepare the IDP, making use of information obtained from key stakeholders and publicly available information. • To maintain the IDP going forward. • To organise regular meetings of the IDP stakeholder group, chair and issue notes, ensure delivery on agreed actions.
Local Enterprise Partnerships	<p>West of England Local Enterprise Partnership potential to have a significant role in local infrastructure planning. Precise nature of this role to be confirmed</p>

4 Summary list of infrastructure items by location

District Wide

Infrastructure reference	Infrastructure item name
DWI.1*	Direct Public Investment in Affordable Housing
DWI.2*	Waste Treatment Facilities
DWI.3*	Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education
DWI.4*	Acute Care
DWI.5*	Power Generation & Distribution
DWI.6*	Gas Supply
DWI.7*	Water Supply
DWI.8*	Waste Water
DWI.9*	Playing Pitches
DWI.10*	Green Space (Formal, Natural & Allotments)
DWI.11*	Children's Play Areas
DWI.12*	Strategic Green Infrastructure
DWI.13*	Greater Bristol Bus Network Improvements (and other Transport Proposals for Bath)
DWI.14	Future Strategic Transport Intervention Package
DWI.15	Two Tunnels Greenway
DWI.16	Leisure & Culture
DWI.17	Built Sports Facilities
DWI.18	Public Realm & Movement Programme
DWI.19	District Heating
DWI.20	Further Education
DWI.21	Higher Education
DWI.22	Youth Services
DWI.23	Police
DWI.24	Fire
DWI.24	Ambulance
DWI.25	Great Western Mainline Electrification
DWI.26	Smarter Choices Interventions
DWI.27	Renewable Energy Infrastructure

* Key infrastructure items included in the Core Strategy summary

Bath

Infrastructure reference	Infrastructure item name
BI.1*	Transport Proposals for Bath
BI.2*	Improvements to Flood Defences of Bath City Centre & Riverside
BI.3*	Public Investment into Bath Western Riverside
BI.4*	Improvements to Bath Train Station and enhanced frequency of trains from Bath & Oldfield Park to Bristol
BI.5	Parking Strategy for the City of Bath
BI.6	Bath Library
BI.7	Bath Centre District Heating Network
BI.8	Bath Riverside District Heating Network
BI.9	Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education

* Key infrastructure items included in the Core Strategy summary

Midsomer Norton & Radstock

Infrastructure reference	Infrastructure item name
MNRI.1*	Public Investment for Site Preparation and planning including site specific infrastructure
MNRI.2*	Part of Greater Bristol Bus Network: A37 Bristol to Midsomer Norton & Radstock and Bath to Midsomer Norton & Radstock
MNRI.3*	Site Base Infrastructure Requirements for Old Mills II
MNRI.4	Transport Network improvements Midsomer Norton
MNRI.5	Transport Network Improvements Radstock
MNRI.6	Midsomer Norton Town Park

* Key infrastructure items included in the Core Strategy summary

Keynsham

Infrastructure reference	Infrastructure item name
KI.1*	Public Investment in Site Preparation & Planning Keynsham Town Centre
KI.2*	Flood Protection Measures for Cadbury's Somerdale site
KI.3*	Major Improvements to Sewerage Capacity
KI.4*	Enhance Keynsham Hams as a Wetland Habitat
KI.5*	Secondary road access to Somerdale site
KI.6*	Improvements to Keynsham Railway Station & Enhanced Service Frequency to Bristol and Bath
KI.7	Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education
KI.8	Green Infrastructure
KI.9	Keynsham District Heating Network
KI.10	Community Facilities including new Library
KI.11	Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge over the A4 improving link from Memorial Park to Train Station
KI.12	Town Centre Public Realm Improvements
KI.13	Improved Cycle Links to Bristol/Bath, National Routes 3 & 4 and Regional Route 10
KI.14	Relocation of the Fire Station

* Key infrastructure items included in the Core Strategy summary

Rural

Infrastructure reference	Infrastructure item name
RI.1	Paulton Library
RI.2	Broadband Improvements
RI.3	Farmborough village shop pedestrian link

5 Detailed Schedule of Infrastructure Projects

The table below outlines the infrastructure categories including in the subsequent tables.

Category	Description
Infrastructure item name	These descriptors (infrastructure code and name) are reflected in the Core Strategy to refer to specific infrastructure item names.
Infrastructure category	Identifies the infrastructure category that the item is within e.g. Transport, Green Infrastructure etc
Infrastructure item status	<p>Key infrastructure items are those which are significant in terms of the delivery of the vision for the area, without which development would struggle to come forward. If these do not come forward alternative means of providing for the infrastructure need will need to be met. These items should have an evidence base and should be well defined projects with either funding allocated or in advanced stages of securing funding. These key items also include infrastructure that is necessary to facilitate the development of sites.</p> <p>Desirable infrastructure items are those which are considered to be important items, but which at this time are not able to be sufficiently evidenced or justified as key infrastructure items. These reflect projects that need to be further scoped, developed and funded.</p>
Cost	Where identified costs of infrastructure provision are included where known, in some cases it is too early to quantify costs.
Funding	Details of funding sources are included where costs are specified or potential funding streams identified e.g. funding sources or bodies .
Phasing	Commentary on the phasing of the infrastructure item where known is included, particularly where this relates to funding streams or programmes that have specific phases.
Risks	Risks associated with the delivery of the infrastructure item are included, for example issues to be resolved or potential reasons for the infrastructure item not being deliverable.
Contingencies	In line with PPS12 this explains what alternatives to the provision of the infrastructure item exist or have been considered. This is particularly necessary where the provision of infrastructure items is uncertain.
Lead Agencies	Lead agencies in the delivery of the infrastructure item are listed.
Relevant Policy areas	To relate the infrastructure items back to the place based approach in the Core Strategy the infrastructure items have been listed by location i.e. District Wide; Bath; Keynsham; Midsomer Norton & Radstock; Rural Areas.
Evidence	This refers to key evidence of plans of the Council or Infrastructure Providers upon which the inclusion of the infrastructure item is based.

District Wide

DWI.1 Direct Public Investment in Affordable Housing		Affordable Housing	
The Core Strategy includes an affordable housing policy which will seek a proportion of housing delivery to be provided as affordable housing either on site or as a commuted sum contribution for smaller sites. However, in addition to this policy direct investment is Key to help to meet the acute housing need.			Key
Cost: Bath Western Riverside - 2010/12 HCA investment in affordable housing - £6.03m for Phase 1 providing 100 affordable homes	Funding Sources: Direct Public Investment from HCA. <i>The West of England Single Conversation: Development Infrastructure and Investment Plan</i> describes the priorities for growth and development. It is aligned with the Core Strategy trajectory for housing delivery, and directs and informs the requirement for HCA investment. The Coalition Government has announced £4.5bn as the national investment budget for affordable housing delivery for the next four years (2011-15). Details of how this will impact locally are yet to be published. Currently £15.5m is allocated in the WofE document above to support affordable housing delivery in B&NES over that period, but this will be subject to review. To augment the much reduced level of public investment, Housing Associations (Registered Providers) will introduce from April 2011 Affordable Rented tenancies - these offer property at below market rents but will generate higher revenue to fund future capital investment into affordable housing. To improve collaboration and engagement with sector stakeholders the WOE Partnership procuring under OJEU rules a Housing Delivery Panel with organisations that will help delivery market and affordable housing. The panel will be effective from May 2011.	Phasing: HCA Investment period 2010-2015	
		Relevant policy areas: District-wide Rural Areas, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Lead Agencies: West of England Authorities; HCA; Strategic Housing Association Partners
Risks:			

<p>Contingencies: This funding is Key to help address the acute affordable housing need in the district. However, the Core Strategy policy for affordable housing assumes a grant free policy position, which should lead to the significant delivery of affordable housing alongside market housing by the private sector.</p>		
<p>Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010) p5; B&NES Viability Study (2010);West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) B&NES Strategic Land Availability Assessment (2010); HCA Investment Allocations Reports(Dec 2010 onwards); SPD for Bath Western Riverside Outline Planning Application 06/01733/EOUT Detailed Planning Application 06/04013/EFUL</p>		

DWI.2 Waste Treatment Facilities		Energy & Waste	
<p>The Joint Waste Core Strategy aims to minimise waste and maximise self-containment within the West of England. It includes a spatial strategy for the provision of residual waste facilities. Two strategic sites are identified for residual waste treatment within B&NES: Broadmead Lane, Keynsham and Former Fuller’s Earth Works, Odd Down in Bath.</p> <p>Waste assets in the district are significant and include public recycling centres, collection depots and waste transfer sites. Smaller scale waste management sites can be identified in future DPDs as required.</p>			Key
Cost: Not quantified	Funding Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely private sector led for other schemes- these companies would provide facility and would then charge a gate fee for receiving waste. - Partnership Developments - Alternative funding sources required for council/public facilities 	Phasing: JWCS Plan Period 2010-2026	
Risks: Developers for preferred strategic sites may not come forward. Lack of accessible facilities for the public and businesses could lead to an increase in fly-tipping.		Relevant policy areas: District-wide	Lead Agencies: West of England Partnership; Private Developers
Contingencies: Delivery issues and contingencies considered as part of the Joint Waste Core Strategy			
Evidence: Joint Waste Core Strategy (West of England, 2010) Evidence gathering for IDP (Waste Services) Joint Residual Municipal Waste Management Strategy (West of England) B&NES Waste Strategy Towards Zero Waste Strategy			

DWI.3 Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education		Children's Service	
<p>The Council is currently in the process of reorganising secondary education in Bath which is intended to remove excess places and result in a close match between supply and demand and this is now entering its final stages. A review of primary schools has also been completed. The need generated by allocated sites and sites with planning permission has been taken into account (e.g. for Bath Western Riverside the trigger points at which a new primary school are required are established).</p> <p><i>Future Development</i> The Local Education Authority considers that the majority of existing schools (primary and secondary) are at or heading towards capacity and it is anticipated that there will be minimal or nil surplus capacity to absorb children generated from new housing development and therefore developer contributions will be required to accommodate them.</p> <p>At present there is an increasing primary and secondary age population, it is anticipated that the increase in primary age children will reach the first year of secondary school in 2017/18 resulting in an increase in secondary school age pupils at this time. It is difficult to predict whether the increase in primary school aged pupils will be sustained, and early indications show that this increase may be levelling off.</p> <p>Whilst growth in all age ranges is anticipated over the plan period, the most significant increase is for the age range entering primary school.</p> <p>The need for provision for early years will be informed by <i>B&NES Childcare Sufficiency Report</i>.</p> <p>At Midsomer Norton & Radstock and in rural areas there is considered to be greater capacity for existing primary schools and early years facilities to accommodate growth utilising developer contributions to add extra capacity. This is due to both the lower levels of growth anticipated and the greater potential for extension or expansion of existing facilities. In other parts of the Authority, whole new primary schools are likely to be required.</p> <p>If additional secondary provision is required this is likely to be provided via the expansion of existing facilities.</p>		Key	
<p>Cost: dependent on delivery strategy and phasing. Smaller extensions as per B&NES Planning Obligations SPD,</p>	<p>Funding Sources:</p> <p>Developer contributions</p>	<p>Phasing: 2010-2026</p>	

whole new facilities more costly.			
Risks: Changes in government policy could change the way in which education is delivered.		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: There is a statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places (primary & secondary) and to ensure sufficiency of early years provision. There could be some phasing options around the delivery of facilities.		District-wide	Local Education Authority; Developers/Landowners
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP(Local Education Authority) B&NES Secondary Schools Reorganisation 2006-2010 B&NES Primary School Review (Overview & Scrutiny Panel) 25 Jan 2010 B&NES Childcare Sufficiency Report (Children's Services) for early years			

DWI.4 Acute Care		Health	
<p>The Royal United Hospital NHS Trust in Bath provides acute treatment and care for a catchment population of 500,000 in Bath and the surrounding towns and countryside of North East Somerset and Western Wiltshire. Acute care is focused on the young and old and therefore the demographic profile of the population has a greater influence on the demand for services than the total number. Locally it is these two age groups that are expected to grow.</p> <p>There is a significant backlog of maintenance of the estate which the hospital is seeking to address through future capital projects - notably the replacement of RUH North and the Pathology Laboratories.</p>			Key
Cost: £50m for Capital projects	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Central Government funding needs to be secured by the RUH NHS Trust		
Risks: Capital funding is not secured to improve facilities.		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		District Wide	Department of Health RUH NHS Trust
Evidence:			
Evidence gathering for IDP (Royal United Hospital NHS Trust) No specific issues raised in relation to primary care provision (GPs/Dentists/Health Centres) as part of the evidence gathering process for the IDP (B&NES PCT)			

DWI.5 Power Generation & Distribution		Energy	
<p>The National Grid operates the national electricity transmission network across Great Britain and owns and maintains the network in England and Wales, providing electricity supplies from generating stations to local distribution companies.</p> <p>Western Power Distribution (South West) Plc delivers electricity to 1.4m customers over a 14,400 square metre area in SW England. They own the network and power distribution system, they are responsible for the maintenance, repair, reinforcement of the network to cope with changing patterns of demand and extending the network to connect new customers. Incremental growth can be accommodated; however, specific improvements will be required at larger points of growth to ensure continuity of supply.</p> <p>Later phases of the BWR development will require a new on-site primary sub station. Additional housing, city centre employment land development and increased demand from Bath University may require work to the existing Dorchester St substation, or if substantial new load is requested an additional primary substation may be required.</p> <p>General income and levels of investment are agreed with Ofgem on a 5 year cycle, based on historic trends and major known future developments. Connection charges are made in accordance with their published charging statement, which requires developers to fully contribute to the network being installed for their sole use and disproportionately contributing to shared network reinforcement.</p>		Key	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private sector funded - Western Power Distribution (South West) Plc - Additional costs may fall to developers where larger points of growth. 	Phasing: 2010-2026	
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Lack of capacity could act as a constraint to development particularly in central Bath and the river corridor where larger points of growth.		District wide	Western Power Distribution (South West) Plc National Grid
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for the IDP (WPDSW) Western Power Distribution Investment Planning - Bristol IDP			

DWI.6 Gas Supply		Energy	
Wales & West Utilities supply gas to the district, and own and operate the local gas distribution network in Bath & North East Somerset. They have a plan to guide new investment in the gas distribution network for the next 10 years based on estimated growth in the market.			Key
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Private Sector funded -Wales & West Utilities		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		District wide	Wales & West Utilities
Contingencies: Alternative forms of energy such as decentralised CHP and renewable energy will decrease reliance on one fuel source in the district.			
Evidence: West of England IDP Wales & West Utilities Infrastructure Plan			

DWI.7 Water Supply		Water & Drainage	
<p>Wessex Water has an approved Water Resources Plan for future growth across the region. Future demand can be met from existing resources and there are contingency plans in place of drought measures. No new abstraction licenses are required.</p> <p>Bristol Water provides drinking water to over 1.1m people; it serves the majority of the district with the exception of the city of Bath and its immediate surroundings, which are served by Wessex Water.</p> <p>Draft Bristol Water plan takes account of forecast growth to plan water supply for the next 25 years, having regard to the impacts of climate change and opportunities to increase water efficiency. Leakage reduction and metering are major elements of the strategy. Bristol Water has identified the requirement for the provision of further raw water reservoir storage. Based on current information, it is envisaged that the reservoir will be located within Sedgemoor District, however, there is a degree of uncertainty with regards to the precise nature, timing and location of this project.</p>		Key	
<p>Cost: not known</p>	<p>Funding Sources:</p> <p>Private sector funding.</p> <p>Ongoing repair and improvement costs met by Ofwat and through Customer charging.</p>	<p>Phasing: 2006- 2026</p>	
<p>Risks: Demand could outstrip supply or efficiency savings could fail to be made. Network improvements should be planned to match the rate of development.</p>		<p>Relevant policy areas:</p> <p>District wide</p>	<p>Lead Agencies:</p> <p>Bristol Water Wessex Water</p>
<p>Contingencies: There are further opportunities for abstraction that could be explored, such as the reinstatement of small sources, abstraction from the river Avon or abstraction and desalination of water from the Severn Estuary. Bristol Water retains the use of temporary water use restrictions as a last resort.</p>			
<p>Evidence:</p> <p>Evidence gathering for IDP (Wessex Water & Bristol Water)</p> <p>Draft Bristol Water Management Plan (2010)</p> <p>Bristol City Council IDP (2010)</p> <p>Catchment Abstraction Management Plan (Environment Agency)</p>			

DWI.8 Waste Water		Water & Drainage	
<p>Wessex Water provides a sewerage service for the whole district, taking sewerage from properties through a network of piping to pumping stations and sewage treatment plants within the district. The largest plant is in Saltford, which takes sewerage from Bath and there are smaller works in the Norton Radstock area.</p> <p>Physical assets in the district include pumping stations, treatment plants and the sewer network. An asset management plan capturing capital investment is agreed with the regulator Ofwat every 5 years. Regard has been had of the RSS figures in anticipating future demand.</p> <p>Infill development provides the opportunity to increase capacity as surface water can be separated from combined sewers this provides potential links to SUDs projects. Modelling is required to confirm and quantify the scope of work required by a development.</p>		Key	
Cost: not specified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-15	
	<p>Private Sector funded.</p> <p>Ongoing repair and improvement costs met by Ofwat and through Customer charging.</p> <p>New development will require sewerage connection at developer's cost, for large scale development these costs will be significant. Modelling for this will be charged to the developer.</p>		
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		District wide	Wessex Water
Risks: Disruption could be caused by not planning works. Demand could outstrip that anticipated. Network improvements should be planned to match the rate of development.			
Contingencies: Developer contributions can be sought to cover additional demand			
Evidence:			
Bristol City Council IDP			
Wessex Water Business Plan 2010-15			
Evidence gathering for IDP (Wessex Water)			

DWI.9 Playing Pitches		Sport	
<p>The Council manages 124 football pitches, 42 cricket pitches and 62 Rugby pitches. The playing pitch strategy makes the following projections to 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Football pitches: surplus of senior pitches (40), deficit of junior (22) and mini (26) pitches; - Cricket pitches: deficit of 4.8 pitches - Rugby pitches: surplus of senior pitches (31.2), deficit of junior (19.4) and mini (0.8) pitches <p>Increasing use of school playing fields pursued for wider public use beyond school hours. Capacity of existing pitches can be improved through investment.</p> <p>New main football pitch adjacent to new Fry Club at Somerdale with facilities to those required by the Somerset County League</p>		Key	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Playing pitch strategy to 2021	
	Development requirement for Somerdale site		
	Developer contributions including re-provision where necessary		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas: District Wide	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Built Facilities Strategy (2009) Draft Playing Pitch Assessment (2009) Green Space Strategy (2008) Evidence gathering for IDP (B&NES Council) Fry Club Keynsham: Development of Sports & Social Facilities (PLC, Dec 2009)			

DWI.10 Green Space (Formal, Natural & Allotments)		Green Infrastructure	
<p>The Council manages and maintains 50 hectares of formal parkland as well as 200 hectares of public open space, sports pitches and highway verges. Included within this are parks, recreation grounds and public open spaces, floral displays, allotments, trees, woodland and parks and open spaces events.</p> <p>The Council's Green Space Strategy contains local provision standards and identifies deficits in green space. Future investment is needed as there is a general lack of allotments across the district with more localised shortages of natural space and to a lesser degree formal space.</p>			Key
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing:	
	Developer Contributions	Green Space Strategy	
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks:		District Wide	Bath & North East Somerset Council
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			
Green Space Strategy (2008)			
Evidence gathering for IDP (B&NES Council)			
Emerging B&NES Green Infrastructure Strategy			

DWI.11 Children's Play areas		Open Space	
<p>Lottery funding was secured to the tune of £296,875 provide children between 5 and 16 in the district with free play opportunities (2008-2011).</p> <p>The Council Play Policy (1999) and Play Strategy (2006) prioritise play provision for all children in the district. The Council has funded free play provision for 5-16 year olds in the district since 2000 and the post of Strategic Development Officer for Play. In 2007 £296,875 Big Lottery funding was secured to extend play services in area of deprivation.</p> <p>In 2009 Bath & North East Somerset Council was awarded £2.5m from the Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to develop and renew 31 play spaces in the area, as part of the "Play Pathfinder" Programme. Included within this is the development of a new adventure play park and skate park in Midsomer Norton.</p> <p>Further investment will be needed over the plan period, including the provision of new facilities to support new development.</p>		Key	
<p>Cost: £296,875 revenue funding £2.5m capital funding</p>	<p>Funding Sources: Council funding; Big Lottery Fund; Department for Children Schools and Families - Play Pathfinder; Developer contributions including in kind provision of play areas as part of new developments of scale</p>	<p>Phasing: Complete by 2011; Additional provision throughout the plan period.</p>	
<p>Risks: From April 2011 revenue funding available will be 63% less than in previous years due to Lottery and Pathfinder funding ending</p>		<p>Relevant policy areas: District Wide</p>	<p>Lead Agencies: B&NES Council Bath Area Play Project (voluntary sector) Wansdyke Play Association (voluntary sector) Community Bus (voluntary sector) Department for Children Schools and Families Play England</p>
<p>Contingencies: Potential for some third sector provision but this is not guaranteed. Council would have to consider as a corporate commitment</p>			
<p>Evidence: B&NES Play Policy 1999 B&NES Play Strategy 2006- 2012 Green Space Strategy 2008 B&NES Planning Obligations SPD</p>			

DWI.12 Strategic Green Infrastructure		Green Infrastructure	
<p>Green Infrastructure is a well managed, network of multi-functional green space, key outcomes include biodiversity, adaptation to climate change, landscape and heritage conservation, health living, flood mitigation and SUDs, sustainable transport and fuel/food production. The Council is developing a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the district. In addition to the specific green infrastructure opportunities identified for specific locations in the district.</p> <p>Key strategic issues emerging are: river Avon/Kennet and Avon canal corridor as a key asset to be improved, wetland areas and country parks associated with new development, green infrastructure associated with surface water management and ecology protection measures and the delivery of habitat restoration targets defined through the <i>Biodiversity South West Nature Map</i>.</p> <p>The Council is committed to developing a Green Infrastructure Strategy and delivery plan which will provide a framework to inform individual master plans as these are prepared. Early discussions on the strategic sites have highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wetland areas/ country parks associated with flood management - green infrastructure associated with surface water management - ecology protection measures 		Desirable	
Cost: Not known	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Potential funding sources include:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised management regimes for Council owned land - Partnership working with key land owners and managers - Work with voluntary and community sector - External funding e.g. HLF and other funders for specific access, biodiversity or heritage/landscape projects. - Developer contributions and Masterplan principles e.g. green corridors - To be further explored and identified in the Green Infrastructure Study 	Relevant policy areas: District Wide	Lead Agencies:
Risks:			
<p>Contingencies: Master plans will address GI needs and these will in part be achievable through developer contributions. However gap funding will also be required from other sources.</p> <p>GI will also be achievable through revised management regimes for Council owned land and through working in partnership with other key land owners/managers and organisations across B&NES.</p>			

Evidence: Emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy Biodiversity South West Nature Map and South West Nature Map: A Planners Guide		

DWI.13 Greater Bristol Bus Network Improvements & other Transport Improvements for Bath		Transport	
Key to alleviating rising congestion in the strategic road network. Specific works in B&NES as part of 2 initiatives:			
(i) Greater Bristol Bus Network, including improvements to bus infrastructure between Bath, Bristol and Radstock/Midsomer Norton. Major improvements to bus corridors and the purchase of new buses. Physical measures include bus priority measures and improved bus stops with new shelters, raised curbs and at most popular stops real time passenger information.			Key
Ten new showcase route corridors and over 70 bus routes within the West of England are benefiting from local improvements, which started in the summer 2010 with work on the M32 bus lane - improving punctuality and reliability for buses into Bristol without reducing any road space for cars. The benefits of similar improvements within Bath and North East Somerset can already be seen on the Hicks Gate Roundabout and the A367 Odd Down Bus Lane.			
(ii) the Bath Transportation Package, which include: a new A4 Eastern Park & Ride, expansion of Lansdown, Newbridge and Odd Down Park & Ride, a bus rapid transit scheme linking Newbridge and A4 Eastern Park and Ride, 10 showcase bus routes, real time bus passenger and car park information and city centre enhancements.			
The Bath Package aims to provide a modern integrated easy to use public transport system which seeks to:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a step change in public transport providing an attractive alternative to the private car • Reduce congestion and improve air quality • Bring environmental improvements 			
Create an effective and efficient transport system that will support the Bath Western Riverside regeneration project and other future developments.			
Cost: Total cost of the GBBN is £70m (WoE); Bath Package is £54m; GBBN £42.3M DfT, £20m First & £5.7m Developer Contributions	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Work initiated and to complete in 2019	
	DfT - Regional Funding Allocation 2		
	First		
	B&NES Council	Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Subject to DfT funding. Developer contributions may not be forthcoming in current economic climate.		District Wide	West of England Authorities including
Contingencies: None identified. This project is largely completed. The Bath Transport Package has been put in a 'pool' of 22 schemes bidding into a fund of about £600m. DfT press release: http://nds.coi.gov.uk/clientmicrosite/Content/Detail.aspx?ClientId=202&NewsAreaId=2&ReleaseId=416188&SubjectId=36			

	Bath Midsomer Norton & Radstock	B&NES Council; DfT; First.
Evidence: The Bath Transportation Package has been put in a “pool” of schemes bidding into a funding pot of about £600m. http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/transportandstreets/roadshighwaysandpavements/roadworks/roadreport/MajorSchemes/gbbn/Pages/default.aspx		
Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p3 & Appendix E www.westofengland.org/transport/bath-package		
Greater Bristol Bus Network: Major Scheme Business Case, July 2005		

DWI.14 Future Strategic Transport Intervention Package		Transport	
Capital projects have not yet been defined but include safeguarding routes e.g. proposed Whitchurch bypass and Temple Clutton bypass (safeguarded routes in saved Local Plan policies). Future projects could also improve the A4 between Bristol and Bath and introduction of an A36/A46 link to the east of Bath. These schemes are subject to further investigation.			Desirable
Cost: not known	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Post 2019/20	
	Potential funding could include:		
	DfT		
	B&NES Council	Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
	Future Regional Funding Allocations	District Wide	West of England Authorities including B&NES Council; DfT; First.
Risks: Without intervention existing transport problems will remain and conditions may deteriorate further. Projects still to be developed and funding secured.			
Contingencies: not yet explored			
Evidence:			
B&NES Local Plan, saved policies			
Evidence Gathering for IDP (Transport)			

DWI.15 Two Tunnels Greenway		Transport	
<p>The Two Tunnels route will use an old railway track bed from Combe Down creating a direct route between Bath and the Midford valley, 2½ miles south of the city. The Two Tunnels route is being built by Sustrans working in partnership with Bath and North East Somerset Council. A Two Tunnels Community group who originated the project and who campaign for the route are also active in campaigning and fundraising to support the project.</p> <p>The Sustrans project is called Connect2. Two Tunnels is just one of the many projects included in this scheme.</p> <p>The multi-user path will join Bath and Midford by a system of tunnels and impressive overland paths following the disused railway. The route makes a wide sweep through Oldfield Park, surfaces in the secretive Lyncombe Vale and finally emerges in beautiful open country at Tucking Mill, before joining the long distance Sustrans NCN24 route at Midford.</p>		Desirable	
Cost: £1.8m	Funding Sources:	Phasing: ongoing	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Department of Transport £163,000 grant for Midford Viaduct (Restoration of Midford Aqueduct £850,000) - £1m Lottery funding bid “The People’s Millions Scheme” 		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		Bath Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Community & Voluntary sector; Sustrans; Bath & North East Somerset Council.
Evidence: www.twotunnels.org.uk http://www.sustransconnect2.org.uk			

DWI.16 Leisure & Culture		Social	
<p>The Council provides numerous recreational, cultural, leisure and arts facilities throughout the district. In addition to this there are a number of private facilities such as the Bath Rugby Club at the Rec and Bath City FC.</p> <p>There are also a range of aspirations for a new multi-use stadium in Bath, the remodelling of the Forum as a concert hall, the upgrading of sports field changing facilities and new library & community facilities.</p>			Key
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources: - Bath & North East Somerset Council	Phasing: 2010-2026	
Risks:		Relevant policy areas: District-wide	Lead Agencies: B&NES Council Community & Voluntary Sector Aquaterra
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Evidence gathering IDP (B&NES Council)			

DWI.17 Built Sports Facilities		Sport	
<p>PPG17 compliant study considering built facilities in the district. This study identifies supply of built facilities including synthetic turf pitches, multi-use halls, swimming pools, sports halls, tennis courts, bowling facilities, multi-use games areas, gyms, squash courts, golf courses, youth facilities, athletic tracks and recreation ground pavilions. Population based thresholds for new provision and deficits and supply identified.</p>		Key	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing:	
	Developer contributions including re-provision where necessary		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		District Wide	Bath & North East Somerset Council
Evidence:			
Built Facilities Strategy (2009)			
http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/Environment%20and%20Planning/PlanObligationsmaster2.pdf			
Appendix A			

DWI.18 Public Realm & Movement Programme		Public Realm	
The Council is responsible for maintaining adopted roads and pavements together with street lighting, signage and street furniture.			Key
The upgrade of the public realm has a role to play in the continuing development of the economy and the image of the place.			
Cost: see specific costs within strategies	Funding Sources:	Phasing:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secured Sources - CIVITAS (EC Funding) - Growth Points - Developer Contributions - Council Capital - The public Realm and Movement Programme is developing a funding strategy to support Council Capital to deliver the rolling programme of improvements. 		
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		District Wide	
Risks: Developer contributions may not be forthcoming			
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			
Bath Public Realm and Movement Strategy (2009)			
Draft Regeneration Delivery Plan for Midsomer Norton 2010			
Draft Regeneration Delivery Plan for Keynsham 2010			

DWI.19 District Heating		Renewable & Low Carbon Energy	
The Core Strategy encourages the introduction of combined heat and power and the development of a District Heating network focused on “District Heating Priority Areas” which are shown to have existing and future technical feasibility for the technology. This technology is currently seen to be one of the most cost effective ways of meeting zero carbon requirements for new buildings.		Desirable	
Cost: see area specific costs where available in later sections	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2016; 2016 - 2021; 2021-2026	
	Strategic Network:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy Services Company (ESCo) in public/private partnership investment arrangement which would allow the energy to be produced and then sold on to the consumers. - Developer contributions - Community Energy Fund - Allowable Solutions Local infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivered through development within District Heating Priority areas - Delivered by landowners as a site specific energy solution e.g. already in place at the RUH, University of Bath, Thermae Spa & Bath Leisure Centre. Bath Western Riverside District Heating Scheme in process of being established as part of the detailed infrastructure planning for the site.	Relevant policy areas: District-wide with a focus on the urban areas	Lead Agencies:
Risks:			
Contingencies: District Heating is only one possible energy solution, other site specific or off-site allowable solutions might be implemented as an alternative to meeting the zero carbon requirements, albeit potentially at higher cost to the developer.			
Evidence: B&NES Renewable Energy Research (2009 & 2010) B&NES District Heating Opportunity Study (2010)			

DWI.20 Further Education		Education	
<p>There are two further education colleges in the district: (i) City of Bath College and (ii) Norton Radstock College. Responsibility for Further Education is being transferred from the LSC to the Council.</p> <p>Both colleges have been in discussion with the LSCC on significant projects to overhaul facilities and these have stalled due to a lack of central Government funding.</p>		Desirable	
Cost: Not known	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
Risks: Capital funding is not secured to improve facilities.		Relevant policy areas: District-wide	Lead Agencies: Local Education Authority
Contingencies: Deferred funding will necessitate the extended use of facilities, although they will become increasingly unfit for purpose.			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP (NRC and CBC)			

DWI.21 Higher Education		Education	
There are two higher education institutions in the district: (i) University of Bath and (ii) Bath Spa University.			
The University of Bath has prepared a Masterplan and its needs for the plan period can be met on campus in line with Local Plan policy GDS.1/B11 which has been saved alongside the Core Strategy.			Desirable
Bath Spa University is in the process of preparing a Bath Spa University Masterplan (considering all sites) and a specific Newton Park Campus Masterplan. It is seeking to improve its academic buildings and increase on-campus residence.			
Cost: Not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	University of Bath Bath Spa University		
Risks: Capital funding is not secured to improve facilities.		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: Operations will continue in existing		Bath	University of Bath Bath Spa University
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP & Core Strategy (University of Bath, Bath Spa University)			

DWI.22 Youth Services		Children's Services	
Youth Services provides for the 13-19 age group and will support the work of the Youth Service via Youth Centre provision and activities, equipment, mobile provision and Detached Youth Workers in the areas of the development.			Key
Cost: Per capita calculation included in the B&NES Planning Obligations SPD	Funding Sources: Developer Contributions Some limited mainstream funding	Phasing: 2010-2026	
Risks: Capital funding is not secured to improve services, significant mainstream funding is not anticipated.		Relevant policy areas: District-wide	Lead Agencies: Children's Service
Contingencies: Potential for some third sector provision but this is not guaranteed. Council would have to consider as a corporate commitment.			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP (Children's Services) B&NES Planning Obligations SPD			

DWI.23 Police		Emergency Services	
<p>Avon & Somerset Police force operate from stations in Bath, Keynsham and Radstock. There is also a neighbourhood centre in Twerton. The Central Bath station includes custody suites. The demand for policing is driven more by the level of crime than population growth per se.</p> <p>PFI to ensure re-provision of custody suites, removing 12 cell unit from Bath and re-providing elsewhere (potentially in the Keynsham area). This may also include the refurbishment of the Radstock station.</p>			Desirable
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2016; 2016 - 2021; 2021-2026	
	PFI with Avon & Somerset Constabulary		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		District wide	Avon & Somerset Constabulary
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			
Evidence gathering for the IDP (ASC)			
ASC Developer Contributions Methodology			

DWI.24 Fire		Emergency Services	
<p>Avon Fire & Rescue Service covers the former Avon area. Within the district use is made of the following facilities: Bath Fire Station, Bath Community Safety Centre, Keynsham Community safety Centre, Keynsham, Paulton, Radstock and Chew Magna Fire Stations.</p> <p>Local standards set maximum response times for incidents, Cat A areas 8 mins. For 85% of incidents, Cat B areas 10 mins. For 90% of incidents and for Cat C areas 20 mins for 95% of incidents.</p> <p>The Fire Stations must be located to best manage both the operational response risk and community risk. Increasing traffic congestion and potential development on the periphery of the city is seen to interfere with the future efficient operation of the Bath station.</p> <p>Two small stations could provide improved cover to Bath to replace Bath Fire Station (potentially in more peripheral locations) if funding allows. A replacement station at Keynsham (could be relocated on the eastern side of Bristol) would be considered in support of the desire to redevelop Keynsham Town Centre.</p>		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2026	
	Avon Fire & Rescue Service (land value of existing sites could potentially contribute towards re-provision).		
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Appropriate alternative sites have not been identified and funding not currently available. Bath station may not continue to give appropriate cover to the city.		District wide	Avon Fire & Rescue Service
Contingencies: Explore an alternative strategy.			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for the IDP (AFRS) Keynsham Town Hall Masterplan rationale document (B&NES/NEW Masterplanning)			

DWI.245 Ambulance		Emergency Services	
<p>The Great Western Ambulance Service provide emergency advise, care and treatment to the population of the former Avon area. Within the district the service operates from ambulance stations in Bath, Keynsham and Paulton. In addition it makes use of standby points at the RUH and St Martin’s Hospital. Response times are set for incidents, in order to improve response times the number of standby stations is being increased. There is again potential for increased traffic congestion to interfere with the operation of the Bath station, therefore the relocation of this station to a more peripheral location within the city is seen to be desirable.</p>		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2016; 2016 - 2021; 2021-2026	
	Great Western Ambulance Service - the value of the existing site could contribute to re-provision elsewhere.		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		District wide	Great Western Ambulance Service
Evidence:			
Evidence gathering for the IDP (GWAS)			

DWI.26 Great Western Mainline Electrification		Transport	
Electrification of the line from London to Swansea, including branches to Oxford and Newbury and including both Bristol routes (Parkway & Temple Meads), but not including branch to Weston super Mare.		Desirable	
Cost: £1bn	Funding Sources: The cost of electrification to be met by network rail and to be funded by the government.	Phasing: 2011-2021	
Risks: Scheme put on hold (25.11.10)		Relevant policy areas: District Wide	Lead Agencies: Network Rail DfT
Contingencies: not known			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for the IDP (Transport) DfT press release: http://nds.coi.gov.uk/content/detail.aspx?ReleaseID=416742&NewsAreaId=2			

DW.27 Smarter Choices Interventions		Transport	
<p>Smarter choices are techniques for influencing people's travel behaviour towards more sustainable options such as encouraging school, workplace and individualised travel planning. They also seek to improve public transport and marketing services such as travel awareness campaigns, setting up websites for car share schemes, supporting car clubs and encouraging home working.</p> <p>The Bath Transport Interventions Study (2010) included an assessment of smarter choices options for the city using the G-BATH model. This indicated that a package of workplace and school travel plans, together with personalised travel planning could reduce car trips by 4% of higher with suitable funding. The study also highlighted the number of short car trips within the city, a proportion of which could be diverted to walking and cycling. A package of walking and cycling improvements along the river corridor was estimated to remove 680 car trips in the AM peak hour. A combination of smarter choices interventions across the city and walk/cycle improvements along the river corridor was estimated to reduce journey times by 2 minutes on most routes.</p>		Desirable	
<p>Cost: Workplace travel plans £36-£72k (targeting approx 12,000 employees); School Travel Plans £50k; Personalised travel planning £380k (19,000 residents at £20 per head); Walking and cycle improvements not yet quantified.</p>	<p>Funding Sources:</p> <p>Bath & North East Somerset Council; Developer Contributions (e.g. Travel Plans); National Campaigns; Local Businesses and Amenity/Interest Groups; Public Realm Improvements; Commercial operations e.g. Car Clubs; Health-led projects; Schools and University travel planning</p>	<p>Phasing: 2010-2026</p>	
<p>Risks: Lack of specific ring-fenced funding for smarter choices interventions or investment in walking and cycling networks will result in a reduction in the range of smarter choices interventions that can be delivered.</p>		<p>Relevant policy areas:</p> <p>Bath Keynsham Midsomer Norton & Radstock Rural Areas</p>	<p>Lead Agencies:</p> <p>Bath & North East Somerset Council</p>
<p>Contingencies: Smarter choices measures are a potential contingency where capital investment cannot be sought in transport infrastructure and can often be the most effective and efficient interventions.</p>			
<p>Evidence:</p> <p>Information gathering for the IDP (Transport) Bath Transport Interventions, Transport Modelling Report, Mott MacDonald, February 2010. www.bathnes.gov.uk/transportandstreets/travel/Pages/travelbetterlivebetter.aspx</p>			

DWI.28 Renewable Energy Infrastructure		Energy	
The Council has set targets for renewable energy provision in the Core Strategy. It is anticipated that this infrastructure will be provided on a commercial basis by the private sector and householders. The Council may also have a role in delivering and enabling projects.			
		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Privately funded projects; Householders; Bath Community Energy and other community projects; Grant schemes and tax incentives (e.g. feed in tariff)		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		District Wide	Private sector
Evidence:			
B&NES Renewable Energy & Planning Research (2009 & 2010)			

Bath

BI.1 Transport Proposals for Bath		Transport	
Following the Comprehensive Spending Review, the Bath Transportation Package has been placed in the Department for Transport's development pool of transport schemes being considered for investment in future years.		Key	
The Government are asking all schemes in this pool to review their costs and the Council will follow new Government guidance to do this.			
Bath still has congestion problems and the development of the BTP is important for the longer term sustainable growth of the city.			
The Bath Transportation Package (BTP) is a £54 million scheme designed to tackle congestion in Bath and the surrounding area by improving public transport and enhancing pedestrian access for the benefit of residents, commuters and visitors. The BTP includes the following elements:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding the City's three existing Park & Rides and creating a new Park & Ride to the east of the City, thereby increasing Park & Ride capacity from 1,990 to 4,510 spaces. Creating a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route, including a 1.4km section of "off-street" dedicated bus route which will remove Park & Ride buses from congestion for a significant amount of their journey; Creating a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly City Centre through the introduction of access changes on a number of streets and the expansion and enhancement of pedestrian areas; Improving nine bus routes to Showcase standard, including raised kerbs for better access, off-bus ticketing to speed up boarding and real-time electronic information for passengers; Introducing active traffic management with real-time information to direct drivers to locations where parking spaces are available. 			
Cost: £54 million	Funding Sources: Department for Transport, Council & Local Contributions	Phasing: Subject to new government procedure	
Risks: New government guidance being followed since the Comprehensive Spending Review placed the scheme in the £600m Development Pool .		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies: DfT B&NES Council
Contingencies: not yet identified		Bath District Wide benefits	
Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p7			

http://www.westofengland.org/transport/bath-package Major Scheme Business Case for the Bath Transportation Package, 2006: http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/transportandstreets/transportpolicy/plansandstrategies/bathpackage/Pages/Major%20Scheme%20Business%20Case.aspx Planning Applications for the Bath Transportation Package: http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/majordevelopments/Pages/Bath%20Transportation%20Package.aspx	also as Bath is the primary centre	

Bl.2 Improvements to Flood Defences of Bath City Centre and Riverside Corridor		Water & Drainage	
<p>The Flood Risk Management Strategy has concluded that there is no comprehensive strategic solution to reduce peak flow in Bath that is technologically and economically viable. The strategy proposed is one of on-site flood defences combined with upstream compensatory storage. New development must provide storage to off-set the volume of water that would be displaced in a flood event by the defences on site. In order to meet the requirements a flood storage area of 345,000m³ is required. Provision of compensatory storage off-site is more cost effective than providing it on site and allows for greater flexibility in masterplanning. These improvements will also benefit locations downstream from Bath.</p> <p>The potential for this infrastructure to contribute to strategic green infrastructure (DWI.18) will also need to be considered.</p>		Key	
Cost: £7.6m	<p>Funding Sources: Developer contributions</p>	<p>Phasing: 2011-2026 Upstream compensation and on-site flood defences will need to be in place prior to development commencing,</p>	
	<p>On site requirement for compensatory flood mitigation measures for sites within the River Corridor</p>		
		<p>Relevant policy areas:</p>	<p>Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council; Environment Agency; Landowners/Developers</p>
<p>Risks: Creation of compensatory storage would require forward funding ahead of the receipt of developer contributions, government support is required to facilitate this.</p>			
<p>Contingencies: The strategic solution relates only to flood compensation, on site flood defences will still be required irrespective of whether a strategic flood compensation area can be delivered. This is inline with the Strategic Flood Risk Management Study. Developers will need to be aware of the flood risk management infrastructure along the river corridor in Bath.</p> <p>If a strategic compensation area is not delivered the space required for compensation on a site by site basis and therefore would reduce the development capacity of river corridor sites. This will also have an impact on the design of river corridor development. Costs of an on-site solution may also be prohibitive for some sites and will challenge their ability to be brought forward by the market</p>			

Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p7 B&NES (2008) Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 1&2 B&NES (2009) Strategic Flood Risk Management Strategy Emerging B&NES Green Infrastructure Strategy		

Bl.3 Public Investment in Bath Western Riverside		Site Specific Infrastructure	
<p>Public investment is needed into a number of key regeneration delivery items to bring this site forward. Investment items include - among others- infrastructure delivery, affordable housing, remediation and land assembly.</p> <p>The Bath Western Riverside development site is covered by a Supplementary Planning Document which covers a 35ha area and outlines this area for a mixed use development. Crest Nicholson has applied for planning permission to develop an area of 17.9 ha (OPA1, Application No 06/01733/EOUT) of this overall site, mainly for residential development. Crest Nicholson has also applied for Detailed Planning Permission (DPA1) for a 5.59ha area which is part of the site and under owned by Crest or under their control.</p>			Key
<p>Cost: The cost of the overall development of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has not been estimated in detail. The document outlines though that gap funding for various delivery items will be needed (Part 3 Implementation Plan). The approximate private sector investment in the OPA1 development as outlined by Crest Nicholson is £400M; Approximate private sector investment in the secured land area (part of OPA1 approx. 800 units) £200M;</p> <p>Overall council investment in secured land of around £5M infrastructure funding, and £6.9M affordable housing investment.</p> <p>Further funding towards the first phase of the BWR Crest scheme has been applied for at</p>	<p>Funding Sources: Council Capital Funding, Further public sector funding</p>	<p>Phasing: FY 2010/11 start on site, delivery of initial phase of 299 units over approximately 4 years. Further phases</p>	

the HCA.			
Risks: Delivery Risk (contamination, flooding etc), Market Risk		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: Council to enter into Corporate Agreement with Crest Nicholson for part of the site to support comprehensive delivery of the site parts which will be developed by Crest Nicholson.		Bath	
Evidence: Supplementary Planning Document Bath Western Riverside Outline Planning Application No 06/01733/EOUT and associated documents Detailed Planning Application No 06/04013/EFUL and associated documents_			

Bl.4 Improvements to Bath Train Station and enhanced frequency of trains from Bath & Oldfield Park to Bristol		Transport	
Capital improvements to the station and links to this to be sought as part of the BWR development.			Desirable
Enhanced service and increased frequency to Bristol from Bath, Oldfield Park and Keynsham will require additional revenue funding. Great Western Mainline Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) highlights that the line has capacity to run addition services without capital investment to the track or signalling.			
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010 +	
	- Network Rail - Train Operators		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		Bath Keynsham	Network Rail; Developers & Landowners;
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP (Transport) Bath Western Riverside SPD Great Western Mainline Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS)			

Bl.5 Parking Strategy for the City of Bath		Transport	
<p>The management of car parking is a key mechanism to achieve wider economic, environmental, safety, social and quality of life objectives. Some existing car park sites in central Bath have been identified as key development sites, so their release for alternative uses (with replacement parking at Park & Ride sites) needs to be effectively managed to ensure that all access to the city centre is maintained. The existing Riverside Coach Park forms part of the Bath Quays development site, so may need to be relocated. In terms of maintaining accessibility to the city centre, coach parking is an efficient land use, with an average coach carrying the equivalent of 20 cars. A replacement coach parking facility within the city centre is therefore envisaged.</p>			Key
Cost: Car parking strategy: n/a Cost of replacement coach park not yet quantified.	Funding Sources: Bath Parking Strategy underway and led by the Council's Transportation Planning Department.	Phasing: 2010 onwards	
Risks: : Redevelopment of car park sites requires replacement parking provision at park & ride sites.		Relevant policy areas: Bath	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council
Contingencies:			
Evidence: A comprehensive series of parking and Park & Ride surveys was undertaken in 2009. Research is currently underway, anticipated publication in 2011 (Transportation Planning)			

Bl.6 Bath Library		Social	
Bath Library would benefit from relocation and reconfiguration, potentially to be secured as part of the redevelopment of the Podium/Cattlemarket site.		Desirable	
Cost: not known	Funding Sources: Development requirement for the Podium/Cattlemarket site.	Phasing:	
Risks: Podium/Cattlemarket site fails to come forward in the plan period.		Relevant policy areas: Bath	Lead Agencies: Podium/Cattlemarket site landowner/developer B&NES Council
Contingencies: Continued use of current site within the Podium.			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP (Library Services)			

BI.7: Bath Centre District Heating Network		Energy	
The implementation of a district heating scheme in Bath has been investigated and shown to have the potential to deliver significant CO ₂ reductions (3097 tonnes CO ₂ pa) and long-term financial (3.96% IRR) returns.		Desirable	
Cost: £5,010,224	Funding Sources: Private financing from third-party ESCOs European funds (JESSICA, ELENA) Developer contributions	Phasing: Developer contributions can only be received where network connections are agreed prior to construction. Capturing large development sites improves project returns.	
Risks: Attracting large enough customer base on long term heat contracts to realise carbon savings and financial returns.		Relevant policy areas: Bath	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council; Landowners/Developers; Energy Services Company
Contingencies: Without a district heating network new development sites will still be required to meet the same carbon targets, although at additional cost. An existing network acts as an enabler to making carbon savings in the existing building stock; through modelled connection and through future network expansion. This is particularly relevant to network options in Bath where heritage and conservation designations make it one of only a few effective interventions.			
Evidence: B&NES District Heating Study (AECOM, 2010) B&NES Renewable Energy Capacity Study (CAMCO, 2010)			

BI.8: Bath Riverside District Heating Network		Energy	
The implementation of a district heating scheme in the Bath Riverside development corridor has been investigated and shown to have the potential to deliver significant CO ₂ reductions (3401 tonnes CO ₂ pa) and long-term financial (6.85% IRR) returns.		Desirable	
Cost: £5,448,996	Funding Sources: Private financing from third-party ESCOs European funds (JESSICA, ELENA) Developer contributions	Phasing: Capturing large development sites is vital to project feasibility, for heat demand and for developer contributions.	
Risks: Attracting large enough customer base on long term heat contracts to realise carbon savings and financial returns. The network requires large development sites to connect to the network. If planning consent is given prior to an agreement to connect the customer base may be locked out.		Relevant policy areas: Bath Riverside	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council; Landowners/Developers;
Contingencies: Without a district heating network new development sites will still be required to meet the same carbon targets, although at additional cost. An existing network acts as an enabler to making carbon savings in the existing building stock; through modelled connection and through future network expansion. This is particularly relevant to network options in Bath where heritage and conservation designations make it one of only a few effective interventions.			
Evidence: B&NES District Heating Study (AECOM, 2010) B&NES Renewable Energy Capacity Study (CAMCO, 2010)			

BI.9 Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education		Children's Service	
<p>The re-development of MOD Foxhill, Bath is likely to trigger the need for a new primary and early years facility on site, this is likely to be required in the early stages of development in order to accommodate the children from the new development as they appear. Many of the existing primary schools in Bath have limited capacity for extension or expansion on site.</p> <p>There will also be an additional need for primary school places generated within Bath, resulting in the need to potentially build new primary schools or expand existing schools. Initial estimates suggest that this might be approximately equivalent to 2 new two form entry primary schools (420 place capacity) or 4 new one form entry primary schools (210 place), the exact amount will depend on the housing mix and phasing. This will need to be picked up in the Placemaking DPD within which sites may need to be allocated.</p> <p>There will be a need to add additional capacity to Secondary Schools within Bath to keep step with development, there is potential for this additional capacity to be accommodated on site (e.g. by distributing the extra teaching space needed across several schools).</p>		Key	
Cost: dependent on delivery strategy and phasing	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Developer contributions		
Risks: Changes in government policy could change the way in which education is delivered.		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: There is a statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places (primary & secondary) and to ensure sufficiency of early years provision. There could be some phasing options around the delivery of facilities.		District-wide	Local Education Authority; Developers/Landowners
Evidence: Evidence gathering for IDP(Local Education Authority) B&NES Secondary Schools Reorganisation 2006-2010 B&NES Primary School Review (Overview & Scrutiny Panel) 25 Jan 2010 B&NES Childcare Sufficiency Report (Children's Services) for early years			

Midsomer Norton & Radstock

MNRI.1 Public investment for site preparation & planning and site specific infrastructure		Site Specific Package	
Investment to bring forward regeneration of brownfield sites in Midsomer Norton & Radstock town centres and to facilitate the delivery of employment sites			Key
Cost: £7.7m	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2016; Investment by period 2010 - 2015	
Proposed phasing: 2011-12 £0.3m 2012-2013 £5.1m 2013-2014 £2.3m	Public Investment via HCA		
Risks:		Relevant areas: Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Lead Agencies: West of England Partnership; Homes & Communities Agency
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p14 Rural Masterplanning Fund Masterplanning for Old Mills			

MNRI.2 Part of Greater Bristol Bus Network: A37 Bristol to Midsomer Norton & Radstock and Bath to Midsomer Norton & Radstock		Transport	
Major improvements to bus corridors and the purchase of new buses. Physical measures include bus priority measures and improved bus stops with new shelters, raised curbs and at most popular stops real time passenger information.			Key
Cost: 70m for overall project	Funding Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - £42.3M DfT - £20m First - £6m Developer Contributions 	Phasing: Project Timescale 2006-2016	
Risks: Developer contributions may not be forthcoming in current economic climate.		Relevant policy areas: Bath Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Lead Agencies: West of England Partnership; First Group; DfT
Contingencies: Carry out all works possible within budget and explore other options for transport improvements.			
Evidence: Evidence gathering for the IDP (Transport) Also included in Bristol Development Framework Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2010) See DW1.1A			

MNRI.3 Site Base Infrastructure Requirements for Old Mills II		Site Specific Package	
See details in MNRI.1			Key
Cost:	Funding Sources:	Phasing:	
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			

MNRI.4 Transport network improvements Midsomer Norton		Transport	
Modifications to existing highway network in Midsomer Norton town centre, in association with redevelopment, could improve the public realm and improve conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.		Desirable	
Cost: Not yet quantified	Funding Sources: Developer Contributions External Funding DfT block allocation for minor schemes	Phasing: Not known	
Risks: Some improvements may be reliant on developer contributions to come forward.		Relevant policy areas: Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Lead Agencies: Highways Department
Contingencies: Minor improvements could be implemented by the Council, but the full benefits would only be realised with redevelopment of key sites.			
Evidence: Regeneration Delivery Plan (B&NES 2010) has indicated that alterations to the highway network are feasible.			

MNRI.4 Transport network improvements Radstock		Transport	
Managing traffic movements and the meeting the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in the centre of Radstock is challenging due the convergence of the A367 and A362 in a confined area. Redevelopment proposals offer the opportunity to manage these demands more effectively and make improvements to the public realm.			
		Desirable	
Cost: Not yet quantified	Funding Sources: Developer Contributions External Funding	Phasing: Not known	
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Some improvements may be reliant on developer contributions to come forward.		Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Highways Department
Contingencies: Minor improvements could be implemented by the Council, but the full benefits would only be realised with redevelopment of key sites.			
Evidence:			

MNRI.4 Midsomer Norton Town Park		Green Infrastructure	
Aspiration to create a new publicly accessible Town Park in Midsomer Norton			Desirable
Cost: Not known	Funding Sources: Potential to be cross funded by development	Phasing: Not known	
Risks: Delivery mechanism not yet secured.		Relevant policy areas: Midsomer Norton & Radstock	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Emerging B&NES Green Infrastructure Strategy Regeneration Delivery Plan (B&NES 2010) Evidence Gathering for the IDP (Core Strategy)			

Keynsham

KI.1 Public Investment in Site Preparation & Planning Keynsham Town Centre		Site Specific Infrastructure	
Keynsham Town Centre & Somerdale site public investment for site specific investment in site preparation and planning.			Key
Cost: £0.3m Funding secured for 2011-12	Funding Sources: Public Investment via HCA	Phasing: Investment period 2010-2015	
Risks:		Relevant policy areas: Keynsham	Lead Agencies: West of England Partnership; Homes & Communities Agency
Contingencies:			
Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p15			

KI.2: Flood Protection Measures for Cadbury's Somerdale site		Water & Drainage	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development in this area will need to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment Flood protection measures need to be implemented as part of the Masterplan for the redevelopment of the site. The northern part of the site is in the flood plain (zone 2). Risk can be mitigated through works on site or upstream, paid for by developers. Potential measures could include raised defences and floodplain storage, with SUDS techniques to be incorporated into drainage design. Development within the Policy area must be safe through out its lifetime and informed by the B&NES SFRA and Flood Risk Management Strategy 			Key
Cost: Dependent on scheme design	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Enabling works to precede development	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributions On site works required to address and respond to the implications of flood risk and necessary to obtain planning permission. 		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: The Masterplanning process should ensure in the first instance that a sequential approach is taken to direct development to areas at least risk of flooding, therefore reducing the need as far as possible for flood protection measures.		Keynsham	Bath & North East Somerset Council; Landowner/Developer; Environment Agency
Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p15 Draft Keynsham Regeneration Delivery Plan (2010) B&NES Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008) B&NES Strategic Flood Mitigation Strategy (2009) B&NES Flood Risk Management Strategy (2010) Cadbury Somerdale Vision for the Future (LDA Design, Feb 2009) Evidence Gathering for IDP - Environment Agency			

KI.3: Major Improvements to Sewerage Capacity		Water & Drainage	
Major improvements to the sewerage capacity are needed to facilitate substantial development within the town. This includes (i) off-site sewerage improvements needed for any substantial development as insufficient local capacity (ii) planned upgrade of Keynsham treatment plant to increase treatment capacity.			Key
Insufficient capacity to accommodate development beyond about 500 houses without intervention (RT/URS, 2009).			
Cost: Dependent on scheme design	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Enabling works to precede development	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wessex Water • On-site works and Developer contributions • K2 development to bear costs of complex connection to sewerage network 		
Risks: A risk was identified that there could be insufficient space for upgrading of Keynsham sewerage treatment plan in its current location, however, this issue has since been resolved via the Joint Waste Core Strategy process.		Relevant policy areas: Keynsham	Lead Agencies: Wessex Water; Bath & North East Somerset Council; Landowners/Developers; Environment Agency
Contingencies: On site strategies could be explored.			
Evidence: Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010)p15 K2 planning application Committee Report (09/04351/FUL)p13-14 West of England Partnership: Responding to Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Issues in the West of England (Roger Tym/URS 2009)			

KI.4 Enhance Keynsham Hams as a Wetland Habitat		Green Infrastructure	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somerdale redevelopment site requirement to improve the value of the Hams in environmental, ecological and recreational terms. This will allow the Hams to provide open space, wildlife habitat, recreation, flood alleviation, visual amenity, and a landscape setting for the town. To include improved access for public through improved connections and a concentration of community uses at the heart of the site. 			Key
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources: - Development requirement for Somerdale site	Phasing: to coincide with redevelopment of Somerdale	
Risks: Continuing engagement will be required to realise this through future Masterplanning etc.		Relevant policy areas: Keynsham	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:			
Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cadbury Somerdale Vision for the Future (LDA Design, Feb 2009) Somerdale Landscape Framework (LDA Design, June 2009) Cadbury Somerdale Public Exhibition (Atisreal, Feb 2009) Keynsham draft RDP (New Masterplanning, March 2010) 			

Transport

Key

KI.5 Secondary road access to Somerdale site	
<p>Access: Two points of access required to serve development site with internal loop road. Primary access = new traffic signal controlled junction on Station Road, combined with Avon Mill Lane junction. Road realignment of Station Road on new junction approach required. Improvements to Chandos Road/Station Road junction. Use of Somerdale Road likely to be restricted to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Local Impact: Improved pedestrian/cycling infrastructure require with direct linkages to town centre. Improved access required from site to railway station, including disabled access.</p> <p>S106: Possible requirement for contribution towards bus service re-routing, signalised access junction, network signalisation throughout Keynsham. Mitigation of traffic impact required. Travel Plan required for all employment uses and new residents welcome packs for all new households, including free travel tickets for given period for all members of new households. Contribution towards accessibility improvements at railway station and bus infrastructure provision.</p>	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:
	- Developer Contributions.
Risks:	
Contingencies: If this enabling work is not undertaken the development capacity of the site will remain constrained as per the previous Local Plan allocation.	
Evidence:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cadbury Somerdale Vision for the Future (LDA Design, Feb 2009) • Keynsham draft Regeneration Delivery Plan (New Masterplanning, March 2010) • SHLAA, 2010 	

Phasing: To precede significant development at Somerdale site

Relevant policy areas:

Keynsham

Lead Agencies:

Landowner/Developer

KI.6 Improvements to Keynsham Railway Station & Enhanced Service Frequency to Bristol and Bath		Transport	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the railway station to be secured as a Development Requirement for the Somerdale site, including pedestrian and cycle facilities, disabled access and improved links between the station, Somerdale and town centre Future improvements to the frequency of train service to be lobbied for demonstrating the increased commercial attractiveness to the rail service providers Greater Bristol Metro Rail Project to provide improvements to suburban services around Bristol, including improved frequency to provide half hourly services involving new rolling stock and some new infrastructure. This scheme is promoted within LTP3. 			Key
Cost: 19.7m for Greater Bristol Metro Rail Project	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Railway station improvements to coincide with redevelopment of Somerdale	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developer contributons Greater Bristol Metro Rail Project 		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		Keynsham	West of England Partnership; Network Rail; Train Operator(s)
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Western Mainline Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) Single Conversation: West of England Delivery & Infrastructure Investment Plan (2010) Cadbury Somerdale Vision for the Future (LDA Design, Feb 2009) Cadbury Somerdale Public Exhibition (Atisreal, Feb 2009) Keynsham draft RDP (New Masterplanning, March 2010) Future for Keynsham (B&NES 2006) Keynsham Town Plan (2004) 			

KI.7 Early Years, Primary & Secondary Education		Children's Service	
<p>Although the housing mix and detailed site capacity is not yet known, based on assumptions informed by the Local Education Authority the following education requirements are identified at this time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Early Years facility at Somerdale - New Primary School at Somerdale - Extension of Castle Primary School at South West Keynsham - Potential for a small number for additional Primary School places and early years facilities (options around how these are accommodated) <p>In relation to secondary schools, any development within the Broadlands School catchment can take up existing capacity within this school which is currently occupied by pupils from outside the Local Authority area. For development within the Wellsway School catchment, this school is close to capacity, so contributions are likely to be required to expand capacity at this school.</p>		Key	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: Enabling works to precede housing development	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early Years facility and new Primary School at Somerdale to be provided on-site and via Developer contributions as part of the Development Requirements for Somerdale. - The extension of Castle Primary School will be secured as part of the Development Requirements for K2 Allocation. The additional early years facilities will be secured via Developer Contributions. - Developer Contributions to be sought to secure these facilities from new development that triggers its need. 	Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		Keynsham	Local Education Authority; Landowners/Developers
Risks: Changes in government policy could change the way in which education is delivered.			
Contingencies: There is a statutory obligation to provide sufficient school places (primary & secondary) and to ensure sufficiency of early years provision. There could be some phasing options around the delivery of facilities.			
Evidence:			
Evidence gathering for IDP(Local Education Authority)			
B&NES Secondary Schools Reorganisation 2006-2010			
B&NES Primary School Review (Overview & Scrutiny Panel) 25 Jan 2010			
B&NES Childcare Sufficiency Report (Children's Services) for early years			

KI.8 Green Infrastructure		Green Infrastructure	
Aims: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a legible continuous green link along the River Chew corridor connecting the riverside south of Temple Street with the town centre/Memorial Park, the marina, Somerdale, the Hams and the River Avon corridor • Somerdale redevelopment to include the river corridor as part of the green link through the site, with development sensitive to the landscape setting and ecological features with an integrated approach to the design • Ensure the Hams opens up to the wider network of recreational routes in the area, including the Avon Valley, with the Somerdale site development encouraging movement through it • Improvements to the Memorial Park 			Desirable
Cost: depends on implementation	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011 onwards	
	Potential funding sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised management regimes for Council owned land - Partnership working with key land owners and managers - Work with voluntary and community sector - External funding e.g. HLF and other funders for specific access, biodiversity or heritage/landscape projects. - Developer contributions and Masterplan principles e.g. green corridors - To be further explored and identified in the Green Infrastructure Study 		
		Relevant policy areas: Keynsham	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council; Keynsham Town Council
Risks: Project not defined or costed			
Contingencies: Somerdale Masterplan should address GI needs and these will in part be achievable through developer contributions. However gap funding will also be required from other sources.			
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cadbury Somerdale Vision for the Future (LDA Design, Feb 2009) • Somerdale Landscape Framework (LDA Design, June 2009) • Representations to B&NES Keynsham Town Centre Masterplan (BNP Paribas, September 2010) • Cadbury Somerdale Public Exhibition (Atisreal, Feb 2009) • Keynsham draft RDP (New Masterplanning, March 2010) • Emerging B&NES Green Infrastructure Strategy 			

KI.9: Keynsham District Heating Network		Energy	
The implementation of a district heating scheme in Keynsham has been investigated and shown to have the potential to deliver significant CO ₂ reductions (681 tonnes CO ₂ pa) and long-term financial (18.69% IRR) returns.		Desirable	
Cost: £970,181	Funding Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private financing from third-party ESCOs • European funds (JESSICA, ELENA) • Developer contributions 	Phasing: Needs to be considered in conjunction with design proposals for Keynsham Town Hall. Developer contributions can only be received where network connections are agreed prior to construction. Capturing large development sites improves project returns.	
Risks: Relocation of the leisure centre would reduce the heat demand and would reduce/remove the technical and commercial case for a network.		Relevant policy areas: Keynsham	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council; Landowners/Developers;
Contingencies: Without a district heating network new development sites will still be required to meet the same carbon targets, although at additional cost. An existing network acts as an enabler to making carbon savings in the existing building stock; through modelled connection and through future network expansion. This is particularly relevant to network options in Bath where heritage and conservation designations make it one of only a few effective interventions.			
Evidence: B&NES District Heating Study (AECOM, 2010) B&NES Renewable Energy Capacity Study (CAMCO, 2010)			

KI.10 Community Facilities including new Library		Social	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K2 community facilities • 2009 £250k Developer Contributions from Tesco for community facilities in the town • Keynsham Library re-provision to be secured as part of the re-development of the Town Hall site • New one-stop-shop for Council service users as part of the re-development of the Town Hall site • Fry Club , Somerdale - latest information shows that it is intended that the parent company grant the new Fry Club organisation a long lease on the new facilities which include a replacement clubhouse (on a basis to be agreed) (PLC, 2009). • Investment in existing community facilities 		Desirable	
Cost: £250k secured, other projects still to be confirmed or outside local authority control	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011 ongoing	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development requirement for the Centre/Town Hall site to make re-provision on site for the Library and one-stop-shop - Development requirement for Somerdale redevelopment to make re-provision of Fry Club - Developer contributions - Community Right to Build may apply to community facilities (awaiting Localism Bill) 		
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
		Keynsham	B&NES; Fry Club organisation; Landowner/Developer; Keynsham Town Council
Risks: Much of the funding identified is linked to development, so is contingent on development coming forward.			
Contingencies: Additional investment in existing community facilities.			
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence gathering for the IDP (Libraries) • Keynsham Town Hall Masterplan rationale document (B&NES/NEW Masterplanning) • Fry Club Keynsham: Development of Sports & Social Facilities (PLC, Dec 2009) • Cadbury Somerdale: Developing a Vision for the Future: Presentation to Keynsham Development Advisory Group (Atisreal, September 2008) • Representations to B&NES Keynsham Town Centre Masterplan (BNP Paribas, September 2010) • Keynsham draft Regeneration Delivery Plan (New Masterplanning, March 2010) • Future for Keynsham (B&NES 2006) 			

KI.11 Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge over the A4 improving link from Memorial Park to Train Station		Transport	
There is opportunity to create a new 'level' route for pedestrians and cyclists across the A4 with a lightweight bridge which would connect the Memorial Park to the railway station, addressing the A4 and railway line as major physical barriers within the park.			Desirable
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011 onwards	
	Potentially could include:		
	- Developer Contributions		
	- Funding bids	Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Project not yet defined, scoped or costed		Keynsham	
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keynsham draft Regeneration Delivery Plan (New Masterplanning, March 2010) 			

KI.12 Town Centre Public Realm Improvements		Public Realm	
Public realm improvements to the High Street, particularly at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction of Bath Hill and High Street containing a new public space replacing the current public space in front of the Town Hall following redevelopment. • Space in front of St. John's church • Junction of High Street and Charlton Road Enhancement/creation of network of pedestrian routes between High Street, Temple Street, the park entrance and the river, and Bath Hill East car park. Improved disabled access to shops.		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011 onwards	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developer Contributions - Developer requirement for the town hall site to make re-provision of the public space 		
		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Risks: Details of strategy need to be further developed and costed. Highways issues and through traffic issues key.		Keynsham	B&NES; Landowner/Developers; Keynsham Town Council
Contingencies:			
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail Strategy (Urban Practitioners and DTZ 2008) • Future for Keynsham (B&NES 2006) • Keynsham draft RDP (New Masterplanning, March 2010) • Keynsham Town Hall Masterplan rationale document (B&NES/NEW Masterplanning) • Shops Access survey (The Keynsham Network) • B&NES Area Wide Spatial Strategy (David Lock Associates 2006) 			

KI.13 Improved Cycle Links to Bristol/Bath, National Routes 3 & 4 and Regional Route 10		Transport	
Improve links from Keynsham to the large number of long-distance footpaths and other adjacent recreational routes and strategic cycleways, such as the River Avon Trail and the Two Rivers Way.			Desirable
Cost:	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2016; 2016 - 2021; 2021-2026	
	- Developer Contributions.		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		Keynsham	
Evidence:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somerdale Landscape Framework (LDA Design, June 2009) • Future for Keynsham (B&NES 2006) 			

KI.14 Relocation of the Fire Station		Public Services	
<p>Avon Fire & Rescue Service have an aspiration to relocate the footprint of the station to an area near to the industrial estate in Keynsham or on the eastern side of Bristol to meet the requirements for managing operational response and community risk.</p> <p>The facility at Keynsham meets the current and projected needs of the Fire and Rescue Service but relocation would be considered in support of the desire to redevelop Keynsham Town Centre.</p> <p>The basis for any strategy for relocation of the fire station in support of town centre redevelopment must be on a cost neutral basis for the Fire Authority.</p>		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2011-2026	
	Must be cost Neutral for the Fire Authority		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: If re-location not secured the Fire Station is likely to remain on the present site either in existing building or via on-site re-provision as part of the associated Town Hall redevelopment.		Keynsham	Fire Authority Bath & North East Somerset Council
Evidence: IDP Evidence gathering process - Responses from Avon Fire & Rescue Service			

Rural

RI.1 Paulton Library		Social	
The library at Paulton is in need of replacement, options for the improvement to this service are underway.			Key
Cost: not known	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010+	
	Options under exploration, may require acquisition of a new building in the vicinity		
Risks:		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies:		Rural Areas Somerset Valley	
Evidence:			
Evidence gathering for the IDP (Libraries)			

RI.2 Broadband Improvements		ITC	
There is difficulty for some parts of the District in accessing high speed broadband. Although there is a lack of information in relation to this coverage. The National Infrastructure Plan suggests that this will be an area for significant investment, awaiting further details of proposals.		Desirable	
Cost: not quantified	Funding Sources:	Phasing: 2010-2026	
	Public/Private Investment Strategies - National Level		
Risks: Unknowns		Relevant policy areas:	Lead Agencies:
Contingencies: Alternative technological solutions		District Wide Rural Areas	BT ISPs
Evidence: National Infrastructure Plan Proposals (DCLG, 2010)			

RI.3 Farmborough village shop pedestrian link		Social	
The grocery shop in Farmborough has recently closed; this footpath would connect the village to the local food store. This would ensure that the village meets the criteria for future small scale development. The cost estimate for this is based on an estimated cost of providing a path at £100 per meter, plus an assumed legal cost, land take and telegraph pole and hedgerow relocation. The transport solution would be a kerbed footway 1.5m wide.		Desirable	
Cost: around £150,000 for suggested transport solution	Funding Sources: Developer contributions from development in Farmborough	Phasing: 2016 - 2021	
Risks: This project only has a rough cost estimate and the practicalities (e.g. land ownership, deliverability) and impact on scheme viability are still to be considered.		Relevant policy areas: Rural Areas	Lead Agencies: Bath & North East Somerset Council Developer
Contingencies: Developer contributions to support development of a community shop (either in kind or financial) in the village of Farmborough could be an alternative solution to this issue potentially at lower cost. The Parish Plan Steering Group is currently looking into the potential for a community run shop.			
Evidence: B&NES Transportation Planning B&NES Planning Policy Team discussion with Parish Councils			

6 Opportunities for co-location and integrated infrastructure provision including details of “Total Place” project.

Opportunities for integrated infrastructure provision

6.1 The following key opportunities for integrated provision have been highlighted as part of the preparation of the IDP:

- Greater coordination between highways and various infrastructure provision and maintenance to minimise disruption and reduce costs
- A holistic approach to green infrastructure can provide additional opportunities e.g. a flood defence as a country park, cycling routes adjacent to SUDS drainage solutions, tree planting and biomass fuel generation e.g. Somerdale, Keynsham
- Increasing joint work between sports and leisure and the PCT in promoting sports and active lifestyles

Opportunities for co-location

6.2 The following key opportunities for co-location have been highlighted as part of the preparation of the IDP:

- Extended use of schools including the building for community or further education use and the grounds for play and sports e.g. Wellsway School in Keynsham
- Co-location and rationalisation of public sector office space e.g. Council Office Relocation Strategy and new “one stop shops” for customer service
- Shared facilities between acute and primary care e.g. Keynsham Health Park
- Co-location of emergency services e.g. desire for Avon Fire & Rescue and Great Western Ambulance Service to relocate from Cleveland Bridge station

Total Place

6.3 Total Place is a new initiative that looks at how a ‘whole area’ approach to public services can lead to better services at less cost. It seeks to identify and avoid overlap and duplication between organisations - delivering a step change in both service improvement and efficiency at the local level, as well as across Whitehall.

6.4 The impact of the economic downturn means all of the public sector needs to find radical new solutions to not only deliver better value for money, but also better local services more tailored to local needs.

6.5 Three total place projects are being taken forward by the West of England Partnership, the first of these is being led by Bath & North East Somerset Council:

1. Low Carbon Economy: Project One Public Sector Carbon Reduction; Project Two: Low Carbon Economy Project¹¹

¹¹ See Project Outcome Specifications for (1) South West Councils - Total Place West of England Low Carbon Initiative, 2010/11 Project One - Public Sector Carbon Reduction and

2. Asset Management Project
3. Think Family

6.6 The asset management project is being led by South Gloucestershire Council. This project will consider all property assets held by the public sector, focusing initially on Councils, PCTs and Emergency Services in the West of England and then extending to cover all public services.

(2) Total Place: West of England Low Carbon Initiative, 2010/11 Project Two - Low Carbon Economy. Total Place funding is secured to take forward this project.

7 Viability

- 7.1 The Viability Study undertaken by the Council¹² tested the impact of developer contributions in addition to affordable housing contributions of rates of £15,000 and £7,500 per dwelling. The affordable housing policies in the Core Strategy are therefore premised against this level of contribution.
- 7.2 Further work on viability will be undertaken as the IDP is progressed, in relation to site specific requirements and the development of local community infrastructure levy (CIL).

¹² B&NES Viability Study, Three Dragons (2010) www.bathnes.gov.uk/corestrategy

Appendices

Appendix A: Summary of B&NES Infrastructure Survey

Between December 2009 and March 2010 a comprehensive survey of infrastructure providers was undertaken to inform the first detailed draft IDP. The survey questionnaire is included below.

Alongside this survey a workshop for infrastructure providers was held and stakeholders were also provided with information on demographic change and details of the Core Strategy Options paper. In a number of cases one to one meetings with the stakeholders were also held to discuss the questionnaire return.

Questionnaires were received from the following stakeholders:

- Highways Agency
- First
- Transportation, B&NES
- Western Power Distribution (South West Plc)
- National Grid
- Environment Agency
- Wessex Water
- Bristol Water
- Waste Services, B&NES
- Economic Development & Regeneration, B&NES
- Parks & Open Space, B&NES
- Strategic Housing, B&NES
- University of Bath
- Children's Services, B&NES
- Norton Radstock College
- Royal United Hospital
- B&NES Primary Care Trust
- Avon Fire & Rescue
- Avon & Somerset Constabulary
- Great Western Ambulance Service
- Culture, Leisure & Tourism, B&NES
- Sports & Active Leisure, B&NES

Infrastructure Planning: A Questionnaire to Key Stakeholders December 2009

Introduction

To create sustainable communities, providing housing and employment opportunities alone is not sufficient. There is a need to provide the necessary supporting 'infrastructure' of utility services, transport, schools, open space, community, health and leisure services to support the local population and those who visit or work in the District.

Planning for the District through the Sustainable Community Strategy, the Core Strategy and the Regeneration Delivery Plans must be supported by evidence of what physical, social and environmental infrastructure is needed to enable the necessary development to progress. At the same time existing infrastructure deficiencies need to be identified and addressed. This requires the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP will identify what infrastructure is required, when it is needed, who is responsible for its provision and how it will be funded. It will draw on and influence the investment plans of the local authority and other organisations. It will help to co-ordinate public and private investment and provide clarity on the amount of total investment in the district. It will complement the West of England Strategic infrastructure Planning which will address the high level sub-regional infrastructure requirements. As it develops it will support investigation into co location and efficiencies.

For information to be robust it should be built upon consistent baseline data. In order to promote consistency, attached to this questionnaire is an assessment of demographic change within the District, together with summary information on projected housing demand and employment taken from the Core Strategy Spatial Options Consultation document.

Whilst the IDP will initially be produced from existing information, it must be continually updated to ensure it is current and to address the impact of changing circumstances and new information; it is a living document. The ongoing support of key stakeholders will be essential in this.

Making Bath & North East Somerset
An even better place to live, work and visit

Project Objectives

The key objective of the IDP is:

To prepare a formal document setting out infrastructure requirements within the authority to 2026 in 5 year tranches. A schedule will be prepared which will confirm; location, project name/ description, reason for requirement, lead agency, other agencies involved, cost, phasing, sources of funding, dependencies.

The schedule will be supported by a more detailed evidence base for each project.

Project outcomes

The key outcome of the project will be the creation of a central source of knowledge on public services infrastructure based upon a common evidence base which will allow cross service understanding of future requirements. This will bring efficiencies through reduction in overlapping tasks and highlight potential for co-location.

The IDP will facilitate joint working on infrastructure through the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). This will bring efficiencies to external organisations as well as the Council.

The IDP will also inform meetings with major landowners.

Through its monitoring and update the IDP will assist attainment of LAA targets.

It will establish an on-going corporate process to record and update capital programmes and investment in the Council

It will provide a key element of the corporate evidence data base.

It will produce an effective basis for development and service planning.

Making Bath & North East Somerset
An even better place to live, work and visit

Questionnaire

In order to create the first issue of the IDP information is needed from key stakeholders, both from within the Council and from external organisations. This needs to be collected and presented in a consistent way if information is to be understood, cross referenced and used effectively.

To assist matters the following simple questionnaire has been prepared. This is to be issued to key stakeholders and follow up meetings held shortly after issue to talk through each question and so collect information efficiently and with minimal disruption to the stakeholder's day to day activities. For the first issue of the IDP the focus is on high level information from a shortlist of key stakeholders. In later issues (anticipated to be reviewed annually) a greater depth of information will be sought to build on what has been stated previously and a wider stakeholder group will be engaged with to create a more robust evidence base.

Below is the proposed format of the IDP schedule

Location	Description	Reason	Priority	Lead agency	Other agencies	Cost	Phasing	Funding	Dependencies and risk

A launch meeting is to be held at the time of issue of the questionnaire, to expand on the benefits of the IDP, to take questions on information required and to answer any concerns. Subsequently it is proposed to bring the group together once a draft schedule has been prepared so that all can benefit from a shared understanding and comment upon information collected.

Going forward, key stakeholders will be brought together, anticipated annually, to update information and so keep the IDP a living document of real benefit to all.

Making Bath & North East Somerset
An even better place to live, work and visit

1. Service/ organisation:
2. Contact and contact details:
3. Other key contacts within organisation:
4. Date(s) of meetings:
5. Services provided:
6. Geographical areas covered:
7. Location of built assets (provision of information in cartographic/ GIS format would be of assistance.)

8. Current capital programme:

Time period	Description	Reason	Funding Source	Funding secure? Y/N
0 to 5yrs				
5 to 10yrs				
Time period	Description	Reason	Funding Source	Funding secure? Y/N
10 to 15yrs				
15+ yrs				

9. What triggers your projects:

10. Are any of the projects triggered by population change? If yes, in what way?

11. Do you expect any changes to the delivery of your service in the short term?

12. Do you expect any changes to the delivery of your service in the long term?

13. What measures or standards do you use to determine the level of service provided? Are these set by yourselves or are they statutory?

14. When were your measures/ standards last reviewed?

15. Is there a deficit in the existing service you provide when assessed against your standards? Do you have evidence to demonstrate this?

16. Will these standards be applied to areas of population intensification and growth? If not, what standards will be applied?
17. Have you any views re: opportunities for the joint delivery of services with other public services or for co-location? Can you identify any specific examples/ opportunities?
18. Are there any other comments you would like to make:

Appendix B: Summary of further engagement with Infrastructure Providers

A stakeholder consultation on the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan was undertaken in November 2010. This was a further opportunity for the key stakeholders to update the status of their projects and to reflect the outcomes of the October 2010 spending review. Stakeholders were asked to provide specific comments on the draft at this stage.

The stakeholders were also provided the latest information on the Core Strategy approach in the form of and the housing and employment development anticipated during the period to 2026.

Comments were received from the following stakeholders:

- Royal United Hospital, Bath (Acute Care)
- Sports & Active Leisure, B&NES (Built Sports Facilities, Playing Pitches)
- Children's Services, B&NES (including education, youth services and play services)
- Environment Team, B&NES (relating to ecology and green infrastructure)
- Environment Agency
- Avon Fire & Rescue
- National Grid
- Parks & Open Space, B&NES
- Avon & Somerset Constabulary
- Economic Development & Regeneration, B&NES
- B&NES Primary Care Trust
- Western Power Distribution (South West Plc)
- Transportation, B&NES
- Waste Services, B&NES
- Wessex Water
- Bristol Water
- Strategic Housing, B&NES