Oadby & Wigston

Town Centres Area Action Plan

Matter Six
Implementation and Monitoring
6.1 Are the key infrastructure providers signed up to the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) in Appendix D? (There is support for the LIP from a housing developer)

6.1.1 Public sector infrastructure delivery partners listed as part of the delivery of Appendix D in the Local Infrastructure Plan include Leicestershire County Council, Leicestershire Constabulary and the Primary Care Trust. Private sector partners include developers, bus companies and GP’s.

6.1.2 Both public and private sector partners are all committed to the content of the Town Centres Area Action Plan’s Local Infrastructure Plan.

6.1.3 All partners, public and private, have been contacted as part of the preparation of the Town Centres Area Action Plan and have submitted comments as necessary as part of the public consultation. They are also annually involved in the review of the Borough Council’s Local Infrastructure Plan (separate to the Town Centres Local Infrastructure Plan in Appendix D) (document library reference I15) via the Local Infrastructure Partnership. The Borough Council will probably look to change the name of this document in its next review to the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy in order to avoid confusion in the future.

6.1.4 The local bus company, Arriva, met with the Council in preparation of the Wigston Town Centre Transport Report (document library reference M1) prior to the submission of the Town Centres Area Action Plan and are in support of proposals to upgrade public transport facilities on Leicester Road in Wigston. They are also open to discussions regarding a new Public Transport Facility on Bull Head Street, Wigston.

6.1.5 The local GP’s are aware of and open to the fact that health care facilities in both centres are in need of improving.

6.2 Are there any showstoppers in the Local Infrastructure Plan?

6.2.1 Delivery of the Town Centres Area Action Plan proposals are largely dependent on a number of factors including commercial interest, economic growth, overcoming site constraints, meeting development costs, investment that can be generated by partners and the availability of funding from the public sector. All of this is also set with a backdrop of challenging economic conditions in the current market. However, the Council is confident that with ownership of key sites in each town centre, it has the ability to work with partners to lever private sector investment.

6.2.2 In both town centres, successful delivery of the Town Centres Area Action Plan is largely reliant upon ensuring that any car parking and access issues are fully considered at every stage and that public realm improvements are delivered as part of every phase to promote the full potential of all opportunities in the town centres.

6.2.3 Therefore, the Council is of the view that there are no ‘showstoppers’ in the Local Infrastructure Plan and does not foresee any unachievable projects.
6.3 What is the critical path for securing the effectiveness of delivery of the AAP?

6.3.1 Please refer to Situation Update Matter Six Issue 6.4 for a detailed explanation of the phasing of development and the priorities for both Wigston town centre and Oadby town centre. Within this, the critical path for effective delivery of the Town Centres Area Action Plan is set out.

6.3.2 The Delivery Strategies for both Oadby and Wigston town centres provided by property consultant, BE Group (June 2011, document library ref: H6a & H6b) in support of the Town Centres Area Action Plan Proposed Submission Document, highlight that the Plan has been brought forward in a period where the economic unpredictability has great impact upon the property markets. BE Group recognise that although this has short term consequences, the Town Centres Area Action Plan’s time horizon is set out over 15 years and beyond. It is anticipated that the market conditions will go through changes over the Plan period and with this, economic growth and investor confidence will increase.

6.3.3 As stated in paragraph 4.36 of the Town Centres Area Action Plan, whilst the Phasing Plans with the associated elements of the Delivery Strategy shows the broad anticipated order of project delivery in each town, the Borough Council will take a flexible approach and will consider developments coming forward in a different order subject to ensuring that any car parking and access issues are fully considered to the satisfaction of the Local Highways and Planning Authorities. It will also be ensured that the delivery of the housing remains in conformity with the policies as set out in the Borough’s Core Strategy.

6.4 Is the high number of phase 1/2 schemes indicative of lack of confidence, uncertainty or lack of realism in the plan?

6.4.1 Situation Update Matter Six Issue 6.4 provides an in-depth update on this matter, but essentially, the Council is proposing a number of amendments to the Local Infrastructure Plan in Appendix D of the Town Centres Area Action Plan so as to relate better to the Phasing Plan’s in Appendix C. These proposed changes will provide more certainty to the phasing of the infrastructure elements that will support the overall delivery of the Town Centres Area Action Plan in both Wigston and Oadby.

6.4.2 Some of the town centre infrastructure requirements are linked to delivery of projects outside of the Town Centres Area Action Plan area, particularly the Direction for Growth.

6.4.3 Longer term projects such as public realm works still run through duelled phases and relate to the delivery targets set out in the phasing plans in Appendix C.
6.4.4 Having submitted successful Expressions of Interest, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council is currently working in partnership with Leicestershire County Council to prepare full applications for financial support from the European Regional Development Fund to support public realm improvements for both Oadby and Wigston town centres. Should this application for European Regional Development Fund funding be successful, this will kick-start a significant level of public realm investment in both towns in Phase 1 of the Plan period and enhance the deliverability of the rest of the Town Centres Area Action Plan across the remaining phases. (See Situation Update Matter Three Issue 3.8 for more information).

6.5 How realistic is implementation of the Burgess Junction multi-storey car park (£32.6 million) within phases 1/2? Or are all these schemes programmed to start in phase 1 and then continue into subsequent phases?

6.5.1 As detailed in Situation Update Matter Six Issue 6.4, it is acknowledged that the Phasing Plan in Appendix C (of the Town Centres Area Action Plan) for Wigston identifies a single phase for each development and that this was not necessarily represented in the phasing of supporting infrastructure delivery in the Local Infrastructure Plan as set out in the Appendix D.

6.5.2 Therefore, as detailed in Situation Update Matter Six Issue 6.4, Burgess Junction multi-storey car park is programmed for delivery in phase 1.

6.5.3 Implementation of this scheme in phase 1 is reliant upon attracting a suitable development partner. The stipulated £32.6 million applies to the overall build costs for Wigston town centre and is derived from the Wigston Town Centre Master Plan Delivery Strategy, BE Group, June 2011 (document library ref: H6b). Therefore, the figure does not solely represent the cost of the multi-storey car park.

6.5.4 The Delivery Strategies for both towns also set out proposals for the various approaches to establish partnership(s) to manage the delivery of the proposals and also the various approaches to procure the delivery of development on the various sites. The Borough Council has deliberately chosen not to start pursuing these approaches until the Town Centres Area Action Plan has been adopted in order to ensure that the specific site allocations and policies are in place. This will provide an element of certainty that currently does not exist and will allow more detailed development briefs to be prepared in relation to specific sites.

6.5.5 The Borough Council has a dedicated Economic Development Team in place as part of a shared service with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. This team has a proven track record of delivering schemes such as those in the Town Centres Area Action Plan and has and is currently delivering similar schemes established through the Hinckley Town Centre Area Action Plan. In this respect, the Borough Council has a good understanding of the resources required to implement the schemes including, for example, car parking. However, given that it is the intention that the Borough Council will be to work pro-actively in partnership with key landowners and developers to see such schemes brought forward and delivered in the future, it would not be appropriate to go into such a level of detail at this stage.
6.5.6 Through the delivery of an early public realm improvement scheme in Wigston town centre and the development of a detailed site brief for each development opportunity including Burgess Junction, the Council is confident that by utilising the expertise contained within the Economic Development Team, as well as developing the relationship between the newly appointed Town Centre Manager and the retailers in the town centres, delivery of key infrastructure in the anticipated phase such as Burgess Junction Multi-Storey car park will be ensured.

6.6 **What is the cost of the Town Square and who will pay?**

6.6.1 The Town Squares in both towns are included in the overall costs and their delivery is clarified in Sections 5 and 6 of the Delivery Strategy for each town centre (document library ref. H6a and H6b).

6.6.2 It is difficult to be specific at this stage about the costs of implementation of the town squares in both towns. However, by using a figure of £175 per sqm based upon a 50 per cent reduction in the public realm costs from the sensitivity analysis sections of the Delivery Strategies (BE Group, August 2011), the approximate costs of the public squares would be £100,000 in Wigston (Chapel Mill, Library site) and £88,000 in Oadby (Brooksby Square). The Council envisage more detail, including delivery costs, for each town square to be considered in greater depth as part of future Development Briefs for each site.

6.6.3 These projects will be achieved as part of wider schemes via partnership working between Oadby and Wigston Borough Council and the developer partners through the negotiation of Section 106 Agreements and the implementation of schemes funded through developer contributions.

6.7 **Which schemes are likely to require compulsory purchase orders (CPOs) and/or Section 106 contributions?**

6.7.1 Paragraph 4.53 and 5.53 identify that Section 106 contributions and compulsory purchase order powers may be required to help to deliver the schemes. This is detailed further in the Delivery Strategy for each town.

6.7.2 It is envisaged that large scale use of compulsory purchase order powers will not be required as the bulk of the project land is already owned by Oadby and Wigston Borough Council. However, major land ownerships may require compulsory purchase order should negotiations between private developers / the Council and landowners not reach an acceptable agreement.

6.7.3 It is assumed that Section 106 contributions would be required from all of the schemes in order to fund the proposed public realm / infrastructure requirements in both centres.
6.8 Should provision for policing be included in the LIP, based on developer contributions?

6.8.1 Leicestershire Police has suggested a number of items of infrastructure that should be included in the Town Centres Area Action Plan Local Infrastructure Plan through its representations and subsequent Statement.

6.8.2 The Borough Council regularly reviews its Borough-wide Local Infrastructure Plan (http://www.oadby-wigston.gov.uk/pages/infrastructure1) which includes reference to ‘enhancement of policing infrastructure’ under ‘Borough Wide Infrastructure Requirements’. This is also referenced in Appendix 2 of the adopted Core Strategy (p.136) following the Inspectors recommendation that such should be included and that the Borough Council should work in partnership with Leicestershire Police to agree a locally based developer contribution that can be applied to development in the Borough as part of the then forthcoming Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.

6.8.3 The Council has subsequently worked with Leicestershire Police in the process of developing its Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was adopted in December 2011. This document includes a locally justified formula specific to policing needs in the Borough that can be applied to housing developments of 10 or more dwellings or commercial developments of 1,000m$^2$ or above. Leicestershire Police would then need to justify any contribution sought as part of the negotiation of a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010, reissued 2011).

6.8.4 Therefore, the Council is of the view that Policing needs are appropriately considered as part of the suite of documents that comprise the Local Plan, specifically through the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and that infrastructure provisions for Policing in the Borough should continue to be negotiated through this existing process. The infrastructure requirements that have been set out by Leicestershire Police are not proportional to the level of growth that is anticipated in the Borough over the Plan period and therefore Policing infrastructure requirements in the town centres should continue to be addressed in the manner as included in the Borough-wide Local Infrastructure Plan and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.

6.8.5 In addition to this, through the ongoing work that Scott Wilson URS (consultant) are doing on behalf of Oadby and Wigston Borough Council as part of the Leicestershire and Rutland Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment, the Borough Council is working with Leicestershire Police to focus upon items of infrastructure required by them to accommodate the predicted growth in the Borough up to 2026 to establish how much the necessary infrastructure is likely to cost and what proportional element of that cost Leicestershire Police expect to be contributed through community infrastructure levy.
6.8.6 However, the Borough Council is not clear at this stage whether or not it will be taking community infrastructure levy forwards and will not be in a position to make this decision until the findings of the Scott Wilson URS Viability Assessment become known (likely to be July 2012).

6.9 How will the monitoring arrangements work? Should Appendix G include reference to changing crime rates, as suggested by the police?

6.9.1 Monitoring arrangements for Town Centres Area Action Plan Appendix G should be set out on p.111 as follows:

‘Monitoring can indicate where further action may be required, particularly where implementation is dependent on partnership working. Effective monitoring is an essential component in achieving sustainable development and communities. The indicators and targets used to monitor the Town Centres Area Action Plan will be reported upon within the Annual Monitoring Report. The Annual Monitoring Report will also be the process through which targets and indicators will be kept up to date. Therefore, the most up to date Annual Monitoring Report should be read in conjunction with this Appendix’.

6.9.2 The Monitoring Framework in Town Centres Area Action Plan Appendix G sets out how the key objectives for each town centre will be achieved and monitored.

6.9.3 In their representation (163/112), Leicestershire Police made the suggestion that the Council should consider referencing changing crime rates as a measure of success of the Plan. In response to this, the Council suggested a change to Town Centres Area Action Plan Appendix G to include a commitment to monitor changing crime rates in the town centres.

6.9.4 Subsequently the Council has liaised with Leicestershire Police to ascertain how this could be monitored. At present, Leicestershire Police monitors crime rates for the Local Policing Unit. They are unable to break the overall crime rate statistics down to a more localised level than Local Policing Unit. The Local Policing Unit is made up of three Beat Levels: Oadby (LW70), Wigston (LW69) and South Wigston (LW68). Unfortunately, the boundary for each Beat Level is the overall settlement rather than the Borough Council’s town centre boundaries. Also, at Beat Level, Leicestershire Police are only able to monitor Anti-Social Behaviour rates.

6.9.5 To monitor Local Policing Unit crime rates bears little relevance to the Town Centres Area Action Plan developments. Anti Social Behaviour on each Beat Level is a little more relevant but then still not focussed on the town centre crime rates and the impact that is felt as a result of the development in each town centre.

6.9.6 If Leicestershire Police are able to suggest an alternative and more suitable mechanism for such data to be monitored, then the Council would be able to include such in Town Centres Area Action Plan Appendix G and seek to monitor the changing crime rates as a local indicator within the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.
6.9.7 However, having liaised with Leicestershire Police and having not come to any meaningful conclusion over this matter, the Council does not support the inclusion of a reference to monitor changing crime rates in the town centres in Appendix G of the Area Action Plan. Moreover, as stated by Leicestershire Police in section four of their representation, ‘the Borough Council and its partners already monitor local incidents of crime and antisocial behaviour through the Crime Reduction Partnership’.

6.10 When is it envisaged that a CIL will be part of the LDF?

6.10.1 Scott Wilson URS have been appointed to undertake the Leicestershire and Rutland Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment which will enable all districts, including Oadby and Wigston, to assess whether or not a community infrastructure levy Charging Schedule will be viable in their local authority area.

6.10.2 It is anticipated that each authority will be in a position to determine their approach by July 2012.

6.10.3 Until the Council has received the recommendations of Scott Wilson URS and the Viability Assessment, it is difficult to place an accurate timeline on the implementation of community levy in the Borough. Indeed, the final recommendation may well be that a community infrastructure levy Charging Schedule is not viable in this Borough.

6.10.4 The Council adopted its Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document in December 2011.

6.11 Appendix G, the monitoring framework, is repetitive and could be simplified; why does it need to include references to plan objectives?

6.11.1 The Monitoring Framework in Town Centres Area Action Plan Appendix G is set out in this format so that the Council can ensure that the monitoring of the Town Centres Area Action Plan’s objectives is consistent with the approach found sound by the Inspector for the Borough’s Core Strategy in Chapter 8: Delivery and Monitoring Framework.

6.11.2 The approach set out ensures that each objective will be consistently and categorically monitored.

6.12 What is the status of the master plans in the AAP (Pages 38 and 63)? Is the Proposals Map sufficiently detailed and clear to provide a site-specific framework for development over the plan period?

6.12.1 The masterplans included in the Town Centres Area Action Plan on pages 38 and 63 support policies within the Town Centres Area Action Plan, but do not themselves form policy.
6.12.2 The masterplans are intended to provide one illustration of how the policies within the Town Centres Area Action plan can be implemented which the Council's evidence base demonstrates are viable and deliverable. They are included for illustrative purposes and it is quite likely that a planning application may suggest an alternative approach. This would be acceptable provided it met the requirements of planning policy and were viable and deliverable. As part of a Site Development Brief for each site, more detail could be included in the future as and where necessary.

6.12.3 The Proposals Map Insets included in the Town Centres Area Action Plan on pages 47 and 70 indicate where the sites for development opportunities as identified in AAP Policies are located. The Council feels that the level of detail included in these Proposals Map Insets (taking into account the amendments that have been proposed in the Council’s Statement for Matter 3) is appropriately related to the Town Centres Area Action Plan to provide a site specific framework for development over the plan period.