INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

Published November 2012
With updating up to 20\textsuperscript{th} May 2013
EXPLANATORY FRONTISPIECE

i. The South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SWIDP) was produced in November 2012 in support of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP): Proposed Submission Document, which was approved by the three South Worcestershire Councils in December 2012 for publication purposes.

ii. In accordance with best practice, the SWIDP is a “living document” and the opportunity has been taken in May 2013 to update the document, especially in light of a further technical consultation on the SWIDP in early 2013. The document has also been refined and this includes Appendix Y, the schedule on infrastructure. As at late 2012, Appendix Y of the SWIDP and Annex I of the SWDP were identical. South Worcestershire Councils do not propose to change Annex I to match the updated SWIDP Appendix Y in advance of the submission of the SWDP to the Secretary of State but would be willing to do so before the SWDP is adopted.
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

STATUS

1.1 This is the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SWIDP) which is written in support of the delivery of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP). The SWDP Proposed Submission Document was approved by the three South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) in December 2012. The area covered by the SWDP and basic geographic information about it can be found on the Context Plan located in the main SWDP document, which is reproduced in this SWIDP (Figure 1).

1.2 The SWIDP should be regarded at this stage as a technical supporting paper and it is an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is a “living document” where work is still in progress. The information gathering process is both on-going and dynamic. The SWIDP has been updated as of May 2013.

1.3 This paper has no formal planning status in respect of any policy or development management decisions by any of the Councils. It is a technical evidence paper, written in support of the SWDP.

PROCESS

1.4 As set out in the Introduction to the SWDP, the SWC partner authorities embarked on a four stage process to strengthen their understanding of Infrastructure:-

a) Consolidated the existing information at the SWDP: Preferred Options stage in autumn 2011

b) Prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan Interim Position Statement to support the SWDP in July 2012

c) Prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan in November 2012 to support the proposed submission version of the SWDP

d) Updated the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in spring 2013 to support the SWDP as submitted to the Secretary of State.

1.5 The following structure of the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan, based on national best practice and the particular situation in South Worcestershire, was endorsed by the South Worcestershire Joint Advisory Panel (JAP) on 02/03/12. This was subsequently contained in the SWIDP evidence supporting the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document that was approved by the three South Worcestershire Councils in December 2012:-

1. Introduction.
2. South Worcestershire Context
3. SWDP IDP Approach
4. Physical Infrastructure
5. Social Infrastructure
6. Green Infrastructure
7. Spatial planning of Infrastructure.
8. Costing of Infrastructure
9. Delivering infrastructure
10. Delivery of Infrastructure: Funding Mechanisms
11. Conclusions
   Appendices.

1.6 Evidence on infrastructure was provided during the Regulation 18 preparation and participation stage through the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan Interim Position Statement (SWIDPIPS). The South Worcestershire Councils published this document in July 2012. It informed the 3rd July 2012 decisions of the three SWC Councils regarding the SWDP: Proposed Signification Changes (including ‘Annex Y’). It was available with other evidence base documents at the same time as the publication of the SWDP: Proposed Significant Changes for the consultation held between August 2012 and September 2012. SWIDPIPS contained the following key section of the SWIDP:-

1. Introduction
4. Physical infrastructure
5. Social Infrastructure
6. Green Infrastructure
7. Spatial planning of infrastructure
Appendix Y on crucial infrastructure

1.7 Following the approval of the SWDP by 3rd July 2012 SWC Councils, this SWIDPIPS was itself the subject of a parallel technical consultation during the summer 2012 period and the results were considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into the November 2012 SWIDP. The latter informed and supported the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document, as approved by the three SWC Councils in December 2012.

1.8 This updated version of the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been published in May 2013 to support the submission of the SWDP and the accompanying schedule of minor changes which the SWC will ask the Inspector to consider. It incorporates updated information arising from a separate but parallel technical consultation on the SWIDP in early 2013. A schedule of the SWIDP consultation responses in summer 2012 and early 2013 can be found in “Appendix Z” at the end of this document.

1.9 Conclusions in the SWIDP May 2013 have been further shaped by input from two key SWC Seminars in March 2013:–

a) Seminar with Worcestershire LEP: 18th March 2013

b) Seminar involving SWC Chief Executives and SWC and County Council Chief Officers: 19th March 2013. This considered the conclusions of the 18th March Seminar and then focussed on the SWIDP with particular reference to funding mechanisms, financial issues and the matter of prioritisation. These conclusions and the technical work which flowed from them have all been included in this May 2013 version of the SWIDP.

1.10 The SWIDP remains an on-going live document which will be updated as appropriate during the course of 2013 and monitored annually, once the SWDP has been adopted.
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RELATIONSHIP WITH THE WORCESTERSHIRE INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

1.11 In parallel with the work on this SWIDP document, Worcestershire County Council is in the process of preparing a Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (WIS) and considerable efforts have been made to bring together the evidence collected for these two work streams. (Further information on the latest position on the County Strategy can be found in section 11 of this SWIDP). This is in accordance with the “duty to cooperate” and it has been a positive and effective partnership working arrangement. Throughout 2011 and 2012, the County Council worked with the SWC and infrastructure providers to develop an evidence base of strategic infrastructure needs. This has been published by the County Council in the form of a “Needs and Issues background document”. The County Council has ensured that, where relevant, the Needs and Issues background document has taken account of any detailed work on infrastructure requirements undertaken at a local level.

1.12 The Needs and Issues background document has formed the evidence base to support the development of a Countywide Infrastructure Strategy. In order to define the scope of the strategy, the County Council consulted on a series of “Strategic Options” during June/July 2012. Following this consultation, the County Council produced a draft Strategy by December 2012 with initial consultation completing in spring 2013. Every effort has been made to ensure that the conclusions of the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which supports the SWDP, will be consistent, where appropriate, with the emerging draft Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and vice versa. This will ensure that infrastructure providers, developers and the public are provided with a reliable picture of strategic infrastructure needs in South Worcestershire over the SWDP plan period within a Worcestershire context.

1.13 As with the SWIDP, the County Council’s Needs and Issues background document will be a living document and that County document will be subject to annual monitoring and review. The County Strategy will be reviewed every three to five years. Likewise the SWIDP has been updated in May 2013 and will be updated at regular intervals after that.

RELATIONSHIP WITH WORCESTERSHIRE LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (WLEP).

1.14 In accordance with the duty to cooperate, the South Worcestershire Authorities have engaged with the Worcestershire LEP, both at the Preferred Options Stage and subsequently in relation to possible changes to the emerging SWDP. This included a presentation to a WLEP Planning and Development Workshop (June 2012) to inform the WLEP’s Business Plan “The Outlook is Bright in Worcestershire” which was launched in November 2012. Given the role of the WLEP in promoting the economic interests of Worcestershire and the emphasis placed on the emerging SWDP in delivering economic prosperity, it is essential to forge a positive and complementary relationship between the WLEP’s economic ambition, especially the WLEP’s priorities for infrastructure provision to meet business needs, and the contents of this SWIDP document. A further Infrastructure Seminar between Worcestershire LEP, the SWC Councils and the County Council was held on 18th March 2013.

1.15 The Worcestershire LEP has submitted to SWC a very positive formal letter of support on Infrastructure. It includes the following statements:

“The WLEP endorses the approach being taken by the South Worcestershire Councils in identifying the need to ensure that economic prosperity, business growth, inward investment and job creation are all facilitated by investment in fundamental infrastructure which releases development in key locations. The WLEP welcomes the inclusion of the infrastructure schemes identified in South Worcestershire in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and will work with the South Worcestershire Councils in identifying and securing funding for the implementation of key projects.”
The WLEP continuously lobbies Government to improve funding opportunities for Worcestershire initiatives while preparing infrastructure and development proposals which can take advantage of rolling Governmental funding announcements. Establishing a business case for priority infrastructure schemes will form a key part of the future WLEP submission to Government in its emerging WLEP Growth Plan and EU Investment Strategy.

The WLEP offers its support to infrastructure investment and provision identified in the South Worcestershire Development Plan because, if this aligns strongly with employment sites and inward investment ambitions, the whole offer by Worcestershire to potential investors will place it in a strong competitive position in the UK and internationally.”

1.16 The key outcome of the 18th March 2013 WLEP and SWC local authorities’ seminar was the confirmation that the WLEP considers that there is a strong synergy between its ambitions and both the SWDP (and its supporting SWIDP) and the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. It was recognised that, given the national context and the fact that the WLEP Business Plan covers a five year period, the WLEP’s priority is for growth and jobs in the short and medium term. However, the longer term time horizon of the SWDP is helpful to the WLEP, particularly given the Government’s response in spring 2013 to the Heseltine report “No Stone Unturned: In Pursuit of Growth”. The Government has signalled that the WLEP’s emerging longer term Growth Plan and EU Investment Strategy could be usefully developed in tandem with all the local authorities in Worcestershire. Moreover, the overall approach to prioritisation of infrastructure by SWC is directly supported by the WLEP and there is a commitment for on-going liaison between WLEP, SWC and the County Council.

SWDP POLICY CONTEXT

1.17 This SWIDP document supports the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document which was approved by the three SWC Councils in December 2012 for Regulation 19 purposes and then for submission to the Secretary of State in May 2013. The SWIDP is a supporting technical document which has been updated in May 2013 but will require continuing updating.

1.18 The “anchor point” policy in the SWDP is policy SWDP 7 on Infrastructure including Annex I to which SWDP 7 refers. In its May 2013 form, including the minor changes being suggested by SWC, the policy SWDP 7 now reads as follows:

POLICY SWDP 7: Infrastructure

1.19 The Local partner Authorities will work closely with their partners, especially the County Council, to bring forward the necessary appropriate and proportionate crucial infrastructure that is required in order to deliver the Spatial Strategy as set out in the Plan.

The current assessment of crucial infrastructure requirements is set out in Annex I to this Plan, and is explained in more detail in the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Development will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of infrastructure needed to support it. Developers will also need to contribute towards community benefits related to the development.
Where new infrastructure is needed to support new development, the crucial infrastructure must be operational no later than the appropriate phase of development for which it is needed.

The council partner authorities intends to introduce a co-ordinated Community Infrastructure Levy by March spring 2014.

The partner authorities intend to explore a range of funding mechanisms in order to finance necessary appropriate and proportionate crucial infrastructure, and these are set out in more detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

1.20 The reasoned justification and context for this Policy is contained in the SWDP document, and the evidence base including for example the Transport Background Paper, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment & Water Cycle Study.

1.21 “Appendix Y” now lists the best current understanding of crucial infrastructure. It is intended that Appendix Y, as updated, should serve not only as an Appendix to this SWIDP but also that it should be eventually incorporated as an updated Annex I to the SWDP itself. (See explanatory Frontispiece).

1.22 For purposes of clarity, please note that Appendix Y was amended in November 2012 to reflect the technical fact check consultation in summer 2012 and again in May 2013 to reflect the fact check consultation in early 2013.

1.23 Site allocation policies in SWDP refer to some specific infrastructure, but are also supported by ‘larger than local’ infrastructure which supports development across a wide area.
SECTION TWO: SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE CONTEXT

2.1 This South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SWIDP) is written as an on-going “living document” as evidence which supports the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) by setting out the infrastructure required to achieve the delivery of the SWDP.

2.2 As set out in the Introduction, the SWDP is framed by and in turn promotes a very clear vision of the plan area during the years to 2030. Identified as a result of extensive consultation from 2007 onwards and refined and adjusted as the Plan was developed, this Vision reflects both the aspirations and the firm intentions of the three authorities to improve, protect and manage sustainable growth in the area over the coming years. Paragraph 1 of the submission SWDP document sets out the following:

“The SWDP faces a number of economic, environmental, social and infrastructure challenges that will need to be met if the vision for south Worcestershire is to be realised. To address these challenges, the SWDP seeks to achieve an appropriate balance and synergy between these, including the timely provision of the infrastructure required to its development proposals.”

2.3 As stated in the introduction to the SWDP, it is imperative for the future prosperity of South Worcestershire that new development proposed in the Plan is supported by the necessary and proportionate crucial infrastructure. This is fully in accordance with the stated Vision and Aims of the Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership. And, as stated in paragraph 1.15 of this SWIDP, in October 2012 the Worcestershire LEP gave its explicit support for this SWIDP.

2.4 This SWIDP underpins most of the policies in the SWDP but in particular it relates to the seven strategic policies (SWDP1-SWDP7) which are so important in terms of the delivery of the SWDP. There is also a strong inter-connection with policy SWDP62 on implementation.

2.5 The demands for new infrastructure arise from many sources. There can be weaknesses or deficiencies in existing infrastructure. General population growth causes a general pressure on infrastructure. However, of particular importance for this SWIDP is the fact that new infrastructure may be specifically required as a consequence of development proposals contained in the Plan. In particular, the following proposals set out in SWDP 3:

• Employment provision of about 280 ha during the period 2006-2030.

• Housing provision for about 23,200 dwellings between 2006-2030.

• Retail provision for about 50,000 sq. m between 2006-2030.
SECTION THREE: SWIDP APPROACH

National policy context

3.1 The national context for infrastructure is set out in paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3.2 Paragraphs 173-177 of the National Planning Policy Framework place considerable emphasis on the viability and deliverability of Plan Proposals. Work on this SWIDP has been undertaken in tandem with the Overall Viability Study for the SWDP, which is available as a separate but linked part of the SWDP evidence base.

3.3 SWC have sought on-going advice from the Planning Advisory Service and via this route and via liaison with other planning authorities, the SWC have sought to draw on best practice. However, it has been regarded as being important to produce a SWIDP which is bespoke to the particular requirements of the SWDP.

A bespoke SWIDP

3.4 The SWIDP is tailored to the local plan area. The importance of infrastructure is spelt out in the Introduction to the SWDP which explains the four stage process to the production of the SWIDP and this has already been set out in paragraph 1.4 of this SWIDP. The evidence is specific to the local area, produced with partners relevant to the local area, and cognisant of local circumstances.

3.5 Key elements of the approach taken by SWC in their progression of its SWIDP include:

   a) The merits of building on the existing infrastructure information base. The County Council had the foresight to commission significant research which resulted in the 2009 Baker Associates Study on Infrastructure Requirements in Worcestershire. This has been updated by the County Council in 2011 and 2012 as part of its preparation of a Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. The on-going sharing of that evidence base by the County Council is gratefully acknowledged. This evidence base provides the platform for this SWIDP and extensive cross reference is made to that County Council work in this SWIDP.

   b) The importance of engaging with key partners, especially the County Council and the LEP but also the key infrastructure providers. This has advanced the work through meetings and discussions. And, in particular, there was a technical consultation carried out on the SWIDPIPS in summer 2012 and on the SWIDP in early 2013. The feedback and the follow up discussions have helped inform this version of SWIDP and the contributions of those agencies are gratefully acknowledged.

   c) The importance of the SWIDP both underpinning and interrelating to other parts of the SWDP has been an intensive and on-going process.

   d) The importance of work on Viability and the links with specific development proposals. This is an on-going and dynamic process and further updating work may be necessary in due course.

   e) The importance of funding and prioritisation is fully recognised and discussions have taken place with:
      • The treasurers of the three SWC Councils and the County Council, with further updating as a result of the 19/03/13 Seminar, as explained in paragraph 1.9 of this SWIDP.
      • The LEP in relation to supporting the case for infrastructure, including the 18/03/13 Seminar, as also explained in paragraph 1.9 of this SWIDP.
• Physical infrastructure providers such as the Water and Energy bodies to ensure that costings are built into their long term plans.

f) This version of the SWIDP is suitable and sufficiently proportionate, in line with NPPF, to underpin the proposals contained in the SWIDP. As a "living document", the SWIDP was updated in May 2013 so that it supports the SWDP submitted to the Secretary of State in May 2013 with the most up to date information. As a living document, the SWDP will continue to be updated.

3.6 Infrastructure has been described as the facilities and services that help local people live their everyday lives. It can be infrastructure at a strategic level, such as a new road, or local, such as a local play space. This distinction is understood but, in the view of SWC, this should not be overplayed because it is the full range of infrastructure which is important.

3.7 In assessing the range of infrastructure, the SWIDP employs a widely used categorisation:

a) **Physical Infrastructure** which is dealt with in Section 4 covers Transport, Utilities (Electricity, Gas, Water Supply & Waste Water), Flood Risk & Drainage, Communication Infrastructure (Broadband and mobile phone) and Waste Infrastructure.

b) **Social infrastructure**, which is covered in section 5, includes Education, Health & Public Health, Social Care, Community Facilities (including Community Centres and Sports & Recreational Facilities) and Emergency Service infrastructure.

c) The full range of **Green Infrastructure**, which is covered in Section 6.

3.8 The **Spatial Planning of Infrastructure**, as set out in section 7, describes requirements on a geographical basis both in terms of the major settlements and specific key sites. This also relates to site specific requirements as set out in the SWDP. Both the combined sections 4, 5 & 6 and section 7 are looking at the same infrastructure requirements but the former combined chapters examine the package by infrastructure stream whilst section 7 examines the infrastructure packages on a geographic basis.

3.9 The costing of infrastructure, the delivery of infrastructure and the funding mechanisms are dealt with sections 8, 9 & 10 respectively before section 11 draws conclusions for the SWIDP as at May 2013.

3.10 Of the Appendices, particular attention is drawn to Appendix Y, which is of such importance that it has been included in the SWDP as Annex I in conjunction with policy SWDP 7 on Infrastructure.

For clarity, Appendix Y is structured with the following key headings:-

- Listed by infrastructure type
- Listed by project and by location
- Cross reference to relevant SWDP policy
- Delivery partners
- Estimated cost
- Potential sources of funding
- Estimated timescale
- Notes on costing and funding delivery
- Prioritisation (see section 11 for explanation).
SECTION FOUR: PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

A. TRANSPORT

Introduction

4.1 Malvern Hills, Worcester City and Wychavon Councils are working together to prepare a Development Plan with the aim of ensuring that future development within South Worcestershire is well planned and managed effectively, whilst having a positive impact on the economy and the environment.

4.2 Worcestershire County Council (WCC) and the South Worcestershire Councils commissioned Halcrow to support the preparation of the necessary transport modelling to help identify, develop and cost the transport related infrastructure and services, and provide advice on the transport evidence associated with the South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SWIDP). The transport infrastructure (highway, public transport, cycle and pedestrian) and public transport services identified have been based on the development policies and proposals set out in the emerging SWDP.

4.3 The SWIDP provides details of the infrastructure that is required to support the growth set out in the SWDP. It is envisaged that the information set out in the SWIDP will be used to develop a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and to inform and support negotiations with developers about site specific s106 (and other relevant) agreements to contribute towards the mitigation of development impact (cumulative and site specific) on both the local and strategic transport network, as outlined in the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) and policy SWDP 4.

4.4 The transport elements of the SWIDP will inform the further development of the Worcestershire LTP3 and associated transport packages (infrastructure and service schemes), including: the inter-urban links between the key urban areas, the Worcester Transport Strategy, the packages for Droitwich, Evesham, Malvern, Pershore and those for the wider rural hinterland. This will help to ensure that the transport improvements are integrated with, and importantly, take full account of cumulative impact on the transport network of the planned land use changes contained within the SWDP. The assessment takes full account of the significant growth in travel demand generated by SWDP planned development and other, non-SWDP generated, background growth. This package approach taking full account of cumulative growth and, as outlined in LTP3 and policy SWDP4, will help to avoid a piecemeal and potentially poorly targeted approach to investment in transport which would do little to support economic growth or encourage sustainable development.

Approach

4.5 A key premise of the SWDP is to recognise that the quantum of development proposed in South Worcestershire will not only have a local transport impact immediately adjacent to each site but also on the local and strategic transport network further afield (including the Highways Agency and Network Rail managed networks).

4.6 The local impacts of any development can be directly identified, assessed and local access and other minor mitigation measures implemented. For the strategic transport network and locations further away from the proposed development sites, however, whilst the transport problems which arise as a result of cumulative growth in travel demand are all too readily obvious, the cause may not be clear to all. The cumulative impact is a key issue for Worcestershire County Council (and its key stakeholders) as it has to manage the...
network such that it supports the key policy aim of supporting economic growth (LTP3 and policy SWDP4). This aim would be undermined in the event of increased costs being imposed on businesses, other network users and transport operators arising from traffic congestion, inadequate levels of service on and performance of, the rail and bus networks and increased and variable journey times and costs. It is critical, therefore, that the cumulative effects of increased travel demand are properly understood and mitigating transport infrastructure and service measures identified.

4.7 The identification of the source of transport issues away from the immediate environs of development sites can demonstrate that a relatively small development site (or the summation of small development sites) can cause a significant issue on the transport network, as a result of both local and long distance trips. In identifying the cumulative effects of growth, it is possible to both develop adequate (network wide) mitigation and to provide the evidence which underpins the requirement that the identified sources of additional traffic should contribute appropriately toward the delivery of the necessary improvements to the wider transport infrastructure, as outlined in LTP3 and policy SWDP4.

4.8 In order to undertake a network wide assessment of the transport network and specifically to assess the cumulative transport impact on transport networks resulting from SWDP planned development, a Vehicle/Trip Generation modelling tool has been developed. This enables:

- The calculation of the numbers of trips that each proposed development site will generate
- An assessment of the way in which those trips will route on the network
- The summation of trips to establish an overall (cumulative) impact

4.9 The model draws upon existing evidence and previous related SWDP studies. Where appropriate, the Vehicle/Trip Generation Model was validated for consistency against the previous studies and the Worcester Multi-Modal Model. Further information on this can be found in the supporting technical work provided in the Transport Technical Background Paper and the Halcrow report into the transport infrastructure associated with the SWDP.

**Development Assumptions**

4.10 The transport infrastructure (highway, passenger transport, cycle and pedestrian) and passenger transport services identified have been based on the emerging SWDP. The land use assumptions included changes to the previous iteration of the plan in autumn 2011 in respect of quantum of residential and employment development, updating of windfall and commitments and inclusion of C3 release development sites. The employment assumptions were also more disaggregate in terms of development type (B1, B2, B8 etc.) These revised assumptions had a major impact on employment related trip generation. In particular, as B8 developments generate significantly less vehicular trips than B1 (office) developments, the overall scale of employment and generated travel demand decreased in comparison with the previous (B1 dominated) assumptions.

4.11 Worcestershire County Council has been working with the South Worcestershire Councils to assess the impact of the December 2012 SWDP: Proposed Submission Document planning policies and proposals. This follows the same methodology as used to assess the previous development assumptions to provide the development assumptions used in the modelling.
Methodology

4.12 The methodology used to complete this project was agreed jointly between Halcrow, Worcestershire County Council and the South Worcestershire Councils in December 2011. The methodology adopted has:

- Understood, from previous work, the relevant policy guidance, development quanta, types and locations and agreed parameters for the project
- Established the transport network and infrastructure baseline conditions for South Worcestershire, thereby understanding the network performance for all modes of transport and to identify potential key gaps in transport infrastructure and service provision across South Worcestershire
- Developed a Vehicle/Trip Generation model to act as an assessment tool to assist with the identification of schemes to support the SWDP planned development
- Identified infrastructure schemes and services to mitigate against the impacts of proposed development

4.13 A key premise of the transport network analysis is to recognise that the quantum of development proposed in South Worcestershire will not only have a local transport impact immediately adjacent to the site but also on the wider and strategic transport network further afield.

4.14 The SWDP Vehicle/Trip Generation model enables a network wide assessment to be conducted. It includes all the key routes and, most importantly, key junctions. Without such an assessment tool, it is difficult to assess the combined impact of development sites over a large area.

4.15 The SWDP Vehicle/Trip Generation model combines a number of functions:

- Multi-modal trip generation model;
- Trip routeing model;
- Gravity model; and
- Presentation and analysis of results

4.16 Importantly, the methodology provides multi-modal trip generation data for walk, cycle, passenger transport (bus and rail) and highway for both the AM and PM peak periods and a full 24 hour period.

4.17 It should be noted that the model has not been the sole source of scheme identification. Other sources of evidence include:

- Worcester Multi-Modal Transport Model
- Evesham, Pershore, Malvern and Droitwich Town Development Models
- Accessibility Analysis of Walk, Cycle and Passenger Transport (bus and rail)
- Worcestershire County Council led Officer Workshops
4.18 These sources have combined to provide a comprehensive assessment of network requirements to accommodate SWDP planned development. This has ensured that best use has been made of existing data and tools available and has provided a means by which complex cumulative ‘knock on’ effects can be identified and assessed.

4.19 The overall approach has been based on achievable interventions, recognising environmental and deliverability factors and is consistent with LTP3 and policy SWDP4. This does not rely on an approach focussing on a single or limited number of schemes or modes.

**Overview: Existing Highway Network Issues**

4.20 The existing highway network across the South Worcestershire area shows the strategic A-road network to form a ‘spoke’ like effect spreading from Worcester to the surrounding towns and rural areas. In addition, the M5 Motorway traversing north to the south, lies immediately east of Worcester, providing a vital link to the West Midlands conurbation, the South West and, via the M50, South Wales. South Worcestershire is linked to the M5 via Junction 5 (A38 & Droitwich), Junction 6 (Worcester North) and Junction 7 (Worcester South).

4.21 Worcester has a network of by-passes (A4440 to the south and east and A449 to the north), which is formed by sections of single and dual carriageways. The southern bypass (A4440) provides one of two road links over the River Severn through Worcester; the other being in the City Centre (A44). All of the major A-Road routes to Worcester from the surrounding towns join with junctions on the Worcester by-passes (A449 and A4440).

4.22 Due to the strategic pattern of the A-Road highway network in South Worcestershire and its links to the M5, trips routeing between the main population and employment centres in the area generally route via Worcester, using sections of the A449 and A4440 around Worcester and key junctions on these links. These traffic volumes mean that the A449 and the A4440 are key corridors for through trips. It is noted that the cumulative impact of SWDP proposals is greatest on these routes.

4.23 The development sites proposed through the SWDP will contribute to additional local and longer distance traffic routeing through the key corridors in and around Worcester. This has an impact on the location and scale of transport schemes resulting from the SWDP. In particular, there is a need to address capacity constraints to the south of the city and to ensure that the planned major urban extensions are designed from the outset to maximise use of walk, cycle and passenger transport modes, particularly for journeys to/from/within Worcester City.

4.24 For the other towns, this assessment has found that there are issues to address as a direct result of development proposals, with some identified cumulative impacts on the strategic (inter-urban) transport network. Whilst the schemes outside Worcester tend not to be of such a significant nature, there are a number of locations that will need mitigation. The requirement for mitigation measures as a result of planned forecast growth is outlined in LTP3 and policy SWDP4.

**Overview: Strategic Road Network (managed by the Highways Agency).**

4.25 Currently both the A46 and M5 operate well throughout most of the day; congestion and queues do occur, but these are largely managed within the peak hours. Main carriageway flows are increasing but within capacity.
There are currently no planned improvements in the area as a result of existing congestion or delay issues.

4.26 The proposed SWDP growth will have a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network) with the majority of junctions on the A46 and M5 requiring mitigation to accommodate the proposed growth. Mitigation schemes have been identified and are discussed in greater detail at paragraph 4.57 below.

Overview: Existing Passenger Transport (Rail) Issues

4.27 The main towns in the South Worcestershire area are connected to Worcester and regional/national destinations by the rail network. There are, however, limited services to/from some key locations during peak times and evening and weekend services are poor in terms of timetabling and frequencies. The important role of the rail network is discussed in detail within the LTP3 and referenced in policy SWDP4.

4.28 Specifically, to improve service provision, the County Council is seeking:

- Worcester – London journey times to be 2 hours or less, fully utilising the recent investment in the Worcester-Oxford (Cotswold) Line infrastructure and planned investment in infrastructure between Oxford, Reading and London (including Crossrail).
- To have, by the end of the Great Western Franchise period (2016-2028), two trains per hour between Great Malvern, Worcester and London Paddington, with one train per hour running fast or semi – fast between Worcester and Oxford.
- Further Cotswold Line redoubling to improve reliability and journey times, including new signalling and track layout in Worcester city centre.
- An improved rail service between South Worcestershire and Birmingham New Street (via Bromsgrove).
- An improved rail service between Worcester, Cheltenham and Gloucester.
- To support rail industry proposed improvements to rail services to/from South Worcestershire and the infrastructure needed to deliver them. For example, the enhancement of the frequency of services between Worcester and Birmingham New Street during Control Period 5 (Network Rail Delivery Plan 2014–2019), as initially proposed in the 2011 West Midlands and Chilterns Route Utilisation Strategy, and the West Midlands Regional Rail Vision plans to extend electrification from Bromsgrove (due 2015) to Worcester (by 2024), with an aspiration to enhance service frequencies.

4.29 In addition, Worcestershire County Council (WCC) and key stakeholders are actively promoting the introduction of a new “Worcestershire Parkway” station at the intersection between the Cotswold Line and Bristol – Birmingham line at Norton, east of Worcester, to be served by Worcester – London and a proportion of Bristol/Cardiff – Birmingham services.

4.30 The Worcestershire Parkway business case was updated during 2012/2013 (in line with Department for Transport appraisal guidelines). The findings of that work are that the station is operationally feasible and has a strong economic case with a benefit: cost ratio of 3:1, and approximately 0.3million passenger per annum forecast to use the station. The financial case for the scheme is also strong with a significant net operating surplus for train operating companies.
4.31 Worcestershire County Council has been working closely with the rail industry including Network Rail, Train Operating Companies and the Department for Transport to ensure that Worcestershire Parkway is integrated with other committed rail schemes. Network Rail, as the operator of the rail network, is working collaboratively with the County Council to advise on the Parkway’s integration with other planned enhancements to rail infrastructure and services. This has resulted in the development of a phased approach to the scheme delivery (subject to further development work as set out in the rail industry Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) process):

- Phase 1 (December 2016: subject to planning and GRIP process and funding) – will involve the construction of a new platform on the Cotswold Line, interchange facilities and parking (including passive provision for a second platform should the section of the Cotswold Line between Evesham and Norton Junction be re-doubled in the future):
- Phase 2 (2019: subject to planning and GRIP process and funding) – will involve the construction of two new platforms and associated platform access arrangements on the Birmingham-Bristol Line and a footbridge to replace an existing at grade crossing. This will enable a proportion of Cross-Country services to call at the station:
- Phase 3 (post 2019: influenced by implementation of Network Rail proposed improvements to Bristol-Birmingham line) – will involve additional Cross-Country services calling at the station (this will be integrated with other rail services).

4.32 There is, therefore, an opportunity to improve the provision of rail services on the existing network that could support the delivery of the SWDP through the resulting mode shift to rail for local and longer distance journeys. Access to railway stations by all modes will also be key for facilitating access to Worcester City Centre, reducing the need for car bourne traffic to travel into or through the centre, and facilitating movement between South Worcestershire and other places, supporting transport of goods and people.

Overview: Existing Local Passenger Transport (bus) Issues

4.33 In terms of passenger numbers, the local bus network is the most important local passenger transport mode in South Worcestershire, recognising that rail is the dominant mode for longer distance regional and inter-city journeys. For many of the planned new developments, the local bus network will provide the only passenger transport choice for journeys to/from/within urban areas. It is critical, therefore, that new developments are planned from the outset to accommodate and support efficient and ideally commercial (i.e. not reliant on public subsidy) local passenger transport services. This approach is outlined in LTP3 and policy SWDP4. Failure to do so will make it difficult for commercial operators to deliver the services needed to manage travel demand and support sustainable development.

4.34 To help support the accommodation of the growth contained within the SWDP, a set of bus operation standards has been developed by the County Council, consistent with the policies set out in the Worcestershire LTP3. An assessment has been made of the infrastructure and operating costs needed to provide local passenger transport services to these standards on key corridors in the SWDP area. In the case that this level of service is not met, whilst some individuals may have the ability to transfer mode to use a car (resulting in increased pressure on the highway network), for others the ability to access key employment, education and health opportunities will be lost or severely constrained.

Overview: Existing Pedestrian and Cycle Network

4.35 Maximising use of pedestrian and cycle use for trips to/from/within major trip attractors and generators, including railway stations, is key to improving the efficiency of the transport
network (particularly in congested urban areas) and meeting local economic and environmental objectives. It is important, therefore, that planned new developments take full account of policies and best practice design standards that relate to maximising walk and cycle accessibility within developments and also linking to destinations that are within a reasonable walk/cycle distance.

4.36 In order to identify infrastructure requirements to support the development assumptions put forward through the SWDP, each development site has been considered in turn. The number of anticipated pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from each site over a 24 hour period has informed the process.

4.37 The analysis focused on identifying links from the proposed development sites to the existing network in terms of footways, pedestrian crossing, on and off-road cycle routes, signage and storage facilities, where required. The infrastructure requirements include linkages from the proposed development sites to existing links surrounding the sites, but not pedestrian or cycle infrastructure within the development sites. The requirement for provision of walk and cycle infrastructure is discussed in LTP3 and outlined in policy SWDP4.

Existing Evidence

4.38 The work has, where appropriate, drawn on existing LTP3 Transport Packages. For example, the list of schemes for the South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan, has taken full account of the considerable work undertaken to develop the Worcester Transport Strategy and associated 2012 Major Scheme Bid (www.worcestershire.gov.uk/WTS) and has not sought to duplicate this work. In developing the Worcester Transport Strategy, the planned development/land use assumptions were consistent with the emerging SWDP. Similarly, the most recent Major Scheme Business case submitted to the Department for Transport uses the latest land use assumptions and is wholly consistent with the emerging SWDP.

4.39 Outside of Worcester, the schemes and/or pinch points identified through the previous ‘Development Traffic Impact Assessment’ work for Droitwich, Evesham, Malvern and Pershore have been used as a basis for the schemes in these towns. Similar to Worcester, this previous work provides a sensible starting point as it included, as input, SWDP land use assumptions.

4.40 Where additional issues have been identified in both Worcester and the four main towns, and for areas not previously covered, this work has identified further locations where mitigation is required to overcome or to reduce the impact of proposed development.

Scheme Identification

4.41 The transport schemes proposed have been identified to mitigate against forecast future year transport issues to 2030 associated with planned development. The highway infrastructure schemes will improve capacity at key junctions which are anticipated to incur additional delays as a result of the SWDP proposed growth if required capacity and other transport improvements (infrastructure and services) are not achieved.

4.42 The sustainable transport infrastructure schemes aim to connect the SWDP development sites to the existing transport network and, where appropriate, improve the existing transport network to encourage greater use of more sustainable transport modes and maximise the performance of the transport network to meet economic and environmental policy aims. This is particularly the case in more congested urban areas where the highway network is under particular pressure.
In developing the SWDP transport scheme proposals, as set out in Tables 1 and 2 in this section and again in Appendix Y, relevant policy, strategy, feasibility, deliverability and appropriate design standards and guidelines have been considered to ensure that schemes are appropriate and practicable (subject to funding). The schemes were considered against environmental and deliverability criteria as well as mitigation of transport impacts. A fundamental requirement of the SWIDP is that the schemes can be implemented to the same programme as the proposed development, as set out in the SWDP.

It should be noted that the scale of infrastructure proposed is less than that which has been introduced in the past 20-30 years. With the exception of the significant improvements to the capacity of the A4440, the improvements to the highway and passenger transport network are targeted at dealing with specific pinch points (usually junctions) on the urban and in particular inter-urban, highway and passenger transport networks.

It should be noted, however, that in view of the early stage of development of a number of the transport schemes, there may well remain planning and/or land acquisition issues that will need to be overcome as more detailed designs are prepared. This has, necessarily led to a cautious approach to the costing of schemes.

Schemes

The different characteristics of locations within the SWDP area have been taken into consideration when identifying schemes. That is, although there is always an emphasis on the provision of sustainable alternatives, there is also an acknowledgement that the schemes must be appropriate for the journey being made and location of the start and end points.

In Worcester, there has been an emphasis on dealing with the capacity problems on the inter-urban, Primary Road Network (in particular the A4440, A38 and A44), improving conditions along the key radial and orbital corridors and in the city centre, crucially supported by and integrated with the provision of passenger transport, cycle and walk transport infrastructure and services such that they can provide alternatives for journeys to/from/within the city. The assessment indicates that, in combination, these measures will help to manage the forecast increases in traffic and congestion as a result of increased demand for travel.

In the south Worcestershire towns, a similarly balanced approach has been adopted, identifying both highway and more sustainable measures. In the rural areas, whilst the use of sustainable modes is to be encouraged, it is acknowledged that highway capacity issues must be addressed to enable both car and local passenger transport trips to use the network efficiently.

This requirement for a balanced approach to schemes is set out in policy SWDP4 and detailed in LTP3.

Worcester Transport Strategy

The pressure points on the Worcester transport network identified during the development of the Worcester Transport Strategy (WTS) and associated Major Scheme Bid for Phase 1 of the strategy have been found to be consistent with those identified through this SWDP work. Hence, the list of highway, passenger transport, cycle and walk schemes included in the Worcester Transport Strategy has been included in this South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan. A small number of additional schemes have been identified to reflect the latest set of land use policies and proposals included within the SWDP.
4.51 The junctions identified as requiring investment through the WTS are all shown to require upgrading as result of the additional pressure on the highway network associated with the additional housing and employment development proposed through the South Worcestershire Development Plan.

4.52 The proposed improvements to the existing network will include the following measures:

- Strategic Highway improvements, including significant capacity enhancements to the A4440 Southern Link Road
- Key corridor improvements to enhance the main routes into and out of Worcester city for all users, improving traffic flow and reducing congestion, this will include:
  - All main radial routes into the city
  - The orbital route linking the Southern Link Road/M5 Junction 7 with the employment, health, education and leisure facilities located to the east/north of Worcester
  - Improvements to traffic signals and junction operations
  - Improvements to facilities for pedestrians and cyclists (including within the city centre)
  - Improvements to facilities for local passenger transport users and operators
- Enhancement of existing rail stations, including passenger facilities and access arrangements and information provision
- The construction of a new Railway Station (Worcestershire Parkway)
- Implementation of Intelligent Transport Systems to improve efficiency and choice

4.53 The requirements for the Worcester Transport Strategy are outlined in policy SWDP4, which includes reference to the need to protect land needed to deliver the WTS, including proposed Worcestershire Parkway rail station and transport interchange.

Droitwich, Great Malvern, Pershore, Evesham

4.54 The analysis for Droitwich, Great Malvern, Pershore and Evesham indicates a number of key junctions within these towns that are performing at levels approaching, at or over capacity in the base year (2011) and the future year (2030) scenarios. These junctions occur at key intersections on the main routes through and around the towns. Mitigation schemes for all modes have been identified and their costs estimated.

4.55 The proposed transport schemes are shown on Figure 2.
Figure 2: Draft SWDP Transport proposals – excluding Worcester

**SWDP IDP – Transport Requirements**

**Highway**
- Including:
  - Junction and signal enhancements
  - Additional junction capacity and realignment
  - Walk and cycling facilities

**Rail Infrastructure and Services**
- Worcestershire Parkway
- Station Enhancement Measures

**Worcester Transport Strategy**
- Highways:
  - Duddeston to A449 between M5 J7 and Pievick Mains
  - Key corridor improvements
- Rail Infrastructure:
  - New Worcestershire Parkway Regional Interchange
  - Fosseway Street & Shrew Hill Station improvements
- Local Passenger Transport:
  - High frequency & high quality passenger transport services
  - Enhanced facilities for users and operators in city centre
- Walk & Cycle Enhancement to/from and across the WRIS site, including:
  - Improved connectivity
  - Improved infrastructure
  - Improved signage
  - New routes
  - New developments to maximise use of walk and cycle through infrastructure and Smarter Choices

**Walk, Cycle and Passenger Transport Infrastructure and Facilities**
- Including:
  - Additional walk and cycle links
  - Smarter Choices measures
  - Signage and cycle storage facilities
  - Passenger transport infrastructure

**Passenger Transport Service**
- Including:
  - Urban, Inter-Urban and Town Services
  - Rural Feeder Services (not shown)
4.56 The reasoned justification to Policy SWDP4 makes reference for the need to deliver the transport elements of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including protecting the land required to enable the provision of the infrastructure needed to deliver the rail industry proposed improvements to rail services to/from South Worcestershire. Cross reference should be made to paragraphs 2, 19 & 23 of that reasoned justification to SWDP 4.

**Strategic Road Network (managed by the Highways Agency)**

4.57 The Highways Agency has, in conjunction with Worcestershire County Council, been assessing the impact on the performance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) of the SWDP. As a result of this work, and taking into account the effect of sustainable transport measures, the Highways Agency (HA) has highlighted that improvements will be required to the SRN to enable the SWDP to be delivered without affecting the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, specifically at:

- M5 Junctions 6 and 7 (adjacent to Worcester)
- Five Junctions on the A46 (T) near Evesham

**County Scheme Costs**

4.58 Each of the proposed transport schemes is accompanied with a cost for implementation. Costs include **construction** costs, relevant percentage uplifts to account for scheme preparation and development costs over and above the basic construction and materials and "optimism bias" (reflective of the stage of development of scheme designs). An estimate is also made of the maintenance costs of the schemes over a 30 year period.

4.59 A breakdown of the costs for the proposed transport schemes on a mode-by-mode and town-by-town basis is provided in Tables 1 & 2. Where schemes fall outside the towns the cumulative costs are shown in the interurban/rural table.

**Strategic Road Network (managed by the Highways Agency)**

*Required Mitigation*

4.60 Impacts on the SRN which is managed on behalf of the Secretary of State by the HA have been examined in close co-operation with the County Council as the affected Highways Authority. In order to ensure consistency, the same evidence base utilised by the County Council for the examination of impacts on local and primary road networks, have been utilised to examine the future impacts on the SRN.

4.61 This examination has led to the requirement for improved infrastructure in the following locations as a result of the planned growth:

- M5 junction 6: improvements to all the arms of the junctions and further signalisation;
- M5 junction 7: signalisation of off slips and lining improvements on the circulatory and approach arms; and
- A46: all junctions on the Evesham bypass require signalisation and in some locations improvements on approach arms.

4.62 M5 junction 5 has already been examined as part of the planning application process and has been shown to accommodate the SWDP growth. However, as capacity at the junction will be eroded by traffic increases as a result of the planned growth, further mitigation will be required if additional development over and above what is included in the SWIDP takes place which impacts at the junction.
4.63 Each of the potential improvement schemes have been examined with respect to the operation of the SRN and have been found to achieve improved capacity in these locations, such that the HA can be satisfied that the planned growth can be accommodated without severe impact on the SRN. However, it should be noted that the phasing of these improvements, cost and design are all in the preliminary stages and therefore subject to change. It should also be noted that the acceptability of the identified improvements schemes on the SRN need to be further discussed the County Council.

4.64 The HA have identified that planned growth cannot be accommodated on M5 J7 without the County Council proposed improvements related to the Southern Link Road (A4440). Modelling indicated that J7 would become severely congested without the identified improvements; to the extent that queues on the exit slips extended back to the main carriageway during peak hours. Further work is being carried out in order to provide greater detail on the phasing of the enhancements to the Southern Link Road (A4440) and understand at what point in the SWDP, the full dualling of the link road needs to be delivered. The current assessments undertaken by the County Council have indicated that the Southern Link Road (A4440) will need to be dualled between the Ketch and Whittington junctions by 2021.

4.65 The HA have not considered the impact of the proposed Worcestershire Parkway Station on M5 J7 in light of assurances from the County Council that, although the Parkway scheme is being promoted by the County Council, it is not relied upon to support the planned growth. The potential impacts of the Worcestershire Parkway Station will be considered by the HA at planning application stage.

SRN Scheme Costs

4.66 To support the SWIDP, the HA has produced indicative costs in relation to the above preliminary schemes. The costs estimates provided for schemes in Evesham and at the M5 Junction 7 are based on preliminary designs and further work is required to provide more detailed costs. The following items have been included as percentage fees only and hence have not been assessed based on detailed site information:

- Traffic Management
- Risk and Contingency
- Statutory Undertakers Diversions
- Preliminaries (site set up and welfare)
- Design costs

The costs are also exclusive of any additional land take fees associated with construction and do not include 60 year maintenance costs.

Proposed mitigation schemes on the M5 at junction 6 have been taken from a preliminary cost estimate provided by the Managing Agent Contractor with similar caveats imposed.
Table 1 below provides details of these preliminary cost estimates.

### Table 1: Preliminary cost estimates for Highways Agency SRN Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highways Agency SRN Schemes</th>
<th>Indicative Cost* £millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A46 Evensham junctions (A46/A44 to A46/A4184 Cheltenham Road inc.)</td>
<td>£5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Junction 6</td>
<td>£4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Junction 7</td>
<td>£0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note these costs are based on early preliminary designs and do not include measured fees for items such as traffic management, statutory undertakers, maintenance or design. These costs are therefore subject to change as designs are finalised.

Funding for Highways Agency SRN schemes

4.67 The HA does not have a specific long term forward investment plan to support Local Plans. The HA will, however, work closely with local stakeholders such as the County Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership to identify funding programmes that could supply improvements and will undertake bids, when appropriate, to maximise funding from all sources.

In the absence of such funding the HA will look to developers to provide the infrastructure required to support the planned growth through a range of mechanisms, such as those identified in Policy 62 of the SWDP.

County Transport Schemes

4.68 The County transport schemes for South Worcestershire are itemised in Table 2:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost (£millions)</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Notes</th>
<th>Further Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAY SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>A4440/Southern Link Road capacity Enhancements, Key Corridors, traffic signals enhancements NOTE. Excludes costs for M5 junctions 5, 6 and 7 which are within the jurisdiction of the Highways Agency.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worceshire CC, Developers, Highways Agency, Network Rail, SWC</td>
<td>£106.2</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106 &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</td>
<td>2012-2020: (1) Dualling A4440 (Whittington-Ketch) (2) Key Corridors linking urban extensions with City Centre (3) Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone transport infrastructure works 2020-2030: (1) Further Enhancements to A4440 and remaining key corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Costs (2012-2020)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAIL SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Foregate Street Station improvements (in addition to those funded through WTSMSB), Shrub Hill Station Improvements &amp; Worcestershire Parkway</td>
<td>Worcs hire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Train Operating Companies, (indirectly: Office of Rail Regulator &amp; DfT, SWC)</td>
<td>£22.1</td>
<td>2012-2020: (1) Foregate Street (2) Worcestershire Parkway (3) Shrub Hill Station (if Opportunity Zone development proposals advanced for delivery in this period) 2020 - 2030: (1) Shrub Hill (if delivery of Opportunity Zone development delayed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Including: Bus stop infrastructure, Real Time Information systems and other passenger transport elements of Key Corridors schemes</td>
<td>Worcs hire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£22.0</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012 - 2020 and 2020 - 2030) aligned with key Corridor improvements and delivery of SWDP planned growth (in particular the urban extensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALK &amp; CYCLE SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>New and improved walk and cycle routes, additional walk and cycle bridge to north of city (and associated access links) and walk &amp; cycle elements of key Corridor schemes</td>
<td>Worcs hire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£11.5</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012 - 2020 and 2020 - 2030) aligned with key Corridor improvements and delivery of SWDP planned growth (in particular the urban extensions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£161.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAY SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Local highway network improvements including A38 highway enhancements in vicinity of Droitwich.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£3.4</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAIL, LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT AND WALK &amp; CYCLE LINK SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Droitwich rail station and associated interchange facilities (including parking, information, access routes etc.). (3) Provision of walk &amp; cycle footbridges over A38 linking proposed development sites to town centre. (4) Improvements to canal towpath.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>£4.1</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£7.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGHWAY SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Including town centre junction enhancements. <strong>NOTE:</strong> Excludes A46 schemes which are within the jurisdiction of the Highway Agency.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>£0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAIL, LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT AND WALK &amp; CYCLE LINK SCHEMES</strong></td>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Evesham rail station and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.). (3) Provision of walk &amp; cycle footbridges over A46 and River Avon linking proposed development sites to town centre, railway station, retail parks and employment centres. (4) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity (5) Improvements to town centre walking and cycling facilities</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>£6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestshire CC, Developers, SWC, (Highways Agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestshire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC, Highways Agency (in respect of the proposed A46 footbridges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL £6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** £6.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malvern</th>
<th>HIGHWAY SCHEMES</th>
<th>Local highway network improvements NOTE: See Inter-Urban Highway section (below) for A449 highway enhancements in north-east Malvern.</th>
<th>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</th>
<th>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</th>
<th>£5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAIL, LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT AND WALK &amp; CYCLE LINK SCHEMES</td>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites, and further improvements to Malvern Link Station (2) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity (3) Information kiosks (4) Improvements to town centre walking and cycling facilities</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>£0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pershore | Local highway network improvements **NOTE:** See **Inter-Urban Highway section** (below) for A44 highway enhancements.  

**NOTE:** Measures required to support the SWIDP include the transport schemes set out in the Pershore Package elements of the SWIDP (including maintaining the performance of the A44 element of Worcestershire’s Primary Road Network) and the provision of a new bridge and link from the B4083 to the A44 | SWDP 4 & SWDP | Worcesstershire CC, Developers, SWC | £0.8/ TBC in relation to the provision of a new bridge and link road | Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL & s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available | Across both phases (2012-2020 & 2020 – 2030) | The authorities support all the transport schemes set out in the Pershore Package elements of the SWIDP and a new bridge and link road between the A44 and the B4083. |
## RAIL, LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT AND WALK & CYCLE LINK SCHEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Including:</strong></th>
<th><strong>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</strong></th>
<th><strong>Worcestershire hire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</strong></th>
<th><strong>£2.9</strong></th>
<th><strong>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</strong></th>
<th><strong>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Pershore rail station and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.). (3) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity (4) Improvements to town centre walking and cycling facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** £3.8

## Rural Malvern Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Including:</strong></th>
<th><strong>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</strong></th>
<th><strong>Worcestershire hire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</strong></th>
<th><strong>£0.2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</strong></th>
<th><strong>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity to the existing network (3) Improvements to walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** £0.2
### Rural Wychavon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAIL, LOCAL PASSENGER TRANSPORT AND WALK &amp; CYCLE LINK SCHEMES</th>
<th>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</th>
<th>£2.3</th>
<th>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</th>
<th>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to rail stations and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.). (3) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity (4) Improvements to walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inter-Urban Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHWAY SCHEMES</th>
<th>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</th>
<th>£6.1</th>
<th>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, +other funding sources as available</th>
<th>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including improvements to the A44 mainline (Evesham-Worcester), A38 junctions to the north of Worcester, A449 roundabout in north east Malvern, A449 to the north of Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL COUNTY TOTAL £194.145**
### Highways Agency: Strategic Road Network (for cost exclusions see note 9 below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highways Agency: Strategic Road Network</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost (£millions)</th>
<th>Potential Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Further Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK SCHEMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A46 Evesham Bypass (5 Junctions)</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp;</td>
<td>Highways Agency,</td>
<td>£5.8</td>
<td>Developers (s106 &amp; s278) + other funding sources as available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 &amp; 2020 – 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 7</td>
<td>Developers,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Junction 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 Junction 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL SWIDP TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£204.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. This accounts for Supervision, Evaluation, Drainage, Preliminary Design, Site Supervision, Design Services and Utilities, Landscape, Traffic Management, Groundworks/Earthworks, Maintenance, Consultation, Ecology.
2. Optimism Bias represents a contingency allowance reflecting the early stage in the development of schemes. It is a standard approach developed by the Department for Transport (DfT) to avoid over-optimistic estimates of transport infrastructure costs.
3. County costs EXCLUDE any land acquisition and Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) costs in the event that these are required.
4. County maintenance costs are for 30 years from completion of works and are the expressed as % of total construction costs at this stage in scheme development. These costs are not included in the above table, construction costs only are shown.
5. INCLUDES allowance for: A46(T) Junctions and M5 Junctions 6 and 7 works (as separately assessed by the Highways Agency – see note 9 below). INCLUDES allowance for: A4440/Southern Link Road capacity enhancements, Key corridors enhancements, traffic signal enhancements (SCOOT/MOVA etc.), amended Traffic Regulation Orders, improvements to Worcester Foregate Street & Shrub Hill rail stations a new Worcestershire Parkway, improved bus stop infrastructure, Real Time Information Systems, new/improved walk and cycle routes and additional bridge.
6. EXCLUDES City and Town Centre Public Realm Improvements.
(7) INCLUDES improvements to A44, A38 and A449
(8) County Council transport phasing is based on periods 2012-2020 and 2020-2030
(9) Highways Agency costs: *Note these costs are based on early preliminary designs and do not include measured fees for items such as traffic management, Statutory undertakers, maintenance or design. These costs are therefore subject to change as designs are finalised.
4.69 The total costs across South Worcestershire for transport infrastructure and maintenance for the period to 2030 are as follows:

- Infrastructure: £204.445 million (including SRN)
- 30 year Maintenance: £48.536 million (excluding SRN)

4.70 It should be noted that, as set out in the notes to the above tables, these costs include uplifts to allow for additional costs above and beyond the actual cost of construction. This includes items such as detailed design and evaluation, site preparation, site supervision, drainage, landscaping, ecology and traffic management. Different uplifts are applied for traffic management dependent on the local road network.

4.71 The costs also include significant allowance for contingency and "risk" (known as "Optimism Bias"). This is prudent in view of the early stage of development of a number of the schemes. This is a standard approach (see ‘The Department for Transport Procedures for Dealing with Optimism Bias in Transport Planning Guidance Document – June 2004’). The Optimism Bias uplift is based upon the maximum applied rate for standard civil engineering works at this preliminary stage.

4.72 In terms of maintenance the relevant LTP3 policy states:

“Worcestershire County Council will work in partnership with Worcestershire Borough, City and District Councils across the County to ensure the contributions from developers toward the on-going cost of:

- Maintaining walk, cycle, passenger transport and highway infrastructure and services required to deliver developments that are sustainable and policy compliant.

Schemes Excluded From Cost Estimates

4.73 Please note that the above tables and costs exclude some elements of transport infrastructure and services improvements. Specifically, they exclude:

- **Passenger Transport Service Enhancements**: The transport evidence associated with the transport elements of the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document, as set out in the SWIDP, shows that enhancements to local and regional passenger transport services will be essential to address accessibility issues, reduce traffic generation, manage traffic congestion and support the delivery of sustainable development. Potential enhancements have been identified along with an estimate of operating costs (before revenue); however, further work will be required to identify the net increase in operating costs after allowance has been made for development generated demand and revenues. Promoters of developments must provide local passenger transport solutions to ensure that their site is accessible and sustainable. The promoters will be expected (as set out in the LTP3) to prepare a 20 year business case for the passenger transport provision, which will demonstrate the scale and profile of any revenue support and the source of this funding (including from the promoter of the development), thereby demonstrating that the operation of services is financially sustainable in the medium to long term, and highlighting any "pump priming" requirements.

- **Inter-Urban Walk and Cycle Infrastructure**: Schemes have been developed which provide improved walk and cycle links between the main urban areas in South Worcestershire (e.g. Malvern – Worcester). These links would also serve a number of the proposed developments within the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document
and would serve a dual function of providing increased choice of transport modes for
journeys generated by the new development and also support increased leisure use
which will benefit both existing and new developments and the tourist/leisure
industry. Further work is underway to identify the capital and on-going maintenance
costs of such measures and the extent to which the SWDP is dependent upon their
delivery.

B. UTILITIES

INTRODUCTION

4.74 The recent position is set out in the evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire
Infrastructure Strategy (Needs & issues Research Paper; June 2012). The County Council has
engaged with Western Power Distribution (WPD) and National Grid Gas. WPD representatives
have attended two meetings and a meeting took place with National Grid Gas and SWC in June
2012.

4.75 The starting point was that the Baker Associates report took the view that the need for
developer contributions for this category was lessened because connections to the grid are
standard parts of the build costs for sites. Utility companies enable connection of the network where
there is capacity or where improvements are part of their organic load growth. Unplanned
strengthening of the network to accommodate development sites needs to be funded by
developers. This has been progressed through meetings and liaison with the electricity supply and
gas supply industries.

4.76 WPD responded (19/09/12) to the technical consultation on SWIDPIPS in that it has begun
a high-level consideration of the capacity of the network to accommodate SWDP proposed growth.

4.77 In terms of response of the gas industry to SWIDPIPS, a response was received from
Wales and West Utilities (09/10/12) and the National Grid Gas provided information (15/11/12) on
the Worcester Urban Extensions and the development at North East Malvern.

4.78 The key issue will be, through continuing dialogue with these utilities, to distinguish that
infrastructure which is absolutely critical before development can go ahead.

4.79 In order to meet carbon emission targets, the County Council emphasises the importance of
the careful management of the way in which energy is used and supplied across Worcestershire.
The latest position in Worcestershire is set out on pp37-43 of the January 2013 version of the draft
Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy.

RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY

4.80 By way of context, a wide range of EU and national legislation has been established with the
objective of tackling climate change by reducing the emissions of carbon dioxide, reducing our
overall demand for fossil fuel and promoting the security of energy supply. This legislation includes
the 2008 Climate Change Act and the 2009 Renewable Energy Directive which establishes national
targets for carbon emission reductions and the development of renewable energy.
4.81 The Climate Change Act 2008 established a legal requirement for the UK to achieve an 80% cut in CO2 emissions by 2050, with a 34% cut by 2020. Both targets are against a 1990 baseline.

4.82 The EU Renewable Energy Directive (Directive 2009/28/EC) sets an overall target for 20% of the energy consumed in the EU to come from renewable sources by 2020. This overall target is divided by country with the UK’s target being 15% by 2020.

4.83 The SWDP has not set carbon reduction or renewable energy targets for South Worcestershire. The reason for this that, whilst the planning system plays a key role in delivering the necessary infrastructure to reduce carbon emissions and ensure continued security of energy supply, there are many factors which influence carbon emissions (e.g. fuel prices, population growth etc.) and the take-up of renewable and low carbon energy (e.g. installation costs; feed-in tariffs etc.) are beyond the control of a Development Plan.

4.84 The County Council (in section 3.4 of their June 2012 Needs & Issues Paper) began their look at renewable energy with the work of their consultants IT Power. The consultants concluded that a suggested realistic target of 3.5% of energy consumption from renewables could be achieved by 2026 across Worcestershire.

4.85 The County Council accepts that the baseline position is low with around 9.5 MW of installed capacity through large scale renewables, which comes mainly from landfill generators. These figures relate only to large schemes and exclude micro generation schemes, such as solar.

4.86 The County Council estimates that there could be the potential capacity for the whole of Worcestershire of 109 MW of energy generation, sufficient to provide for the energy needs of approximately 15,500 homes. The County Council is in the process of preparing a Renewable Energy Strategy to set out the benefits of renewables in terms of the County’s economy, environment and communities. The County Council has played a positive role in bringing forward renewable energy through processing applications for Anaerobic Digestion plants and through providing economic development support to other projects. The South Worcestershire Councils also play an enabling role via their planning function.

4.87 Several applications have been submitted for sizeable renewable installations (including the Lenchwick windfarm and the M5 J6 turbine), and there have been approvals granted for some large solar farms (3.5MW and 5MW) and Anaerobic Digestion plants in Wychavon. All of these are in the public domain and demonstrate commercial interest in bringing forward big projects in South Worcestershire.

4.88 To reduce carbon emissions and secure sustainable energy, the South Worcestershire Councils are proposing in policy SWDP 27 that all new development incorporates renewable or low carbon energy to meet a percentage of the developments energy requirements. It is also proposed that large-scale developments (including Worcester South and Worcester West) examine the potential for a decentralised heat network (for example, combined heat and power). It is anticipated that these would be funded by developer contributions, the private sector or through contributions from the proposed Carbon Offset Fund.

4.89 A proportion of Energy from Waste (EfW) constitutes renewable energy. The EfW plant at Hartlebury was granted planning approval by the Secretary of State in summer 2012. Electricity generation from this plant is likely to start from 2015 and output is expected to generate 15.5 MW, of which 13.5 MW would be exported to the grid and 1.5MW used to power the plant itself. The applicant defined 60% of the energy generation from the plant as renewable based on the proportion of waste being defined as biomass.
ELECTRICITY

4.90 The County Council in their assessment (Needs & Issues report; June 2012: section 3.3) quote from the Baker Associates Study:-

"Broadly speaking, over the twenty year period of planned growth, there should not be a problem in delivering electricity capacity in Worcestershire. However, as development takes place, hotspots can occur in specific locations where a lack of capacity at substations arises. This could be addressed at the time but is likely to be addressed systematically over time"

4.91 The National Grid owns and operates the electricity transmission system (275kV & 400kV). Within Worcestershire, the distribution network (132 kV, 66kV, 33kV, 11kV and 400V) is the responsibility of the Western Power Distribution Network.

4.92 The current situation was assessed at a meeting between Western Power Distribution (WPD), the County Council and South Worcestershire Councils (SWC) on 09/02/12. At that meeting, it was explained that Western Power Distribution submit funding requests to OFGEM for improvements to the network to deal with growth and are about to submit their next bid in June 2013. In terms of development proposals, Western Power assesses how developments can be accommodated based on a number of factors, such as available network capacity and vicinity of apparatus. New network connection, depending on the demand requirement, can be provided through numerous connection types. These are defined in WPD’s Application of the Connection Charging Methodology section of the WPD Statement of Methodology and Charges Document. A typical connection for a small/medium housing development is via a looped 11kV connection into a 11kV/400V distribution sub-station. The cost of this type of connection must be borne by the developer.

4.93 Western Power Distribution (WPD) were one of the consultees in preparing the SWIDP and WIS, with which both the County Council and South Worcestershire Councils have had a dialogue. The detailed response to SWC on the SWIDPIPS on 19/09/12 assessed the major developments in terms of the capacities available at local primary substations. In summary:-

MALVERN HILLS HOUSING SITES

- Newlands: spare capacity available. Third transformer installation planned.

MALVERN HILLS EMPLOYMENT SITES

- Blackmore Park, Newland and Qinetiq site: spare capacity available. No works planned at the moment. Any large load application would trigger upstream reinforcement costs.

WORCESTER HOUSING SITES

- Worcester South. Ample transformer capacity. New 11kV feeders may trigger switchgear change depending on load etc.

WORCESTER EMPLOYMENT SITES


WYCHAVON EMPLOYMENT SITES
• Station Road, Pershore: spare capacity available and no work planned.
• Vale Park Phase 2: spare capacity available with work planned for third transformer.

WYCHAVON HOUSING SITES
• Copcut Lane, Droitwich: Primary OK, requires some minor 11kV reinforcement
• Station Road/Wyre Road, Pershore: OK
• Evesham sites: Primary OK at present, but may need third Transformer if loads increase. Feeders heavily loaded but may be possible to move around.

GAS
4.94 The County Council has made its assessment in section 3.2 of the Needs & Issues Report (June 2012). It states that National Grid Gas owns the Local Distribution Zone for most of Worcestershire with a part of South Worcestershire covered by Wales & West Utilities. Gas reaches consumers via individual suppliers. Under the 1986 Gas Act, gas distributors must develop and maintain an efficient and economical pipeline system and must comply, so far as it is economical to do so, to connect the system to any premises. Payment for gas connection might be required depending on the outcome of an economic test. That the economic test would be undertaken by the relevant Gas Transporter for the location, either National Grid Gas Distribution or Wales and West Utilities, depending on the location of the connection required.

4.95 National Grid prepares annual delivery plans and major reinforcements can be programmed, if communicated in advance.

4.96 The Baker Associates Study indicated that network reinforcement may be necessary in the Worcester area but is assumed that National Grid will fund this requirement. More specifically, the SWDP refers to the need for a new gas supply to be provided to the Worcester South extension. The provision of connections is fully open to competition in gas distribution and therefore a range of individual connection providers such as utility infrastructure providers would be likely to want to quote for any connections work.

4.97 A meeting took place between National Grid Gas and the County Council with SWC on 22nd June 2012 to progress these matters. National Grid Gas were consulted on the SWIDPIPS (08/11/12) and Wales & West Utilities provided a very detailed assessment on 09/10/12 for the Wychavon area. The one site where there could be significant costs is the Vale Park employment site in Evesham.

4.98 The National Grid Gas provided further information (15/11/12) on the Worcester Urban Extensions and the development at North East Malvern that included the estimated load for each site and whether any reinforcements may be needed.

ELECTRICITY AND GAS
4.99 In respect of electricity and gas, the County Council and SWC are seeking costings from the various infrastructure providers. The works needed to connect to the electricity grid (which can include significant cabling and substations within the development site itself) are open to
competition, so costings for these elements cannot be estimated but these costs should be considered a standard part of build costs. It is hoped that any costs needed for strengthening the grid can be provided through broad estimates from WPD.

WATER SUPPLY AND WASTE WATER

4.100 By way of introduction, as set out in the draft Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy, the supply and treatment of water and the management of flood risk are all inter-related. Changes to any of these can have both positive and negative impacts on the others. This means that the right interventions offer opportunities to deliver multiple benefits across a range of areas. Therefore, although the Water Supply and Waste Water and the Flood Risk issues (see Section 4C) are dealt with in separate sections, the overall SWC approach is an integrated one.

4.101 As context for the Water Supply and Waste section, reference should be made to the following documents:-

a) The Water Framework Directive, which is designed to improve and integrate the way water bodies are managed throughout Europe.

b) The draft Water Bill, currently with Parliament, which proposes more competition in the water industry.

c) The River Severn Basin Management Plan, which in itself is a requirement of the Water Framework Directive

d) The South Worcestershire Water Cycle Study, which looks at the level of planned growth and the ability of the infrastructure (i.e. water supply and waste water treatment) to accommodate it without adversely affecting the natural water cycle.

4.102 Cross reference should be made to the relevant policies in the SWDP, especially policy SWDP 30 on Water Resources, Efficiency and Treatment and also policy SWDP 31 on Pollution and Land Instability, and the reasoned justification in both cases.

4.103 The recent situation is considered in depth in chapter 5 of the Worcestershire County evidence base (Needs & Issues Paper: June 2012). The capacity of existing water infrastructure in the allocation and phasing of development could have a significant impact on the timing of development and this will apply to both residential and employment land. This section of the SWIDP has been updated to reflect the January 2013 draft Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. It has also been updated to reflect on-going work on the SWDP, especially over the last 18 months involving SWC, the County Council, Severn Trent Water Ltd and the Environment Agency.

4.104 Water Supply and Waste Water Infrastructure is given full consideration in the 2010 Water Cycle Study and the 2012 Update (published May 2013). Both documents were prepared by JBA Consulting and SWC involved the Environment Agency, Severn Trent Water Ltd and the County Council in the drafting of these documents.

4.105 The key headline message from the Water Cycle Study work is that the proposed level of housing and employment growth in the SWDP can be accommodated either by existing infrastructure or is at least deliverable and viable by improvements to that infrastructure i.e. there are no showstoppers.

4.106 Severn Trent Water Ltd. (STWL) has a statutory duty to provide potable water as well as the treating and disposing of waste water. Over half of the public water supply in Worcestershire is provided by groundwater.

4.107 Whilst conventional treatment of on-site waste water at water treatment works is the main method used, alternative non-main solutions are possible.
4.108 STWL has stated the difficulties for them of undertaking upfront analysis to determine the extent and costing of their infrastructure requirements. This is because the details of each site will not be known until the planning application stage, when the preferred connection location is known.

4.109 For new developments, the only recoverable costs for Water and Sewerage Companies (WASCs) from developers apply to connections to the WASC’s existing water mains and sewers, and a contribution for on-site works.

4.110 The costs for serving specific developments are not determined until application by developers, when costs are calculated on a site by site basis. Adoption of the sewers is agreed between the developer and STWL by way of a s.104 agreement (this is purely for adoption as an administrative exercise and does not receive any commuted sum for capital or revenue).

4.111 Wider infrastructure costs (e.g. sewage treatment works) are not borne by the developer, rather they are agreed through STWL Business Plan (or Asset Management Plan (AMP) to 2015 and then 2015-2040. The cost is ultimately borne by STWL and their customers (both residential and commercial) through their water bills.

4.112 This is why importance is placed by STWL on the need for early communication with planning authorities about proposed development locations and volumes. Early consultation from developers is also encouraged by STWL.

4.113 The STWL Water Resource Management Plan re-assessed their demand-supply analysis and indicated sufficient supply to meet demand until 2013/14 but beyond this there is a negative balance, reaching a projected shortfall of about 120ml/day by 2035.

4.114 The 2012 Water Cycle Study has been published in May 2013 and this takes on board the proposed SWDP allocations. In this 2012 update, STWL has confirmed that there is or will be sufficient “headroom” capacity at the sewage works.

4.115 This water supply issue was discussed at a meeting between STWL and SWC on 06/12/11. STWL officers indicated that the Severn Trent Water Asset Management Plan 2010-2015 aims to increase the resilience of the water supply network.

4.116 In the County Council evidence base in section 5.5, there is reference to the Severn Trent Water Asset Management Plan. This provides notional costs for improvements required taken from work undertaken in the original South Worcestershire Water Cycle Study. A notional cost for improvements in South Worcestershire is in the region of £7.3m for the water supply infrastructure and £4.3m. to £4.4m for the sewerage infrastructure; however, these costs will be reviewed in the forthcoming AMP.

4.117 STWL responded to the SWIDPIPS consultation on 28/08/12 and the SWIDP on 27/03/13 and their comments have been included in this version of the SWIDP.

4.118 The 2012 South Worcestershire Water Cycle 2012 Update has taken into account the 2011 Localism Act, the National Planning Policy Framework, the Government’s Water White Paper “Water for Life”, the draft Water Bill and important guidance such as PPS25 Practice Guide, as well as up to date evidence and site information and the various discussions with the Environment Agency, STWL and the County Council. The update has been produced as an addendum to the 2010 Water Cycle Study as much of that is still relevant.

4.119 The Update showed that the majority of the main findings from 2010 still stand and are applicable today but an assessment was carried out to take account of changes to SWDP sites. The approach taken is demand based and therefore growth comes with some “hidden” costs, partly
met through water bills. A general allowance is made to fund additional capacity for growth where specific projects have not been costed.

4.120 The Update states that a number of the proposed allocations will require some investment in the sewerage infrastructure and the solutions and costs will need to be reassessed on an on-going basis but there is no indication that the investment is not deliverable or will affect the viability of development.

4.121 The Update also concluded that investment will be required to the water supply infrastructure for it to be able to accommodate the proposed site allocations. Severn Trent Water, however, has confirmed that an allocation of funding has been identified to meet the costs of schemes to reinforce areas affected by development in the SWDP area. It also states that any site specific upgrades to the water supply infrastructure will be expected to be funded by developer contributions. And also that demand management options are a vital consideration when planning and building the new development to provide sustainability, both in terms of the aquatic environment and water supply.

4.122 Wherever possible, future versions of the SWIDP will include indicative costings for new water supply and sewerage infrastructure. STWL has advised that it is difficult to assess the exact costs of infrastructure works until the details of proposed development are known at the planning application stage. The costs of infrastructure will either be borne by STWL, through water charges as agreed with OFWAT, or, in the case of site-specific infrastructure, by the developers themselves.

4.123 It also needs to be borne in mind that under the 1991 Water Industry Act, developers have a right to a connection to the existing sewers irrespective of whether there is downstream capacity or not. If additional capacity is required, then the cost will be funded by Severn Trent Water. The developer has only to fund the cost of connecting their site to the existing sewers. However, if funding for infrastructure is limited, it is important to plan development in a way which makes effective use of that infrastructure provision. It will be important to involve the Environment Agency in these on-going discussions.

C) FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE

4.124 As set out in the draft Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (January 2013), responsibility for flood risk is complex with various bodies having either statutory roles or non statutory interests in flood risk management. The Environment Agency has responsibility for managing flood risk from main rivers and reservoirs, whilst the County Council, following the 2010 Flood & Water Management Act, has responsibility for co-ordinating the management of local flood risk from surface water, ground water and ordinary watercourses. Other organisations involved in flood risk management include:-

- The three SWC Councils
- Internal Drainage Boards
- Water Companies
- The County Council as highway authority.

4.125 Cross reference should be made to the relevant policies in the SWDP, especially SWDP 28, Management of Flood Risk, and SWDP 29, Sustainable Drainage Systems, and to the reasoned justification for both policies. Policy SWDP 28 explains the importance of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
4.126 A revised strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was prepared by JBA in accordance with best practice and published in December 2012. This informed Policy SWDP28 and site allocation policies in the SWDP Proposed Submission Document. The Environment Agency had expressed concern regarding flood risk on a limited number of proposed SWDP allocations. The SWC Councils have subsequently met with the EA and the SWDP now makes it explicit that no housing or other vulnerable uses will be permitted outside Flood Zone 1. For a few mixed use e.g. housing and leisure sites, land subject to Flood Zones 2 and 3 is included. The SWDP, however, makes it clear that housing will not be permitted in Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 and it can demonstrate that the capacity of these allocations allows for this. In effect, the SWC Councils have applied the sequential test in the aforementioned case. The revised SFRA provides sound advice to the SWC Councils and developers on how to carry out the Sequential and Exception Tests. The SFRA also sets out clear guidance for the design of sustainable drainage systems which are required by policy SWDP 29.

4.127 The SFRA assessed the flood risk in the SWDP area as a whole and the SFRA has informed the SWC decisions about allocating sites for development. As a consequence of this work, some SWDP sites were deleted and a number of SWDP sites were carefully reviewed in autumn 2012 as a direct consequence of this SFRA Update.

4.128 Key points from the County evidence base included:-

- Previously, PPS 25 and the Water Framework Directive used to set the policy context in which flood risk and water drainage must be considered. This is now replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework but the associated technical advice still remains.
- Under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, there is now a new lead role for Worcestershire County Council in managing local flood risk.
- About 10% of the land area of South Worcestershire is considered to be at risk from flooding (pluvial or fluvial)
- A number of flood defences schemes are already underway or recently completed in South Worcestershire. These have been led by the Environment Agency and supported by the County Council and the relevant Local Council.

4.129 Based on the latest information from the Environment Agency in spring 2013, major schemes include:

- Pershore-complete.
- Upton-upon-Severn: New Street complete; Waterside complete.
- Powick; complete
- Kempsey; was completed in summer 2012 but encountered technical difficulties in the floods in November 2012, which are being addressed by the Environment Agency and all relevant partners.
- Riddings Brook: complete.
- Badsey Brook (Broadway, Childswickham, Murcot) Flood Alleviation Scheme: approved in principle but funding still to be finalised.
- Uckinghall: complete.

4.130 There are other local flood defence/alleviation schemes e.g.; Barbourne Brook, Hylton Road, Worcester.

4.131 Other key points include:-

- There is an understanding of the areas prone to flooding in each District in South Worcestershire.
• The 2009 Baker Associates Study set out indicative costs for providing flood defences.
• The way in which Government funding is allocated to flood risk management schemes is changing.
• Particular importance is attached to the full use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which has informed Policy SWDP 29

4.132 In the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (January 2013), the County Council states that Worcestershire has a strong track record of working in partnership to deliver flood defences and this will need to be continued as funding mechanisms for flood defences are taking a more strategic approach while fewer schemes will be fully funded from Environment Agency grants, a greater number of schemes will receive some funding, with an expectation that the cost burden should be shared between as many contributors as possible.

D) COMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE

4.133 By way of context, it needs to be explained that a specific policy on this topic was prepared in summer 2012 and this was refined to Policy SWDP 26 on Telecommunications and Broadband. Cross reference should be made to this policy SWDP 26 and its supporting reasoned justification.

4.134 The recent situation is assessed in the evidence base for the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. Chapter 6 of the Needs & Issues Paper refer (June 2012)

4.135 Communication infrastructure includes telephone systems (both wire and mobile) and broadband. The Government is committed to securing a world-class communication system and currently the main barrier to this is the availability of super-fast broadband, especially in the more rural areas.

4.136 The law requires that copper wire telephone services are provided to all new development. It is therefore assumed that there will be no issue with the provision of telephone services to new development.

4.137 The County analysis of mobile phone services is still general. Key points include:-

• Mobile phone ownership and usage is rising across the U.K.
• There remain a number of areas of the UK without basic 2G (second generation) coverage. These are known as “not spots” and whilst some are in urban areas, most are in rural areas. These are being investigated by OFCOM.
• Poor mobile coverage makes delivering rural services more inefficient and difficult.
• Mobile phone coverage is measured nationally according to population not landmass so the methodology for calculating coverage does not pick up areas of poor coverage in sparsely populated areas. An area may be classed as covered when in fact large areas may not be. OFCOM classifies a postcode district as covered if 90% of the population within that postcode area can receive outdoor coverage from at least one operator.
• OFCOM calculates that 98% of England has 2G coverage and 87% has 3G coverage.
• Third Generation (3G) technology is increasing in prominence and enables people to use the internet and send and download large quantities of data as well as making calls and sending texts.
• Nationally, 2G coverage has reached its commercial limit so further roll out is unlikely. 3G is unlikely to exceed the footprint of 2G so “not-spots” will remain even when 3G has reached its commercial limit.
• Changing the methodology for measuring access to mobile networks from population to landmass could provide a better overview of “not-spots” and, therefore, a clear indication
of where improvements need to be made in coverage in order to enable, at the very least, emergency roaming.

- There are now four UK mobile phone operators: Everything Everywhere (Orange & T-Mobile), O2, Three and Vodafone. The Mobile Operators Association (MOA) represents these four mobile phone operators.
- This section may need to be updated in the future in respect of Fourth Generation (4G) technology but at present 4G is only being deployed in the big cities.

4.138 Likewise, in terms of broadband:

- Traditionally broadband is provided by ASDL (Asymmetric Digital Subscriber Line). Speeds using this technology are limited because the further away from the exchange the premises is, the slower the broadband speed achieved. Chapter 6 of the June 2012 Needs and Issues Paper notes that in Worcestershire 12% of the postcodes fall below the Universal Service Commitment.
- Increasingly the demand is for super fast broadband using fibre optic technology but there is no legal requirement to provide this facility. BT is currently rolling out superfast broadband to two thirds of the UK by 2015. In April 2011, for example, Malvern was announced for inclusion in this programme.
- Superfast broadband is not necessarily the best product for businesses with an Ethernet Local Area Network providing a better product.

4.139 The Government’s aim is to create the best broadband network in Europe. This is echoed by the County Council’s January 2013 Corporate Plan for which “Open for Business” is a priority and broadband is a key enabler. This is fully supported by the business community and the Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).

4.140 The vision for Worcestershire is to deliver faster broadband for all by 2015: namely:-

- 90% of businesses in Worcestershire to have access to the Superfast Broadband.
- Minimum 2Mbps speed for everyone in Worcestershire.
- 90% of Worcestershire with access to the Superfast Broadband.

4.141 The approved 2011 Worcestershire Local Broadband Plan (LBP), “Connecting Worcestershire”, is intended to facilitate a drive in economic growth and improve the quality of life for all residents and local businesses. As part of the Broadband Programme, the County Council has been actively engaged with local communities and commercial suppliers. Through such engagement, the County Council is aiming to raise broadband awareness, and to educate communities as to their potential use of broadband and thereby stimulate demand which will then maximise opportunities for private sector investment, thus reducing the need for public sector investment. It is anticipated that the total capital funding required for the LBP Programme is approximately £20-25m. The County has already allocated £8.5m. and Broadband Delivery UK’s (BDUK) contribution will be £3.35m out of national pot of £530m contribution will be £3.35m. In addition the private sector partner, procured through Central Government’s Procurement Framework, is expected to match the total public sector funding made available for Worcestershire.

4.142 Work has already commenced in Worcestershire, including some parts of South Worcestershire. Allocated grant funding (Green Infrastructure Fund and Sustainable Transport Fund) is available for improvements to broadband in rural areas which is outside of the LBP. The communities which will receive this funding have been selected through an Expression of Interest and Business Case process.
4.143 Cross reference should be made to policy SWDP 33 on Waste and, in particular, policy WCS 17 on “Making provision for waste in all new development” in the adopted 2012 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.

4.144 The recent position was assessed in the evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy; chapter 7 of the Needs & Issues Paper refer (June 2012).

4.145 Key points are as follows:-

- The Waste Management sector is a primary industry which is critical to the functioning of the economy.
- The EC Waste Directives are key drivers both in respect of waste management via the waste hierarchy and the need to attain self sufficiency via the adoption of a waste plan; and for Worcestershire this means the adopted 2012 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.
- The County evidence base refers to the 79 waste management facilities currently operating in Worcestershire.
- It distinguishes between the responsibilities for:
  a) Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) which is managed by the County Council as waste disposal authority in partnership with the District Councils as waste collection authorities through a PFI contract with Mercia Waste Management
  b) Commercial and Industrial Waste (C&I) which is managed by the private sector though with some district council involvement in commercial waste collection
  c) Construction & Demolition waste (C&D) where there are often crossover contracts between the private and public sectors
  d) Hazardous waste where special arrangements are required
- The adopted 2012 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy analyses waste management data from the Environment Agency. The County Council needs to plan for waste management capacity which is equivalent to the amount of waste that is produced in the County. The need is calculated on what is required to meet European, national and local recycling targets. These and waste infrastructure requirements are set out on pages 97-100 of the WIS Needs & Issues Paper (June 2012). Conclusions are drawn on a phased basis up to 2035 on the capacity gap and the consequent total land requirement.
- The evidence base concludes with references to the costing of meeting the Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) element being provided by the WCC Waste Disposal Section. It is also stated that it must be assumed that normal private sector considerations apply to the provision of facilities for C&I, C&D and hazardous waste.
- The evidence base makes some general comments about provision:
  a) The Energy from Waste facility at Hartlebury, which in July 2012 was approved (as set out in para. 4.89 of this SWIDP), could involve capital expenditure of between £120-160m, according to County Council estimates, but this will not require any public sector expenditure.
  b) The Landfill Directive notes that up to 68% of household waste is biodegradable. There is more potential from waste generation in Worcestershire. However, the adopted 2012 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy encourages activities higher in the Waste Hierarchy, such as reuse and recycling, as the primary use for waste. Energy from Waste will only be permitted if these are not possible.
  c) In relation to private sector recycling facilities, the County Council estimates that this could involve capital expenditure of £70m. up to 2025/2026 and an estimated £210m. up to 2035.
  d) The County Council is involved in discussions with respect to Household Recycling Centres in Worcester, Malvern, Upton, Tenbury and Evesham in South Worcestershire.
  e) A key issue in ensuring sufficient waste management capacity is to ensure the provision of sufficient land and this is addressed in the adopted 2012 Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.
4.146 The information contained in this section is based upon the information provided by the County Council up to September 2012 with some updating on the 2012 County Waste Core Strategy in May 2013.
SECTION FIVE: SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

A) EDUCATION

5.1 This SWIDP has taken into account the information base set out in Chapter 8 of the Needs & Issues Paper produced by the County Council in June 2012 to support the emerging County Infrastructure Strategy. More particularly, SWC have had the benefit of ongoing input from the Provision Planning Team within County Council Children’s Services through 2012 and 2013. They provided information to support the SWIDPIPS, which was considered by the three SWC Councils on 03/07/12; further updated information was provided in October 2012 to include in the SWIDP which supported the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document when it was considered by the three SWC Councils in December 2012. The County Council has provided further updated information in April 2013 for inclusion in this May 2013 version of the SWIDP.

5.2 The County Council, as the Local Education Authority, has a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places for all children of statutory school age living in Worcestershire and whose parents/carers apply for a place at a state funded school.

5.3 Future housing development will lead to an increase in the 0-19 year old population, with a consequential demand for additional school places for all types of education (early years to post-16).

5.4 Strategic planning for school places is undertaken by Worcestershire County Council Children’s Services and their assessments and means of forecasting are set out in the County evidence base. These forecasts were updated again in December 2012 and again in April 2013 for inclusion in this May 2013 SWIDP.

5.5 Academy schools receive public funding but are independent of the local authority. There were 33 academies in Worcestershire as at 31 March 2013 and there is a presumption that any new school opened under the current legislation and requirements will be an academy or a free school.

5.6 Most Worcestershire Districts have adopted Supplementary Planning Documents which set out formulae for calculating developer contributions. Each District Council collects contributions in accordance with their adopted SPD. The County Council recommends inclusion of educational provision within the future Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule on the basis this would enable more effective targeting of resources, but this still has to be considered by SWC.

5.7 The forecasting process is a dynamic one which needs to respond to changing proposals. The County has set out in its latest evidence for SWC in April 2013 a schedule of educational provision related to SWDP development proposals, as approved in December 2012. It is recognised that this is a dynamic process and updating may be required for future versions of the SWIDP.

5.8 This April 2013 County Council evidence is set out below. On this evidence, only one new primary school will be needed to be built and no new secondary schools are needed in South Worcestershire to 2030. Generally, extensions and alterations are favoured over new schools because of the lead in time to build a new school and the total project costs, which often include land acquisition as well as build costs.

5.9 Due to the size of the development at Broomhall (Worcester South) it is anticipated that a new primary school will be required because the development will generate sufficient children each year to sustain that school in the long term. The anticipated time to open a
new primary school is three and a half years and costs are estimated to be around £6m. for a 420 place primary school. This would consist of 7 year groups each with 60 places.

5.10 The County Council expects to meet some of the planned growth by utilising spare education infrastructure capacity where it exists and by accessing such capital funding as is made available by central government. The County Council expects at least 50% of the costs of additional educational provision to be met from developers’ contributions. Where new schools are required to support developments, then developers may be asked to meet the full cost of the new infrastructure.

5.11 For purposes of clarity, all of the figures indicated are the total cost of educational infrastructure and do not make any calculation of the County Council/developer contribution ratio. The cost figures given below are as of April 2013 and reflect the SWDP as of December 2012. Named sites are allocations unless otherwise specified. Please note that completions etc. is a generic heading covering Completions, Dwellings under construction, Long term empty home, Released housing etc. (This is explained under SWDP 3 in the plan itself.) Estimates are given in terms of educational contributions to support the SWDP and are as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;WIDER WORCESTER AREA&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions etc</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Worcester</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>£2,066,139</td>
<td>£2,232,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Worcester</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>£6,000,000</td>
<td>£5,610,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilbury Drive</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£529,779</td>
<td>£572,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwillams Farm</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£529,779</td>
<td>£572,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Ronkswood Hospital*</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£423,823</td>
<td>£457,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>£741,691</td>
<td>£801,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory’s Bank*</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>£360,250</td>
<td>£389,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Govt. Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt. Offices</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£254,294</td>
<td>£274,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Blockhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blockhouse Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£254,294</td>
<td>£274,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South of Leopard Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South of Leopard Hill</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,912</td>
<td>£228,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cedar Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£243,698</td>
<td>£263,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other allocated sites in City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other allocated sites in City</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>£682,356</td>
<td>£737,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Windfall forecast in City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windfall forecast in City</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>£1,824,560</td>
<td>£1,971,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WIDER WORCESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIDER WORCESTER</td>
<td>TOTAL 9,407</td>
<td>£14,122,575</td>
<td>£14,387,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * permitted

#### 5.12 Current situation: April 2013

- There is current pressure on places at primary level. An additional 15 temporary places were made available for September 2012 in Stanley Road Primary School with another 15 places added at Nunnery Wood Primary School. For September 2013, an additional 15 places will be added at Lyyppard Grange Primary School. The County Council has published proposals to make the increase at Stanley Road Primary School permanent from September 2014 and to increase St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School. A final decision on these proposals will be made in June 2013.

- Secondary school forecast is running accurately with sufficient places available across the City. Low numbers will continue with no expected increased until September 2018. The County Council will continue to monitor the situation.

#### 5.13 MALVERN HILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Completions</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALVERN HILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements Dwellings Primary</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Completions etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Malvern</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>£1,483,382</td>
<td>£1,602,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QinetiQ</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>£529,779</td>
<td>£572,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern: other</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>£311,510</td>
<td>£336,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey sites</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>£292,438</td>
<td>£316,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powick sites</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>£63,574</td>
<td>£68,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushwick sites</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£122,909</td>
<td>£132,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lr. Broadheath Sites</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£110,194</td>
<td>£119,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenbury sites</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>£148,338</td>
<td>£160,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Small Sites</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,911</td>
<td>£228,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj the Crown (west), Martley</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£108,075</td>
<td>£116,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Villages Sites</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>£434,419</td>
<td>£469,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern windfall forecast</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>£1,190,944</td>
<td>£1,286,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALVERN HILLS TOTAL</td>
<td>4598</td>
<td>£5,007,473</td>
<td>£5,411,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.14  Current situation: April 2013
5.15 MALVERN

- There are sufficient primary school places but numbers are forecast to rise. The County Council will monitor the situation and, if necessary, act to increase places. Some schools are known to have space on their site to expand if needed.
- There are surplus places in the secondary schools and numbers are not expected to increase significantly in the next few years.

5.16 MARTLEY

- Sufficient primary places for next four years. Need to monitor numbers in rural areas.
- Sufficient places at secondary school for in-catchment applications.

5.17 TENBURY

- There are sufficient places at both primary and secondary phases for all in-county applications for the next four years.

5.18 WYCHAVON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions etc.</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich: Copcut Lane</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>£1,568,147</td>
<td>£1,694,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vines Lane, Droitwich</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,912</td>
<td>£228,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherwich, Droitwich</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>£169,529</td>
<td>£183,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich, Former Land Rover Garage (permitted site)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£178,006</td>
<td>£192,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich: other allocated sites</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>£97,479</td>
<td>£105,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Cheltenham Road</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>£847,646</td>
<td>£915,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Valuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Cheltenham Road (permitted site)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>£334,820</td>
<td>£361,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Pershore Rd, Hampton</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>£847,646</td>
<td>£915,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Abbey Road</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£423,824</td>
<td>£457,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Peewit Road</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£133,504</td>
<td>£144,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Offenham Road*</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>£1,076,512</td>
<td>£1,163,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: Kings Road</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,912</td>
<td>£228,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham: other allocated sites in Town</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>£269,128</td>
<td>£290,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore: Station Road/Wyre Road</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>£1,271,470</td>
<td>£1,373,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore: Three Springs Road*</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>£286,081</td>
<td>£309,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore: Other allocated sites in Town</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>£250,056</td>
<td>£270,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway sites</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>£288,200</td>
<td>£311,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway: Leedons Caravan Park</td>
<td>166 (mobile homes)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlebury sites</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,912</td>
<td>£228,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeybourne sites</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£158,934</td>
<td>£171,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeybourne: Permitted sites</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£243,699</td>
<td>£263,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkberrow sites</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£211,912</td>
<td>£228,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenham sites</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£103,837</td>
<td>£112,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernhill Heath: Small sites</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£254,294</td>
<td>£274,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton: Crookbarrow Road*</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£156,815</td>
<td>£169,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Category 1 Villages</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>£406,871</td>
<td>£439,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Category 2 Villages</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>£625,140</td>
<td>£675,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Category 3 Villages</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>£305,153</td>
<td>£329,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wychavon Windfall forecast</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>£2,040,710</td>
<td>£2,205,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYCHAVON TOTAL</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>£13,185,149</td>
<td>£14,248,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *permitted

**SWC OVERALL TOTAL**  
Primary: £32,315,197  Secondary: £34,047,499  Total: £66,362,696

5.19 Current situation: April 2013

a) DROITWICH

- Sufficient places for all in-area applications for the next four years in all three phases.
b) EVESHAM

- There is a significant difference between the urban and rural areas with the village schools dependent on the movement of pupils out from the town.
- Demand for places in the town schools has increased. The County Council has consulted on increasing the number of places available by expanding Bengeworth CE First School, which is adjacent to the permitted development site at Offenham Road.
- The middle and high schools are expected to have surplus places for the next few years.

c) PERSHORE

- All phases have surplus places. Numbers are not forecast to increase significantly in the next few years.

GENERAL METHODOLOGY

5.20 General Note on methodology of calculation of financial contributions

\[(\text{Number of houses} \times 0.029 \times \text{Number of children per year group per house generated}) \times \text{Building Cost Multiplier (for school phase)} \times \text{number of year groups in phase.}\]

- All figures are based on 2012/2013 building cost multiplier and approximate number of dwellings within the SWDP. Each individual figure will be finalised when applications for development have been received and figures can be reviewed at this time.

EARLY YEARS

5.21 The County Council has a statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of pre-school provision to allow all 3 and 4 year olds resident in Worcestershire to access free entitlement to childcare and Early Years education. From September 2013, some 2 year olds will be eligible for free nursery education.

5.22 Where new schools are created to serve new development, it is likely that some form of pre-school provision will be established and this will be decided on a case by case basis.

POST-16 EDUCATION AND TRAINING

5.23 Under current legislation, those enrolled in education must remain in education until the end of their statutory “school age”, which lasts until the end of June of the school year in which they become 16. By 2015, all young people will be required by law to stay in education or training until their 18th birthday.

5.24 The Education Funding Agency funds post-16 education. The County Council has a statutory responsibility to secure sufficient, suitable post-16 education and training to meet
the reasonable needs of all young people in Worcestershire. The County Council does not fund school sixth forms or other post-16 education or training but the on-going strategic planning of post-16 requirements will be undertaken by the County Council to ensure sufficiency of education and training opportunities in terms of volume, mix and balance, location, meeting economic and community need and quality of provision.

HIGHER EDUCATION

5.25  The University of Worcester is the County’s only University and is one of the growing universities in the country combining excellent academic quality with strong links with businesses, hospitals, schools and other public, private and community organisations. The student numbers currently stand at around 10,500 students with 95% retention rates. The University has a fully funded £100m. investment programme to provide for new, improved and refurbished facilities. Recently completed projects include the new City Campus. The restored Infirmary is a focal point for excellent education, a centre for the arts, a resource for businesses and a dramatic fusion of old and new architecture.

5.26  Worcestershire County Council and the University of Worcester have worked together to create a new multi million pound City Centre library, history and customer centre for students and the public. The Hive was opened in July 2012 and is already a winner of two international awards for the building’s design and sustainability and is the first of its kind in Europe. It is home to 12 miles of archive collections, a quarter of a million books, 800 study stations and has acted as a regeneration catalyst for the City.

5.27  In addition, the University Sports Arena is well underway with a planned opening in May 2013, providing a 2,000 seat venue in the City Centre. The Worcester Arena will enable the University to offer unique services to local sports clubs in the community as well as to elite and professional athletes around the Midlands. With spacious high tech facilities, it can look to develop more innovative schemes, whilst also providing a venue that will attract a great range of spectator events to the City (see also section 5D).

5.28  The University has produced its Strategic plan for 2013-18 in which it sets out its mission statement including aspirations:

- To be an outstanding university at which to be a student
- To make a transformational contribution to the positive development of the cultural, social and economic life of the city of Worcester and the wider region.
- Human health and well being
- Economy, social and environmental sustainability
- Planning permission was granted on 31 October 2012 for mixed use development of the site (P11K0588), which allows for a new University campus, business (use class B1), hotel (use class D1), care home / extra care (use class C2), crèche and nursery (use class D1), health and fitness (use class D2) and retail (use class A1).
B) HEALTH AND PUBLIC HEALTH

5.29 It is important that health and development planning are fully integrated and it is a NPPF requirement that planners promote healthy communities. There are a number of ongoing significant reforms within the planning and public health arenas and these strengthen the argument for recognising and valuing the influence that planning, housing and environmental functions have on improving health and well being and reducing health inequalities.

5.30 The recent position is set out in Chapter 9 of the Needs & issues Paper (June 2012) which is the evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy.

5.31 The NHS is going through major structural reform in April 2013. Commissioning in the future will now be done by the National Commissioning Board, Local Authority (Public Health) and over 200 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). There will be a need to review infrastructure responsibilities and emerging capital programmes as a result of this period of transition.

5.32 NHS Services are currently provided by the Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust, including the Worcestershire Royal Hospital, and the Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust.

5.33 An important meeting took place on 05/04/12 between the County Council, SWC, with the key health agencies. At that meeting, it was explained that both the Acute Hospital Trust (WAHT) and the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust (WHCT) are in the process of developing new estate strategies as a result of the changing needs of the population and the need to make efficiency savings of around 20%.

5.34 The WHCT has a clear vision for the future, developing a hub and spoke model in order to ensure that they operate from high quality fit-for-purpose buildings located in the right place. The WAHT are in the process of a wider Joint Services Review (JSR), the outcome of which will determine how best to deliver services in the future.

5.35 These initial discussions all suggest that there is unlikely to be any new capital investment in new infrastructure in the short term. The focus is likely to be on refurbishment or expansion of the existing estate. This is partly driven by sustainability considerations and the need to reduce the estate’s carbon footprint.

5.36 These same organisations were consulted regarding the SWIDPIPS in summer 2012 and again on the SWIDP in early 2013.

5.37 Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust advise that the timescales for concluding the JSR are such that the results will not be known for this version of the SWIDP.

It then goes on to comment:

“Perhaps more significant is the projected population growth across the County, particularly that in South Worcestershire, which will inevitably lead to increased demand for healthcare including acute hospital services. Whilst more intensive use of facilities can absorb some increased demand this is inevitably at the margins and as with the education sector the healthcare sector may have to look to CIL and developer contributions to support the provision of additional health provision whenever major housing developments are undertaken. Services provided by the Acute Trust are funded via Commissioners and the payment by results mechanism. Therefore, any projected increased health demands as a result of development growth will need to be discussed with the new CCGs and other
Commissioners who would be required to fund such services and the associated capital and health infrastructure requirements.

Worcestershire Royal Hospital would be required to receive the majority of increased demand for acute hospital in patient, out patient and day case services from developments in South Worcestershire. Those towns with a community hospital such as Evesham, Pershore, Malvern and Tenbury may be able to accommodate some limited demand locally whereas in Worcester and Droitwich all new residents will look towards Worcestershire Royal Hospital for all their in-patient and out-patient care.

Inevitably, all these patient facilities will rise as the population grows as a result of development within South Worcestershire which will have a significant impact upon services and facilities at Royal Worcestershire Hospital and the resultant hospital infrastructure improvements which will be required.”

5.38 The Worcestershire Health & Care NHS Trust is supportive of the proposals in the SWDP and the SWIDP. It goes on to state;-

“We need to be sure that the governance arrangements put in place are able to wire into other local strategies. For example, if the accident & emergency services are consolidated at the (Worcestershire) Acute Royal what implications does this have for local routes and the need to get patients from longer distances into the Royal site as soon as possible.”

5.39 Key recent points from the evidence base of the WIS include;-

- The commissioning architecture is being completely reformed. From April 2013 the Worcestershire PCT has been abolished and its functions transferred to:
  a) Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), including one for South Worcestershire.
  b) A NHS Commissioning Board, based in Leeds, which has some sub-national structures with a second tier covering West Mercia (Worcestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin).
  c) Some services will be commissioned by a revamped Public Health Arrangement involving the local authorities with the County Council having a new function to improve population health.

- Existing assets are reviewed in the evidence base. Reference is made to recent investment in community facilities including new community hospitals in Pershore and Malvern and new GP premises in Malvern.

- Reference is made to the Baker Associates Study in assessing the capacity of existing assets. There are some pragmatic rules of thumb in terms of future provision. Thus, an additional GP is needed for an extra 1,500 people whilst an extra dentist is needed for an extra 2,000 people.

- In terms of future provision, there will be an important strategic role for the County Council in preparing a Joint Strategic Assessment which will set the context for commissioning by the CCGs and other commissioning bodies. This will be kept under review by a Worcestershire Health and Well-being Board.

- It is important to remember that any assessment of future need and provision for capital infrastructure is being undertaken during a time of major structural reform and financial pressure in the NHS. The 2012 Health and Social Care Act creates a new market in health provision and it is not yet clear what the consequences of this might be for health infrastructure planning.
5.40 It will be important to continue to work with the County Council and the health infrastructure providers to continue to update this position for future versions of the SWIDP. This is particularly important in respect of the impact of those changes which have become operational from April 2013.

C) SOCIAL CARE

5.41 The recent position is set out in the Chapter 9 of the Needs & Issues Paper (June 2012) evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. However, the provision of social care infrastructure is not considered strategic by the County Council in the context of the infrastructure strategy, which is why it will not form part of the emerging WIS.

5.42 The evidence base states that the County Council has a responsibility to support, care and protect people in the community; there are a wide range of social care needs from the very young to the elderly. Infrastructure will be required to support these people as a result of population growth. This covers a wide range of infrastructure types from residential homes to children’s centres.

5.43 The evidence base lists out the range of facilities available in Worcestershire.

5.44 The County evidence base goes on to consider the pressure on existing assets. It states that the changing needs of the population (e.g. ageing population) and the changing nature of delivery (e.g. improvements in medical procedures, the move to independent living, the move to personalised budgets) have meant that there is a move away from the need for larger facilities and this will increase in the future. Instead, there is an increasing drive to deliver services closer to patients, in community facilities or in the patient’s home. Changes to service delivery and disability standards could result in different requirements for property; making some properties redundant and need for more buildings/facilities in different locations as services move.

5.45 A number of other impacts could flow from the demographic change and the shifting pattern to more localised independent living solutions, an increase in adaptive technology and the increase in care in the community:-

- Increased need for a percentage of adapted housing stock
- A move to flexible lifetime housing allowing easy adaptation from single to married to single occupation.
- A reduction in churn of the associated housing stock where there is a concentration of older residents.

5.46 The JSNA (Joint Strategic Needs & Assessment) for Worcestershire Adult Health and Well Being has given an indication of how the supply of specialised housing for older people in Worcestershire may need to change in future, as set out below. This is based on the projected demographic changes, shifts in policy and older people’s expectations:

- Sheltered housing to rent 1,171 fewer properties
- Sheltered housing for sale 4,636 more properties
- Enhanced sheltered housing for rent or sale 1,610 more properties
- Extra care housing for rent or sale 1,938 more properties
- Housing based provision for dementia 838 more places
- Residential care places 3,068 more places
- Nursing care places 1,069 more places
5.47 This schedule has implications for the County in terms of duty of care that will be extrapolated down to the District authorities through assessment of SHMAs and Housing Strategies. There is the additional need to identify providers of such services i.e. local authority or private sector.

5.48 This section has been prepared with the information made available by the County Council in 2012 but it would be sensible to refine this section of the SWIDP in due course.

D) COMMUNITY FACILITIES

5.49 The recent position as of early 2011 is set out in the Chapter 10 of the Needs & Issues (June 2012) evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy but this section of the SWIDP has been expanded to include South Worcestershire specific information.

5.50 This section focuses on the provision of community facilities such as libraries, faith buildings, community centres and leisure facilities, which are all important aspects of creating sustainable communities. These facilities need to be front loaded in the development process so that these facilities are available when new residents need them. However, new facilities need a critical mass of people to support them. Given a lead time of 2 years to design and build a community facility, the evidence base suggests that they should be provided midway through the delivery of future developments.

5.51 This section tries to give an initial perspective from the point of view of the County Council and before then looking at specific community facilities. Together this gives a more holistic approach than was possible in the SWIDPIPS in July 2012 but it would still be helpful to update and refine all of this section for future versions of the SWIDP.

5.52 The Worcestershire Sustainable Community Strategy presents a vision of;

“a County with safe, cohesive, healthy and inclusive communities, a strong and diverse economy and a valued and cherished environment.”.

5.53 The County Council states that the key theme around the future development of community buildings within Worcestershire will be partnership working across the public and voluntary sectors at schemes that look to co-locate and integrate facilities where possible. It will not be about developing new bespoke facilities such as libraries, museums and community centres, but rather it will be about working with partners such as schools, Parish Councils and local communities to co-locate facilities in a given area. These facilities will often be run locally through the voluntary sector with the public sector taking less of a direct role. On this basis, the County Council does not consider the need for specific new infrastructure in the near future but it should be noted that this is a statement which concentrates on just their own functions.

5.54 The County Council in May 2012 did provide two general statements on social and community infrastructure which are summarised below.

Statement One.

5.55 The County Council recognises that the public services landscape will have to change over the next few years in response to the global economic climate. Public sector funding levels are expected to continue to experience downward pressure, demographic changes will impact on levels of demand for services and customer expectations will continue to evolve. In response Worcestershire County Council is embarking on a programme of fundamentally reviewing all of its activities with the view of ensuring that it
delivers the right level of service through the most appropriate provider at the right price. This could result in significant change within the Council as it works close with communities and partners to develop different, innovative and sustainable ways of meeting need.

5.56 Worcestershire has a wide variety of communities whose needs and opportunities can be significantly different. As a consequence, the County Council believes that a "one size fits all" approach to service provision is inappropriate, preferring instead to develop bespoke solutions for individual communities. These bespoke solutions will, where possible, avoid reliance on single use buildings, preferring instead to promote multiple use of buildings. Some recent examples of this include:-

a) Working with the County Capital and Asset Partnership partners, the County Council is seeking to rationalise its operational portfolio through co-location of services. There are various initiatives where a number of partners are now sharing back office accommodation, and the Partnership is examining potential efficiencies that will arise from the collaborative use of staff training venues, vehicle maintenance and depots. (See also Statement 2).

b) Funding for positive activities for Young People will be delegated to local Member Forums which will commission targeted positive activities for young people in their local area and use whatever accommodation is deemed appropriate. This may result in existing Youth Service facilities becoming redundant or possibly become an asset transfer to a community group.

c) The Libraries Service is looking at a number of innovative partnership arrangements which may involve sharing staff and buildings as well as exploiting technological advances to enable services to be maintained or improved at lower cost. These arrangements will often involve reliance on local volunteers, and may also include an asset transfer to a community group.

d) Adult Day Services are also experiencing change, The County Council has moved away from traditional day centres for the physically disabled and with the advent of personal choice and personal budgets, service users and their carers now have a wide choice of activities available to them from within the wider locality. The County Council will continue to provide a drop-in centre in its major towns where service users may be dropped off and access care facilities before undertaking their chosen community based activity. This model is now being piloted by the Learning Disability Service.

e) The County Council has a small number of specialised residential homes for the elderly and for people with Learning Disabilities. The County Council also provides Respite services. The pattern of service provision may be subject to commissioning review in future.

Key Points from Statement Two.

5.57 The Worcestershire Capital and Asset Partnership is engaged with Central Government’s Total Place and subsequent Capital and Asset Pathfinder initiatives, focusing particularly on developing a closer working relationship with other public sector organisations in the locality regarding the use of property and collaborative service development. The Partnership includes 19 full partners with an additional 17 organisations from across the public and third service sectors being regularly involved as Stakeholders. Examples of this activity in South Worcestershire include:

a) Droitwich, where the library, CAB and Worcestershire Hub have co-located into the library, improving customer footfall, extending service availability, reducing running costs and releasing two buildings for disposal.
b) Pershore, where the Town Council has bought the Library building, is refurbishing it and co-locating the Library with Tourist Information service and other voluntary groups to improve service availability at a lower cost.

c) Broadway, where options to co-locate Police, Library, Parish Council and a voluntary organisation are under consideration.

5.58 This section has been prepared with the information provided by the County Council in 2012 and it would be sensible to refine this section of the SWIDP in due course.

LIBRARIES

5.59 The County Council has a statutory duty to provide a public library service and to ensure that it is "comprehensive and efficient". However, previous standards for library provision have been abolished and it is now for local authorities to determine how to provide an efficient service.

5.60 There are currently 23 public libraries in Worcestershire. In Worcester City, these are in St Johns, Warndon and Worcester. In Malvern Hills, these are in Malvern, Martley, Tenbury Wells, Welland and Upton-upon-Severn. In Wychavon, the libraries are in Broadway, Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Pershore.

5.61 The County Council is assessing libraries individually over a three year period. The proposal is to take an individual approach to reform of the service rather than a one size fits all or "salami slicing", engaging with local communities and partners to come up with a model, supported by the County Council working with communities and local Members, to deliver a service which meets the needs of communities and provides a sustainable and efficient service. As part of that consultation process, the County Council is seeking expressions of interest from the local community in running a library.

5.62 The recent position on the various libraries is set out on pages 136-138 of the Needs & Issues Report (June 2012).

5.63 A new multi-million pound Library and History Centre in Worcester City Centre was opened in July 2012. The centre known as "The Hive" is the first of its kind in Europe providing the community with a range of services and facilities which include:-

- A fully-integrated public and university library
- Worcestershire Record office
- Worcestershire Historic Environment & Archaeology Service
- Worcestershire Hub Customer Service Centre.

It is anticipated that The Hive will attract over a million visitors a year (see also section 5A).

5.64 The County Council hopes that future investment in libraries will be managed and delivered in a joint way with other providers of community infrastructure, such as the NHS and/or the police authority.

5.65 This section has been prepared with the information provided by the County Council in 2012 but it would be sensible to refine this section of the SWIDP in due course.
FAITH BUILDINGS

5.66 In this section, faith buildings cover a wide range of faiths and various types of infrastructure, including not only the place of worship but also any associated buildings (e.g. Church halls) which might serve a wider community purpose.

5.67 The earlier version of the County evidence base in March 2012 contains information on religious buildings but this has not been included in the June 2012 Needs & Issues Paper nor is there any reference to this in the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy because it is not regarded as strategic infrastructure. Instead, this section has been updated in liaison with the faith communities for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP.

5.68 Reference is made in the March 2012 County evidence base to some general research done in Cambridge by Three Dragons which concluded that 6% of the population actively participates in religion; and that an indicative standard of 0.5 ha per 3,000 dwellings is suggested but with the proviso that provision should be based on an assessment of local religious need.

5.69 There is no information in the March 2012 County evidence base on the funding of religious buildings but there was an event in 2009 on “Faith in the future of Worcestershire” and information from this event has been revisited by SWC in spring 2013. At this meeting in November 2009, the Worcester Diocesan Secretary presented a paper. This recognised the scale of new housing proposed in Worcestershire and the need for all faith communities to work together to ensure that the necessary preparation was done in advance of new development. He emphasised the importance of capacity building of both people (existing faith groups and existing & new residents) and buildings, urging the use of existing buildings, wherever possible.

5.70 The position was refreshed and reappraised at a SWC meeting on 27/03/13 to look at the comments of the faith communities on the SWIDP. At that meeting with SWC, there were present the same Worcester Diocesan Secretary, the Diocesan Heritage Buildings & Community Development Officer, the University Chaplain & Bishop’s Inter-faith officer and the Worcestershire Diocese Ecumenical Officer. This meeting reappraised the situation across South Worcestershire. There was very positive evidence of the different faiths and different denominations working together to make sure that facilities were available to all that required them. The principles regarding faith buildings in respect of new development, as set out at the November 2009 conference, were confirmed as remaining sound. Much valuable detailed information was provided for use by SWC and the point about the need for early engagement of the faith communities in any proposed new development was reaffirmed.

COMMUNITY CENTRES

5.71 There is information in the June 2012 version of the Needs & Issues evidence base but this is not directly covered in the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy as this is not seen as a strategic issue. Therefore, information specific to South Worcestershire have been added to this section.

5.72 Community facilities provide valuable facilities to promote community cohesion. It is important with significant levels of proposed residential development that appropriate community facilities are provided.

5.73 The County evidence base assesses current provision with a detailed assessment of the pattern of community provision in Worcester City drawing on existing studies.
5.74 The March 2012 evidence base assesses general standards and, in particular, the Baker Associates Study suggestion that an average standard of one 750 sq.m. facility is provided for every 2,250 dwellings is used to calculate the community centre requirement.

5.75 In respect of youth provision, the June 2012 evidence base sets out the stark reality of a £1.4m. cut in County funding over a 3 year period for youth support. The consequence is that the County Council will no longer be the provider of Youth Support and will instead be the commissioner for this provision. This means that the current assets would be no longer be required by the County Council for delivering youth support activities and alternative sustainable options are required. This will have implications both in the level of support and the release of County building assets.

5.76 This section has been prepared with the information provided by the County Council in 2012 and it would be sensible to refine this section in due course.


5.78 WORCESTER

Worcester City Council’s PPG17 Open Spaces Indoor Sports and Community Recreation Assessment was carried out in 2006. In terms of community provision, the audit focused on the extent and location of existing provision, rather than the quality.

The Assessment highlighted City and Council Community provision. Subsequently these have been transferred over to Worcester Community Trust (WCT) and other local organisations as stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre and Ward</th>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Current arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dines Green, St Johns</td>
<td>Youth Club Community Centre (two separate buildings)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (28 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronkswood, Nunnery</td>
<td>Community centre (one building)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (28 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre, Cathedral</td>
<td>Youth Club Community Centre (two separate buildings)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (28 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolladine, Gorse Hill</td>
<td>Community centre (one building)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (28 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Warndon, Warndon</td>
<td>Youth Club Community Centre (two separate buildings)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (28 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s, St John’s</td>
<td>Youth Club (County Council)</td>
<td>Transferred to WCT (3 year lease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyppard Grange, Warndon Parish Council</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Transferred to local organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s, St Peter’s</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td>Owned by local Parish Council, WCT assist in management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2006 PPG17 Assessment audit highlighted the following private provision:

**Private Community Recreation Provision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Provision Details</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretum</td>
<td>2 Church halls 2 Private Community</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battenhall</td>
<td>2 Church halls 2 Private Community 1 Youth Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedwardine</td>
<td>2 Church halls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>10 Church halls 7 Private Community 3 Youth Facilities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claines</td>
<td>4 Church halls 1 Private Community 2 Youth Facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorse Hill</td>
<td>2 Private Community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunnery</td>
<td>2 Church halls 2 Private Community</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Hill</td>
<td>3 Church halls 1 Private Community 1 Youth Facility</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Clement</td>
<td>1 Private Community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>5 Church halls 2 Private Community 2 Youth Facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s Parish</td>
<td>1 Community Facility 1 Youth Facility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephens</td>
<td>1 Community Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warndon</td>
<td>2 Church Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warndon Parish North</td>
<td>2 Church Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warndon Parish South</td>
<td>2 Community Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WYCHAVON

5.79 The last full survey was carried out in 2007. The information was updated (desk top rather than resurvey) in November 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Condition of Public Hall (where investment is needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashton under Hill</td>
<td>Possible rebuild on different site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckford</td>
<td>Needs rebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredon / Bredons Norton / Westmancote</td>
<td>Refurbishment needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleeve Prior</td>
<td>Capacity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakes Broughton / Wadborough/ Pirton</td>
<td>Needs rebuilding if village (Drakes Broughton) grows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich Spa</td>
<td>Westlands – needs major refurbishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td>Wallace House – needs major refurbishment Public Hall – needs rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlebury</td>
<td>Needs rebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Middle Littleton</td>
<td>Needs rebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton-Juxta-Kempsey</td>
<td>Refurbishment needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombersley and Doverdale</td>
<td>Rebuild needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pebworth</td>
<td>Refurbishment needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td>All 3 halls have capacity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinvin</td>
<td>Rebuild needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgeberrow</td>
<td>Rebuild needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MALVERN HILLS

5.80 The Malvern Hills District Council Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2007) identified 45 village, church and community halls in the District. No shortfall in provision was identified at the time of the Study but this will need to be reviewed in the light of the planned housing development during the Plan period; however, there is a specific requirement for a community hall as part of the North East Malvern urban extension (SWDP 56).

CURRENT POSITION

5.81 All of this information on Community Centres needs to be refined and updated during 2013 but this was not available for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP. Once reviewed by the three SWC Councils, the updated position can be included in a subsequent version of this SWIDP.

SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

5.82 Sport and recreation are important contributors to the health and economy of local communities. This section includes the full range of sports and recreational facilities, including Built Leisure. Built leisure includes infrastructure such as swimming pools, sports and leisure centres, theatres and cinemas. This more holistic approach to this section of the SWIDP is in accordance
with the advice received from Sport England on 07/09/12. It has also been decided not to limit the assessment to strategic sports and recreational facilities because, whilst playing field provision is normally dealt with at the District level, this SWIDP underpins the SWDP and local facilities must be considered for plan-making. Moreover, playing field provision had originally been covered in the Green Infrastructure section in the SWIDPIPS and there is certain logic to that. However, on balance, and in response to the County Council’s helpful representations on this matter dated 18/09/12, the playing field section is now included in this Sports & Recreational Facilities section of the SWIDP.

5.83 The main evidence base is the July 2010 Nortoft Study on Sports Facilities Framework, which covers the time period up to 2026. There had been a representation from Sports England which expressed some concerns about the methodology but following advice received from Wychavon D.C.’s Sport and Development officer, the SWC Councils concluded that the methodology used in the evidence base is appropriate.

5.84 In terms of the general assessment of existing assets, reference is made in Chapter 10 of the June 2012 County Council Needs & Issues Paper, to the Sports England recommended approach.

5.85 The evidence base and the emerging Strategy contain new material on South Worcestershire which makes extensive cross reference to the 2010 South Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework. Generally, sports facilities and playing pitch needs have been identified by a local standard of provision (e.g. the number of facilities needed per 1,000 population in new housing. The Programme for Development (POD) identifies built sports facilities, playing field proposals and tennis and Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs). It states where these should be located and the expected phasing of implementation which is related to the delivery dates of the individual housing developments. The drivers behind the proposals are:

- natural population changes
- new population from the new housing
- policy objective of 1% per year increase in participation.

Priorities for spending on these facilities will depend on the local authority’s POD and Programme of Works (POW).

5.86 The contributions which are to be sought from residential development are based on the capital costs of providing a typical facility.

5.87 The last part of the June 2012 evidence base on Built Leisure refers to the University having completed the first stages of developing “The Worcester Arena” including a centre for drama, dance, sport and performance teaching facilities. The Arena is now complete and is due to open in May 2013.

5.88 A new swimming pool proposal at Perdiswell is being progressed by Worcester City Council. The potential start date is late 2014, with completion by early 2016. This was considered a commitment at the 26th March 2013 meeting of the Council.

5.89 The evidence base for the emerging WIS (Needs and Issues) refers to the fact that a hierarchy of sports facilities has informed the process of identifying levels of developer contributions and is fully explained in the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework.

5.90 The contributions sought are based on the capital costs of providing a typical facility. For sports facilities costs have been calculated using a combination of Sports England costings and other appropriate data.
5.91 In some cases, new residential developments will not generate the need for a new sports facility. However, where developments are located in areas where additional pressure will be placed on existing sports facilities by the development, the local authorities will seek contributions at the standard rate for the enhancement and extension of existing sports in the vicinity of the development.

5.92 It goes on to say that, where larger developments can generate a need for and/or locate suitable playing pitches/fields, then these will be located on-site. Otherwise, off-site contributions will be sought to support nearby existing or new sites and/or for identified, more strategic sites, such as larger, high quality, multi-pitch sites serving more than the local need.

5.93 No further updates or refinements were available for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP although the three SWC Councils intend to undertake further review work and updating work during 2013.

5.94 The SWIDPIPS contained a schedule on the capital cost of built leisure facilities. This was updated by the three SWC Councils in autumn 2012 with further minor refinements in May 2013.

**Summary of Schedule**

University of Worcester Sports Arena: £10m.

New Swimming Pool, Worcester: c. £10.5m.

4 court Sports Hall (linked to Worcester West): £2.7m.  
Plus full size synthetic turf pitch and tennis courts

4 court Sports Hall plus outdoor tennis court, (linked to Worcester South): £2.7m.

6 court Sports Hall (badminton performance centre): Worcester: £4.1m.

Full size 3G football STP, Worcester

6 rink indoor bowls centre, Worcester

4 court indoor tennis centre, Worcester

6 outdoor tennis courts, Worcester

2 MUGA (Multi Use Games Areas), Worcester

8 Lane synthetic athletics track, Malvern Hills: Malvern College

Outdoor athletics facility, Malvern: school site in rural area

5 court Sports Hall (indoor cricket), Wychavon: £3.4m.

8 court Sports Hall, Droitwich or Evesham, Wychavon: £5.5m.

4 court sports hall (expansion of existing facility) and 2 court sports hall, Wychavon: £5.5m.

25m. 4 lane swimming pool (private): Wychavon

4 court sports hall, Wychavon
Outdoor athletics training facility, school site, Evesham

3 court Indoor Tennis Centre, Wychavon

Outdoor athletics training facility, school site, Pershore

Worcester: 25m. pool plus teaching pool (linked to Worcester West) : £3.9m.

5.95  No further significant updates or refinements were available for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP although the three SWC Councils intend to undertake further review work and updating work during 2013.

PLAYING FIELDS IN SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE

5.96  The March 2012 County evidence base makes extensive reference to the South Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework (SWSFF), together with the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework and the three District Playing Pitch Strategies: No further updates or refinements were available for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP

5.97  The SWSFF focuses primarily on facilities designed for community sport and physical activity. The SWSFF suggests that proposals contained in SWSFF should be considered alongside other local facilities including parks, play areas, routes for walking, cycling and horse riding.

5.98  The demand and supply of grass playing facilities, primarily for football, cricket and rugby have been considered as an integral part of the SWSFF. The findings in relation to grass pitches are summarised below.

5.99  Although both Malvern Hills and Wychavon have a generally sufficient stock of playing fields to meet their communities’ needs up to 2026, there are some notable shortages of provision in Evesham, Malvern and, to a lesser extent, Droitwich. These deficits will worsen as new housing is developed in these towns and additional playing fields should be provided. There is a major export of players in all of the pitch sports from Worcester City to Wychavon and, to a lesser extent, to Malvern Hills. The export is primarily due to a lack of pitch provision within the city of Worcester and the situation will worsen if the increased participation rates are achieved for each of the sports and the anticipated housing is provided.

5.100  The South Worcestershire Programme of Development (POD) and Developers’ Contributions Report is part of a suite of documents that make up the SWSFF. The POD provides the details of how the proposed built facilities and playing fields should be provided including location, costs and phasing. It also contains policy proposals in relation to developers’ contributions.

5.101  The POD identifies the facility needs, their locations and the expected phasing of delivery based on the following timescales; up to 2016; 2016-2021 and 2021-2026. The Developers’ Contributions section takes the identified facility needs and identifies how to calculate the developers’ contributions in respect of new housing.

5.102  The drivers behind the SWFF arise from a combination of:
- Natural population changes
- New population from the new housing
- A policy objective of a 1% per year increase in sports participation.
5.103 There is a table in the County Council March 2012 evidence base of the WIS drawing on the SWSFF then goes on to give playing field need in South Worcestershire. This information was checked again by SWC in spring 2013 and is reproduced below in paragraph 5.105.

5.104 No further significant updates or refinements were available for this May 2013 version of the SWIDP although the three SWC Councils intend to undertake further review work and updating work

5.105

- Worcester East (location tbc but separate from cricket site in East): 6.9 ha for football: 2016-2021.
- Worcester West SUE: 4 ha. for cricket: 2016-2021
- Worcester South SUE: 2 ha. for cricket: 2021-2026.
- Evesham SUE (Hampton/Pershore Lane or Cheltenham Road): 6 ha. for football: 2011-2016 & 2016-2021.
- Evesham South or SW SUE (Hampton/Pershore Lane or Cheltenham Road): 2 or 4 ha. for cricket: 2011-2016 & 2016-2021.
- Droitwich Spa SUE (north of Pulley Lane preferably or possibly Copcut Lane): 2 ha. for cricket.

Notes:
Playing fields are to be developed as and when the new housing developments are commenced.
SUE: Sustainable Urban Extension

5.106 The County Council March 2012 evidence base states that the contributions sought are based on the capital costs of providing a typical facility. The calculation includes basic building costs, landscaping and external works, professional fees and initial equipment costs.
5.107 It states in the evidence base that the SWSFF has calculated that the total future need for playing fields is 60.45 ha. Costing has been calculated at £125,000 based on:-
- £80k per 6400 sq.m. (Sport England: 2010) = £125,000.

5.108 Therefore, total contributions for South Worcestershire are estimated at £9,548,750.

E) EMERGENCY FACILITIES

5.109 The current position is set out in this section of the SWIDP, which has been produced in partnership with the emergency services.

5.110 Evidence prior to this includes the most recent draft of the Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (WIS), which was published for public consultation in January 2013. The evidence supporting the WIS comprises chapter 11 of the Needs & Issues Paper (June 2012), which is the evidence base of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. Worcestershire County Council is working in partnership with the Emergency Services with respect to the WIS on an ongoing basis, where appropriate. However, it is recognised that the majority of emergency services infrastructure requirements are local in nature and therefore best considered at a local level. The County Council will continue to work with Emergency Services around specific larger scale infrastructure requirements, and also through the Capital Asset Partnership.

5.111 The Emergency Services were consulted on the SWIDPIPS in summer 2012 and the SWIDP in early 2013 and the responses on behalf of West Mercia Police were assessed and have been discussed with their consultant and the SWIDP amended accordingly.

5.112 Emergency services infrastructure includes the requirements of West Mercia Police (WMP), Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service (HWFRS) and the West Midlands Ambulance Service (WMAS).

5.113 All three emergency services are currently in the process of adapting themselves to the austerity measures and Government financial plans for the public sector. In relation to HWFRS and WMAS, the impact of this is not yet fully understood. As information becomes available the SWIDP will be updated. In relation to WMP however, the impacts are becoming clearer.

Police and Security

5.114 WMP is required to identify £20 million in savings by 2015. This is mainly due to cuts in Government funding, but also resulting from a freeze in the Council Tax precept for policing for 2013/14.

5.115 Key to meeting the tough financial challenge has been the establishment of a ‘Strategic Alliance’ between WMP and Warwickshire Police. This involves both Forces sharing assets as much as possible, to ensure that services can be delivered in the most effective way.

5.116 In addition to the above, a review of WMP’s estate and all its premises has taken place, to ensure that it continues to be fit for purpose whilst delivering savings of £1.5 million. This will involve closing some sites and subsequent relocation to alternative premises. However, service delivery to the public will be maintained at present levels.

5.117 At the time of writing, draft proposals for implementing the above have been published for public consultation by WMP until 31 March 2013. It will be only after this date that proposals for
closures and relocations to alternative premises will become finalised. The three SWC Councils will work with WMP closely and update the SWIDP, as and when appropriate.

5.118 The key point to highlight though is that the cost savings and associated changes being made by WMP are all related to maintaining WMP’s existing capacity and capability to deal with the current level of development and population across South Worcestershire and to address existing deficiencies.

5.119 WMP consequently has no resources at all to enable the provision of the additional infrastructure that will be required to address the demands arising as a result of the future development and population growth proposed in the SWDP.

5.120 With all three emergency services, the impact of development growth relates to two main issues. Firstly, increased development and associated population growth leads to an increased number of incidents which require an emergency response. Secondly, there will be a significant impact on response times and delivery of day-to-day services. New developments provide new destinations to be serviced and therefore will require additional emergency services infrastructure to be provided, if response times and services cannot be acceptably delivered using existing infrastructure. Additional funding and/or in-kind contributions will consequently need to be secured to provide an acceptable level of emergency services cover commensurate with development and associated population growth.

5.121 WMP and HWFRS are working together on infrastructure planning as part of wider work under the Worcestershire Capital & Asset Pathfinder initiative. WMP and HWFRS in turn regularly consult with WMAS to ensure that all three emergency services coordinate their infrastructure planning for future development and population growth.

5.122 The evidence base that examines and calculates the infrastructure required by the emergency services to accommodate the additional demands that will arise from the delivery of planned development and population growth is, as of Spring 2013, provided by the following sources:-

- Planning for Infrastructure in Worcestershire – Consultation on Strategic Options to inform Preparation of Strategy – June 2012.
- West Mercia Police and WYG – South Worcestershire Strategic Infrastructure Assessment – Addendum Note – February 2013.
- West Mercia Police and WYG – South Worcestershire Strategic Infrastructure Assessment – Addendum Note – September 2012.
- West Mercia Police and WYG – South Worcestershire Strategic Infrastructure Assessment – November 2011.

5.123 The above evidence base explains the impact of the autumn 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review and the tough funding formulae for grant for emergency services mean that only revenue costs are funded. Revenue funding is being squeezed as for other infrastructure providers. The emergency services will struggle to find capital for infrastructure and are, therefore, seeking developer contributions to maintain an acceptable level of service delivery, as detailed above.

5.124 Key points from the evidence base regarding WMP requirements are as follows:-

- WMP commissioned WYG to undertake a Strategic Infrastructure Assessment (SIA).
The SIA examined and calculated the infrastructure the police will require to accommodate the demands arising from the delivery of planned development and associated population growth. Infrastructure requirements include buildings, personnel (comprising both operational and support staff), vehicles and operational equipment that would be required to support the growth proposals of the SWDP.

- The SIA which was originally submitted to SWC in November 2011, but whose findings were reconfirmed by WYG in February 2013, concludes that the following additional infrastructure will be required by WMP:-
  a) Worcester South- Police Station- £1,625,000
  b) Worcester West- Police Station- £1,625,000
  c) Worcester North and East Urban Extensions- Two Police posts- £159,000 each.
  d) Extension to Evesham Police Station- £1,420,000
  e) Extension to Pershore Police Station- £800,000
  f) Three new police posts: Droitwich Spa, Hartlebury and Newlands, (NE Malvern.)Each of which will cost £159,000.
  g) Custody facilities expansion (2 cells)-Worcester-£106,000.
  h) Total capital infrastructure cost; £6,371,000 (including land cost).
  i) Additional officers (set-up costs for 64 no. officers) - £244,014
  j) Additional vehicles and other operational equipment - £566,565
  k) Additional central support staff (set up costs for 32no. support staff) - £86,464

- As the above requirements result from the delivery of planned development and associated population growth, WMP considers that the majority of these costs will need to be funded through the planning system.

- The SIA explains in detail why the majority of the costs associated with meeting the infrastructure demands of development and population growth cannot be met through the police's own funding mechanisms.

- The evidence base more generally contains information on those significant development proposals that have come forward, as of autumn 2012, and WMP’s responses to them.

- WMP have also made site specific submissions in relation to their Hindlip Park HQ. The SWDP proposes that Hindlip Park be designated as a Major Development Site (MDS) in the Green Belt which, if confirmed, would allow appropriate development within the MDS boundary.

- In response to the recent public consultation on the Proposed Submission Document version of the SWDP, WYG has confirmed that WMP’s infrastructure requirements remain the same.

5.125 Members of the SWC Councils are supportive of WMP and understanding of their budget situation. However, in view of the scale of police requirements, questions have been asked of the prioritisation of police requirements. This has been raised with WMP and the answer is that the timing of WMP infrastructure will be determined by the phasing of specific development proposals. For example, if major development proposed for Evesham comes forward ahead of a proposal, say an urban extension for Worcester, the extension to Evesham Police Station will be required in advance of the infrastructure needed in relation to the urban extension. If two major development proposals come forward simultaneously, clearly each will require the appropriate infrastructure provision simultaneously in order for WMP to be able to comply with its statutory duty to maintain effective policing. Conversely, if developments proposed in the SWDP do not proceed, there will be no requirement for the additional directly related infrastructure provision.
Fire and Rescue Service

5.126 Turning to the HWFRS, a review of the evidence base reveals that their capital infrastructure in South Worcestershire consists of the following:
   a) 1 whole time fire station in Worcester
   b) 3 day-crewed stations in Malvern, Droitwich and Evesham and
   c) 5 retained duty stations in Pershore, Broadway, Pebworth, Tenbury Wells and Upton-upon-Severn.

5.127 Having analysed the capacity of these stations relative to the development proposals within the SWDP, HWFRS has concluded that they do not require additional capital infrastructure. Instead, HWFRS (with the support of WMP and WMAS) are advising developers to incorporate the following within their proposed schemes:
   a) Adequate water supplies for effective fire fighting, as existing HWFRS funding is insufficient to meet the costs of providing fire hydrants in all new developments across south Worcestershire.
   b) The installation of automatic water suppression systems in all new housing and other developments. This is because these systems are proven to reduce significantly fire deaths, injuries and property damage as a consequence of fire. This is because they control fires with minimal water and reduce the toxic smoke plume fall out, as well as reducing the contaminated water run off from fire.
   c) The design of new housing and other developments must ensure that the emergency services can access all areas and buildings. Ideally, there should be a dedicated access road that connects with the surrounding highway network. In addition, proposals involving on-street car parking within developments must not hinder emergency service access.

Ambulance

5.128 Turning to WMAS, it is their intention to consolidate their estate into centralised hubs supported by a network of Community Ambulance Stations. This will drive down costs by reducing occupied floor area. Surplus estate will be disposed of to enable maximum efficiency savings which will be redeployed to provide enhanced patient care.

5.129 The above process will thereby ensure that fit for purpose accommodation is located in the best locations to support its new operating model, termed “Make Ready”, in order to address the following issues:
   • Poor location factors.
   • An aged estate in poor condition with escalating maintenance costs.
   • Reduce occupied floor area and
   • Reduce annual running costs.

5.130 It is anticipated that the cost of creating a central hub in Worcester will be £0.4m., with the total being met through capital receipts raised from the disposal of former ambulance stations.

Partnerships

5.131 Alongside all of the above, the three emergency services continue to work actively with partners to determine where further efficiencies and savings can be achieved. A key example of this
is the “Strategic Alliance” between WMP and Warwickshire Police. In addition, WMP and HWFRS are working closely to identify opportunities to share buildings. The aim of both these areas of work is to deliver services in a way that achieves greater operational and organisational resilience for the parties involved.

Development Contributions

5.132 In view of the above and the specified infrastructure requirements to respond to the demands arising from development and associated population growth, it is reasonable to expect new developments to contribute towards the cost of new emergency services infrastructure.

5.133 In this respect, WMP has negotiated successfully contributions from a number of developers on sites in South Worcestershire. However, it is becomingly increasingly apparent that development schemes are progressing ahead of the adoption date of the SWDP. This in turn means that limited contributions are being received, as negotiation of contributions towards police and emergency services infrastructure needs is taking place with reference to currently adopted local planning policies, which for the most part did not include reference to contributions to this type of infrastructure.

5.134 All of the emergency services recognise that further detailed infrastructure planning work will be required as the SWDP and its associated SWIDP progress. This is already underway through proactive partnership working.
SECTION SIX: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

A) INTRODUCTION

6.1 This section of this document is written not only in support of Policy SWDP 7 on Infrastructure but also revised Policy SWDP 5.

6.2 Reference should be made to SWDP 5 in the Proposed Submission Document and the supporting reasoned justification. SWDP 5 sets out, inter alia, the requirements for development to make provision for green infrastructure.

6.3 The recent position on Green Infrastructure is outlined in chapter 13 of the County Needs & Issues Paper (June 2012) which is the evidence base for the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (WIS). There is a recent statement of the County Council position on Green Infrastructure in the emerging WIS. There has been on-going consultation with the County Council and also with Natural England on the SWIDPIPS and then the SWIDP and the comments of these two organisations are reflected in this May 2013 version of the SWIDP.

6.4 Green Infrastructure has been defined by the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership as "the network of green spaces and natural elements that intersperse our cities, towns and villages. It is the open spaces, waterways, gardens, woodlands, green corridors, wildlife habitats, street trees, natural heritage and open countryside. Green infrastructure provides multiple benefits for the economy, the environment and people". This is in accordance with a standard West Midlands definition, as first set out in the West Midlands Green Infrastructure Prospectus in 2007/2008.

6.5 As explained in the County Council evidence base, Green Infrastructure considers both public and private assets in both a spatial dimension (e.g. areas or corridors) or as theme running through the various forms of infrastructure provision. The multi-functional nature of Green Infrastructure means that it performs a number of roles, delivering ecosystem services, which can include provisioning, cultural, regulating and supporting services. These include biodiversity, landscape, physical and mental health and well being, contributing to flood attenuation, climate change mitigation etc. and, of course in providing a setting for the growth and development of a sustainable economy.

6.6 In considering future need, provision and funding of green infrastructure, it is important to recognise the multi functional role of such space and the different delivery tools for its planning and provision.

Examples of green infrastructure given in the evidence base include:
- Sites protected for their historic or nature conservation value.
- The implementation of SuDS (sustainable drainage systems) within new development.
- Sustainable transport solutions, such as footpaths or cycle ways within new or existing development.
- Creation of parks and open space in both new residential and commercial development.
- Regeneration or improvements to public space.
- Flood plains flood defence schemes.
- Innovative building design e.g. green roofs.
- Wider landscape enhancements through countryside stewardship or management plans of owners.
- Playing pitch provision.
6.7 There has been increased national recognition in recent years of the continuing importance of parks and green spaces. This was included the PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport & Recreation. This is superseded by the NPPF though this does still emphasise the importance of open space even if it is less prescriptive in defining a standard approach. PPG17 Open Space, sport and recreation has not been superseded and remains valid as good practice.

6.8 Other aspects of Green Infrastructure include the protection and potential enhancement of existing green infrastructure and environmental assets and public rights of way. This promotes informal recreation and other safe walking and cycling routes as part of healthy lifestyles.

B) STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT OF GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

6.9 The County Council evidence base explains that a baseline assessment of the green infrastructure themes for biodiversity, landscape, historic environment has facilitated the development of an Environmental Character Areas map for Worcestershire, as part of the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy.

6.10 This combined assessment has been undertaken to give a high level analysis of the overarching quality of Green Infrastructure within each character area in Worcestershire. This is accompanied by a series of objective tables which highlight the issues and priorities for each of the character areas providing the focus for intervention.

6.11 The map identifies areas of strategic intervention based on the existing Green Infrastructure quality and the broad strategic approach to be taken i.e. protection, enhancement of existing assets or creation of new assets.

6.12 The work on the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy by the partnership is on a broadly parallel but not identical course to both the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and this SWIDP to support the SWDP. The draft Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy was available at the end of December 2012. The draft GI strategy was considered by the Worcestershire GI Partnership in March 2013. The draft document has been reviewed by the GI Partnership in March 2013 and is now being amended prior to a second phase consultation outside of the GI Partnership. This approach has been endorsed by the GI partnership. It will therefore, be necessary and appropriate to update section 6 of the SWIDP in due course to synchronise as far as is possible in the SWDP the emerging conclusions of all three documents. There is on-going positive dialogue with the County Council in this respect.

6.13 The Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy (WGIS) is being prepared by the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership. This consists of representatives from the County Council, the six Local Worcestershire Councils, government agencies and the third sector.

6.14 The purpose of the WGIS is to co-ordinate and plan green infrastructure across Worcestershire arising from both new development and to supplement and enhance existing Green Infrastructure provision and functionality. The strategy will “provide guidance on maximising the functionality of green infrastructure using an ecosystems services approach and working through the Green Infrastructure Partnership to influence and inform their investment decisions which will both impact on and assist the delivery of green infrastructure in the County".
6.15 The WGIS will bring together the existing evidence based framework documents to set out a programme for priority strategic infrastructure projects. The four framework documents will be completed by the end of May 2013 and the WGIS will be completed for adoption by the Green Infrastructure Partnership by June 2013. Framework documents 1, 2, 3 are now complete.

6.16 The WGIS will be supported by Concept Plans and Statements, which support the delivery of Green Infrastructure on individual strategic development sites. These will undertake an assessment of the individual strategic development sites to support and deliver green infrastructure based on an assessment of the individual green infrastructure themes and the priority issues for the site. This approach is being piloted via certain SWDP Sites, such as Worcester South, North East Malvern, Worcester West and Station Road, Pershore. A number of concept plans and statements have been produced so far, outlining the key Green Infrastructure principles and priorities for the sites to enhance, protect and create Green Infrastructure. This approach is currently being tested to determine the long term viability and deliverability of this approach.

6.17 Significant progress has already been made in the assessment of assets across Worcestershire. The typology of Green Infrastructure assets is varied recognising its multifunctional role. Key assets could be seen to include the woodlands, river corridors, country parks (e.g. Worcester Woods), formal parks, allotments, footpaths, cycle ways and SuDS.

6.18 Emerging Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Study Informal Recreation work, prepared for the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Steering Group by Land Use Consultants, contained the following summary table of sub-regional Green Infrastructure recreational assets in South Worcestershire. This has now been included in the Framework Document 3: Informal Recreation which addresses the issues and opportunities for informal recreation in Worcestershire.

**Primary assets:**
- Malvern Hills etc 1,373.3 ha.
- River Avon 415.9 ha.
- River Severn 374.7 ha.
- River Teme 305.7 ha.
- Shrawley Wood 157.9 ha.
- Kempsey Common etc. 103.3 ha.
- Worcester Woods 33.8 ha.
- Worcester Riverside 6.3 ha.
- Evesham Country Park 39.8 ha.

**Linear Assets:**
- Droitwich Canals 11.4 km.
- Staffs. & Worcestershire Canal 31.8 km
- Worcester & Birmingham Canal 44.3 km.
- North Stratford Canal 0.73 km.
- River Avon 72.4 km.
- River Lugg 20.7 km.
- River Severn 96.7 km.
- National Sustrans cycle route 41 19.4 km. (Bristol to Rugby via Evesham)
- National Sustrans cycle route 46 22.3 km. (Droitwich Spa to South Wales via Worcester & Malvern)
- National Sustrans cycle route 45 & 46 106.9 km. (Salisbury to Chester via Worcester & Droitwich)
- Sustrans Regional Cycle Route 44 13.5 km (Pershore to Worcester Cycle Route)
6.19 This same assessment report establishes a clear pattern of assets that run through the central north–south corridor of Worcestershire close to the centres of population coming under most pressure. The majority of assets are at risk from increased visitor pressure from planned development both within and outside Worcestershire. Future development largely reinforces the pattern of current visitor pressure on assets with the central north-south corridor coming under pressure as the population increases in places like Worcester and Kidderminster.

6.20 The partnership will be considering five Potential Green Infrastructure Schemes, as recommended by Land Use Consultants, three of which are in South Worcestershire but it should be noted that these are areas of search for indicative schemes which have not as yet been endorsed by the Green Infrastructure Partnership:-

- Worcester/Droitwich Park; canal ring centred on Hindlip and extending south to junction 6 of the M5
- Hallow Riverside Park: Grimley South to Northwick and Eastbury along both sides of the river
- Sandford (Clifton) Water Park: south of Draycott and extending south to the base of Knight Hill.

6.21 The needs for informal recreation will form a part of the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy, ensuring that sites can deliver a range of multi-functional benefits for Green Infrastructure.

**C) CALCULATING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS**

6.22 The County Council evidence base explains that in order to understand or test the viability of the provision of green infrastructure and the implications for developer contributions, it is necessary to have an understanding of the strategic provision of green infrastructure.

6.23 Such an assessment will need to include a summary and analysis of the District authorities PPG17 audits and play pitch strategies. There is then the difficulty in building a strategic picture because each District has adopted a differing methodology for assessing requirements.

6.24 The County Council proposes that strategic assessments will be informed by the Worcestershire AIRS (Access & Informal Recreation Strategy) and by Strategic Plans such as Local Transport Plans and Management Plans for AONBs.

6.25 In assessing green infrastructure provision, it is important to recognise that the distribution of provision by topology may vary significantly across a District. This can bring a significant disparity between total provision across a District, which may even have a surplus, and provision at a local scale, whilst at ward level there may be significant deficiencies.

6.26 Access to natural greenspace has been evaluated across Worcestershire using a methodology called ANGst, which has been developed by Natural England. This standard measures a distance/size threshold between different sites. Further information is available in the County evidence base.
Ultimately, the future provision of green infrastructure will need to be assessed on an individual site basis based on a site’s characteristics and those of surrounding neighbourhoods.

There is wide variation in the cost of open space provision identified across existing evidence. This reflects the differing experiences across the authorities and the varying costs of provision of different typologies and designs.

Indicative costs quoted from elsewhere are listed in the County Council evidence:
- Proposed woodland structure: whip planting; £3 per square metre.
- Linear park formal/soft landscaped: £75 per sq. m.
- Swales for 10m/ha of developable land: £200 per m.
- Dry attenuation basins (1 per 5000 houses): £100,000.

The County Council evidence base states that there is no overall assessment of the cost of Green Infrastructure in South Worcestershire as this will be determined by strategic priorities and schemes in the WGIS. The Partnership has produced a series of indicative generic capital and revenue costs for green infrastructure based on the type of interventions such as habitat creation, access improvements etc. Using a hypothetical site model, two indicative costs for green infrastructure on a strategic development have been developed for illustrative purposes and are quoted in the County evidence base:
- Capital costs: £19,226 per hectare of Green Infrastructure
- Maintenance (revenue costs): £1,346 per ha. per year.

Green infrastructure is a multifunctional asset and will be influenced by the plans and delivery mechanisms from a number of cross cutting areas. Therefore, in the County Council documentation, in order to avoid double counting, the analysis of cost (where available) has centred on the provision of green space rather than other assets such as sustainable transport infrastructure or SuDS though these will need to be picked up elsewhere in the overall analysis.

Currently in the County Council evidence base document, it is envisaged that Green Infrastructure will come forward through a number of routes including:
- Areas linked to the strategic allocations of housing and employment land.
- New sustainable transport infrastructure as part of LTP3 (Local Transport Plan).
- Requirements for SuDS approvals prior to planning permission under the 2010 Flood & Water Management Act.

The Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership currently has no direct funding and is not seeking direct funding as such. Nevertheless, funding will be required for the provision and enhancement of Green Infrastructure assets. In summary, funding envisaged to potentially come through:
- The local authorities themselves though this will be difficult in current financial climate
- Partner organisations: e.g. Natural England; Forestry Commission; Worcestershire Wildlife Trust etc.
- Central Government Departments including specific schemes such as Regional Growth Fund and Growth Point Funding
- Hypothecated Funding: e.g. Landfill Community Fund
- European Funding e.g. RDPE (rural); INTERREG; EU life+ (nature conservation)
- National Lottery: Big Lottery & Heritage Lottery Fund
- Developer contributions, s.106 contributions and, in time, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Financial markets where there is a future revenue stream
- Private sector endowments from individuals, businesses or communities
- Funding in kind from voluntary or not-for profit-groups
- Agri-environment schemes: e.g. Environmental Stewardship: English Woodland Grant scheme until 2013
- Local Transport Capital settlement can include walking & cycling schemes
- Local Sustainable Transport Fund for schemes which promote walking & cycling.
- Flood & Water Management Act. This mainly relates to Physical Infrastructure but there may be some scope under this heading.

**SPORTS & RECREATIONAL FACILITIES**

6.34 It is recognised that sports and recreational facilities can play an important role within the functioning of the Green Infrastructure network even though these are not, strictly speaking, Green Infrastructure. On balance and following a positive dialogue with the County Council on this matter, the section on Sports and Recreational Facilities, which was contained in section 6 of the SWIDPIPS has now been included in the relevant part of Section 5D of this SWIDP.

6.35 All of this Green Infrastructure section relates to the latest position from the County Council as of May 2013. It would also be sensible in future versions of the SWIDP to consider the more local aspects of green infrastructure which are also important in making developments more sustainable.
SECTION SEVEN: SPATIAL PLANNING OF INFRASTRUCTURE

7.1 After assessing Physical Infrastructure, Social Infrastructure and Green Infrastructure, the SWIDP now moves on to examine the Spatial Planning of Infrastructure across South Worcestershire. This is related to Appendix Y which itemises all the crucial infrastructure for South Worcestershire.

7.2 The provision of infrastructure is, by its very nature, something which changes through time. Hence the contents of this section may inevitably need some updating. The information listed out below from various sources is the best available at the time of publishing in May 2013.

7.3 The main sources of data are as follows:

i) SWDP: May 2013. This gives the relevant SWDP spatial policy as a reference point and then lists out the key infrastructure points as given under the relevant SWDP policy.

ii) SWIDP. Reference is made to earlier sections of this document and, in particular, the material gleaned and summarised from the latest version of the Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and its underpinning evidence base.

iii) The basic SWC schedule on Infrastructure produced in 2010/2011. This is a fairly full schedule giving costings and phasing in most but not in all cases. Reference has been made to this primary source material in producing this SWIDP.

iv) The Baker Associates Study which informed the South Worcestershire Councils’ submissions to the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public in 2009.

7.4 It should be explained that table 25, which appeared in the SWDP Preferred Options Consultation document of autumn 2011, has not been reproduced as part of the SWDP Submission Plan document. Instead, its contents have been divided and treated separately as:

a. The housing and phasing figures which formerly were in Table 25 have been revised as part of the separate work on the housing and employment figures under policy SWDP3 and in site specific allocation policies. They are, consequently, not repeated in this work as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

b. Appendix Y sets out all the crucial infrastructure requirements for the Plan with costings and phasing where known.

7.5 As a separate exercise, the County Council is preparing the Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. As the two documents progress, on-going liaison will seek to ensure consistency between them. Where costings are included in Appendix Y they have been based on source data from the service/infrastructure providers themselves (many elements of which are County Council sources).

7.6 The main infrastructure policies in this May 2013 SWDP Submission Plan besides SWDP 7 are SWDP 4, Transport, SWDP 5, Green Infrastructure, SWDP 62: Implementation and some of those site allocation policies which include specific references to infrastructure. The text below, and Appendix Y, associate infrastructure with site specific policies, where appropriate. However, it must be noted that these “associations” are for guidance only. In each case a development site is likely to need to contribute pooled contributions for infrastructure beyond the immediate needs of the development, whether collected by the current Section 106 arrangements or via the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules in the future.

7.7 New development creates demands for infrastructure in a variety of ways and it is important to keep in mind the full range and packages of new infrastructure required. For example, whilst new development creates a wide range of new requirements for the movement of people and goods, it is very important to bear in mind that this needs to be addressed by the full range of sustainable transport options, not just by increasing road capacity. This requirement is outlined in SWDP 4. Thus, whilst Appendix Y starts with transport schemes, they should not be considered in isolation.
7.8 The analysis which follows is summarised settlement by settlement in the order set out in the Settlement Hierarchy, Policy SWDP 2:

- Worcester
- Droitwich Spa
- Evesham
- Malvern
- Pershore
- Tenbury Wells
- Upton upon Severn
- Villages (Categories 1 to 3)
- Rural Areas (Categories 4a & 4b villages and lower).

7.9 Each “Place” section below sets out:

a) A table summarising the main policy reference points derived from the May 2013 SWDP, followed by

b) A description of the known list of infrastructure requirements, as now understood. For costings (where known) reference should be made to Appendix Y.

7.10 An explanation of the source requirements for infrastructure is set out in the earlier sections of this document: notably Transport (in section 4), Education (in section 5) and Green Infrastructure (section 6).

All developments across South Worcestershire will be expected to contribute to the transport requirements outlined in SWDP 4, including the Worcester Transport Strategy and wider South Worcestershire transport schemes and measures outlined in the SWIDP.

**WORCESTER a) Policy reference points (2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORCESTER – site allocations</th>
<th>Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associated Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SWDP 43 | City allocations | • Developer contributions expected for infrastructure including recreation, education and other community infrastructure.  
• All development will need to contribute as appropriate to the range of infrastructure required in order to make growth sustainable e.g. Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy (including transport infrastructure and services, as set out in SWDP 4; see text below for further details). |
| SWDP 44 | City Centre Opportunity sites | • All development will need to contribute as appropriate to the range of infrastructure required in order to make growth sustainable e.g. Section 106 |
| SWDP 45/1 | Worcester South Urban Extension: Broomhall Community and Norton Barracks Community. 2,450 dwellings (40% affordable) 20 ha. employment land Provision for two separate sites each up to 10 pitches for Travellers within or on the edge of the urban extension Local Centre | Development will need to contribute to:  
- Social and physical infrastructure including education, (new primary school) children’s centre and youth facilities  
- Provision of a parking hub to be agreed in consultation with Worcestershire County Council.  
- Provision of a local green network, including local green network buffers  
- Enhancements to sports and social facilities at Norton Barracks  
- Improvements to Southern Link Road A4440  
- Footpath and cycle networks within the development including safe links to Worcester City, the local centre and Norton Barracks community  
- Improved sustainable transport links to the City Centre, (the text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>Worcester West Urban Extension: Temple Laugherne 975 dwellings (40% affordable) 5 ha. employment land 10 pitches for Travellers Small local shops with contributions towards enhancing Dines Green Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- A network of open spaces, including play facilities, sporting and informal recreational facilities such as allotments  
- Local Green Infrastructure  
- Measures to maintain separation from Crown East and Lower Broadheath  
- Contributions to transportation, education, sporting and recreational facilities (the text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4).  
- Measure to improve access by non-car modes to Worcester city centre, including a parking hub facility close to the A4440. |
| SWDP 45/3 | Worcester East Urban Extension: Kilbury Drive |  
- Measures to maintain separation from Swinesherd Way |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SWDP 45/4 Worcestershire North Urban Extension: Gwillam’s Farm | 250 dwellings (40% affordable)  
Enhanced public realm related to local shopping provision.  
- Network of open spaces, including play facilities, informal open space and allotments  
- Measures to improve accessibility by non-car travel modes  
- Contributions to transport, education, sporting and recreational facilities (including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4; the text below this table provides further detail on transport.)  
- A traffic-calmed central spine road linking Spetchley Road to Whittington Road with appropriate public transport movements and facilities  
- Contribute to public realm enhancements related to local shopping provision at Baynham Drive  
- Development of Local Green Infrastructure Network.                                                                 |
| SWDP 45/5 Worcester Technology Park, Phase 2.              | Measures to maintain separation from Bevere.  
- Network of open spaces, including play facilities, informal open space and allotments  
- Contributions to transport, education, sporting and recreational facilities (including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4; the text below this table provides further detail on transport.)  
- Measures to improve accessibility by non-car travel modes to Worcester City Centre, Bevere, River Severn, local employment areas, schools, leisure centre  
- Development of Local Green Infrastructure Network. |
WORCESTER b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)

7.11 Junction capacity enhancements are expected on the M5 Motorway at both junctions 6 and 7 with an indicative cost of £4m at Junction 6 and £0.5m at Junction 7.

7.12 As set out above, the delivery of the planned growth contained in the SWDP requires investment in transport infrastructure and services, as specified in SWDP 4. The Worcester Transport Strategy sets out the key infrastructure required for the city and its immediate hinterland including, but not limited to:

- The A4440 Southern Link Road
- Key radial and orbital transport corridors to/from/around the city
- Rail station improvements
- New and improved passenger transport services and supporting infrastructure (particularly linking the urban extensions with the city centre and other key locations)
- New and improved walk and cycle infrastructure (particularly linking the urban extensions with the existing networks).

7.13 The A4440 Southern Link Road is already suffering congestion, although works were undertaken in the summer of 2012 at the Whittington roundabout and further improvements will be implemented as part of Phase 1 of the Worcester Transport Strategy (WTS). Significant further works will be needed, however, to accommodate the growth set out in the SWDP, both in and around Worcester and the wider plan area. This will include the dualling the A 4440 between Whittington Junction and the Ketch Roundabout (A44 to A38) by 2021. Allowance also needs to be made for further significant capacity enhancements to the section from the Ketch westwards in the later phase of the plan.

7.14 In addition to the dualling of the A4440, the improvements to the A4440 during the first phase of the plan period will include significant increases to the capacity of the Norton Junction. There will also be a need to provide improved pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities (including foot/cycle bridges over the A4440), and high quality passenger transport services (and supporting infrastructure) linking the proposed South Worcester urban extension with key destinations in and around Worcester City. In other words, the capacity and service improvements must relate to all modes, not just private transport.

7.15 In addition to work to improve capacity (for all modes) around the periphery of the City, key corridor improvements will be needed on the radial routes linking the urban extensions to the City Centre. These will include new and improved cycle routes, additional walk and cycle bridge to the north of the city (+ associated links), walk and cycle elements of key corridors schemes and, subject to business case and financial sustainability, additional park and ride.

7.16 Important enhancements to rail travel are needed at both Worcester Shrub Hill and Worcester Foregate Street Station which is the busiest station in the whole County. In addition, the County Council is progressing, in partnership with Network Rail, the development of the Worcestershire Parkway Station scheme located at the intersection of the Bristol to Birmingham line and the Worcester to Oxford line.

7.17 Other transport related schemes will include “Real Time Information Systems” for bus users, and better infrastructure generally on key bus routes, and other passenger transport elements of key corridor schemes.
7.18 One new primary school will be required in Worcester, principally to serve the South Worcester urban extension. Elsewhere, enhancements to existing primary and secondary schools will be required to meet demand without building further new schools.

7.19 In terms of built leisure facilities, the new Worcester Arena is due to open in May 2013 and three new sports halls will be required, along with new swimming pools (one a replacement and one new). This is detailed in Appendix Y. An extensive schedule of sports pitch requirements is included in Appendix Y.

7.20 Other crucial infrastructure includes new police stations for the south and west urban extensions and two new “Police Posts”. Custody facilities will also be expanded (2 cells). It will be desirable to encourage joint use of buildings to minimise the likely costs of providing dedicated single buildings for each function. An Ambulance ‘hub’ is also required at Worcester (including Wider Worcester Area).

7.21 In terms of Green Infrastructure, the County Council is in the process of developing a County-wide strategy that may well result in some sub-regional new facilities based partly in and near Worcester – possibly one based on the Worcester/Droitwich “Canal ring” and the other based on the River Severn and environs between Grimley and Northwick.

7.22 Other infrastructure demands cannot be specified at this stage. For example, the health needs of existing and new communities are all under review, following the wind up of the PCT and its replacement by new commissioning bodies. Likewise, precise details of water supply and treatment investment is awaiting further information from the water company concerned, as is details of new energy requirements.

7.23 **DROITWICH SPA**  a) Policy reference points (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWDP 48</th>
<th>Sites in Droitwich Spa, including regeneration of Netherwich Basin (includes residential, office retail and leisure elements).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associated Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Developer contributions expected for:- | - Improved passenger transport links to Birmingham and Worcester.  
- Droitwich Spa “Diamond Jubilee Walk” and cycle/walking networks.  
- Increased parking capacity at the station.  
- All development will need to contribute as appropriate to the range of infrastructure required in order to make growth sustainable (e.g. Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy), including contributions to transport infrastructure and services as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- Increased school capacity  
- New police infrastructure (including one new police post).  
- Regeneration of the Netherwich Canal Basin area for a mixed use scheme |

---

**DROITWICH SPA – site allocations**

**Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SWDP 48          | Developer contributions expected for:-  
- Improved passenger transport links to Birmingham and Worcester.  
- Droitwich Spa “Diamond Jubilee Walk” and cycle/walking networks.  
- Increased parking capacity at the station.  
- All development will need to contribute as appropriate to the range of infrastructure required in order to make growth sustainable (e.g. Section 106 contributions or Community Infrastructure Levy), including contributions to transport infrastructure and services as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- Increased school capacity  
- New police infrastructure (including one new police post).  
- Regeneration of the Netherwich Canal Basin area for a mixed use scheme |
comprising residential, office, retail and leisure elements.
• Re-opening of the Brine Baths.

**SWDP 49**

Droitwich Urban Extension (SWDP 49/1 Copcut Lane):
- 740 new dwellings
- 3.5 ha of employment land
- Local neighbourhood centre including shops, community facilities and a police post.

• Enhanced passenger transport, cycle and pedestrian connections.
• New public open space as appropriate, to incorporate and enhance the existing Green Infrastructure and community woodland and develop the ‘Diamond Jubilee Walk’. A landscaping ‘buffer’ will be included as part of any future Masterplan along the edge of the railway line.
• SWDP 4 outlines the requirement for all developments to contribute to identified transport infrastructure and services contained within the SWIDP.

**DROITWICH SPA  b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)**

7.24 As set out above, the delivery of the planned growth contained in the SWDP requires investment in transport infrastructure and services as specified in SWDP 4. The planned development in Droitwich Spa will put additional demand on the highway network in Droitwich and Worcester, including the A38 between Fernhill Heath and M5 Junction 5. This needs to continue to be monitored by the Highways Agency in respect of the motorway, in particular. Capacity enhancements on all the key A38 junctions will be required in conjunction with investment in passenger transport schemes and walking and cycling infrastructure to improve accessibility from new developments into the town centre and railway station. There will also be associated “Public realm” investments needed in the Town Centre.

7.25 The land required between Droitwich Spa and Stoke Works has been identified for safeguarding in SWDP 4 to support rail industry proposed improvements to rail services to/from South Worcestershire and the infrastructure needed to deliver them. For example, the enhancement of the frequency of services between Worcester and Birmingham New Street during Control Period 5 (Network Rail Delivery Plan 2014-2019), as initially proposed in the 2011 West Midlands and Chilterns Route Utilisation Strategy and the West Midlands Regional Rail Vision plans to extend electrification from Bromsgrove (due 2015) to Worcester (by 2024), with an aspiration to enhance service frequencies.

7.26 In Droitwich Spa, there will be a strong emphasis on Green Infrastructure, especially the “Diamond Jubilee Walk” around the Town. The landscape strategy will include community woodland and landscaped buffers. One of the potential sub-regional facilities, a project based on the Droitwich canal ring, will also benefit the Town. Development proposals will need to consider the capacity at the following sewer treatment works – Droitwich (Ladywood).

7.27 Community infrastructure will include appropriate investment in existing schools, a new police post and new sports pitches.

7.28 Various of the above points will come together in the redevelopment proposals for the Netherwich basin, which will be a significant infrastructure project in its own right.
## EVESHAM – site allocations

### Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SWDP 50 Evesham Urban Capacity Sites in Evesham | - Developments will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the IDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- Improved parking provision at the railway station.  
- New public open space/recreation facilities.  
- New pedestrian cycle bridge connecting Hampton with the town centre.  
- Enhanced hospital provision.  
- New pedestrian/cycle bridge connecting Offenham Road with the High Street.  
- Enhancement of Hampton Ferry.  
- New pedestrian and cycle crossing / bridge over the A46 at Vale Park.  
- Extension to West Mercia Police’s Section Station in Evesham and two new neighbourhood Police Posts.  
- Measures to improve accessibility through public transport, pedestrian and cycle links from the allocated sites to the town centre, local employment areas, schools, sports, health and community facilities and Evesham Country Park.  
- Extension to Evesham High Street Regeneration Project.  
- An extension of the riverside meadows to the west and north linking Corporation Meadows round to Boat Lane within a Green Infrastructure approach.  
- A broad network of local connections to the town centre designed to afford priority for walking and cycling.  
- Secure the integration of the leisure centre within the town centre. |
| SWDP 51 Evesham Urban Extensions: SWDP 51/1: Cheltenham Road 400 houses; protection of the Chemtura employment site. SWDP 51/2 South of Pershore Road, Hampton. 400 houses | - Enhanced passenger transport, cycle and pedestrian connections.  
- New public open space, green infrastructure, including alongside the River Isbourne and landscape buffers to new development sites.  
- Contributions to formal sporting facilities, |
SWDP 51/3 Vale Industrial Park
Phased delivery of approximately 38 ha (including landscaping) of B1, B2 and B8 employment land.

health facilities, schools allotments and transport (the text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP4)

- Contributions to the pedestrian cycle bridge across the River Avon
- Enhancements to Hampton Ferry.
- The provision of a new pedestrian / cycle bridge across the River Avon from Hampton to the town centre.

EVESHAM  b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)

7.29 As set out above, the delivery of the planned growth contained in the SWDP requires investment in transport infrastructure and services as specified in SWDP 4. The SWIDP identifies capacity enhancements required to the primary road network (County Council) and the Strategic Road Network (Highways Agency), and investment in enhancing accessibility by walk, cycling and passenger transport. This includes cycle/footbridges to connect key trip attractors/generators and investment in local and inter-urban passenger transport services and infrastructure enhancements will be required to improve access to the railway station.

7.30 The A46 is a trunk road, managed by the Highways Agency, who have carried out their own studies relating to proposals due to come forward during the plan period.

7.31 There will be significant investments to increase capacity of local schools, and social infrastructure will include new sporting facilities, an extension to the police station and fire station enhancements.

7.32 Attention to Green Infrastructure will include particular consideration of the River Isbourne and environs, and strategic landscaping corridors/buffers associated with the new developments.

7.33 The Evesham High Street Regeneration Project is expected to be extended.

7.34 Further investment in Evesham Hospital will be dependent on the overall review of the provision of Health facilities which is currently under way.

MALVERN  a) Policy reference points (2013)

MALVERN  – site allocations
Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 52 Malvern and Allocated Sites</td>
<td>Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the SWIDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SWDP 53 | Malvern Technology Centre 4.5 ha of B1 (or associated uses) employment land 250 dwellings | - Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the SWIDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- Open space and recreational facilities.  
- Links to green corridors.  
- Improved public transport links, walk and cycle facilities.  
- Provision of facilities to promote improved public transport to the site and new footpath and cycle routes to link to the existing built-up area. |
| SWDP 54 | Blackmore Park 4.5 ha of employment land | - Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the SWIDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- A masterplan for the site will be developed with the landowners. This should take full account of landscape issues and maximise the value of the existing woodland to the south. |
| SWDP 55 | Three Counties Showground Agriculture, horticulture, equestrianism and other countryside uses. | - Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the SWIDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport). |
| SWDP 56 | Development at North East Malvern 10 ha of employment generating uses. 700 dwellings Neighbourhood shopping facilities. | - Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the SWIDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport).  
- Community infrastructure including a community hall, cemetery and police post.  
- Green infrastructure: green buffer.  
- Sustainable transport measures, public transport and safe pedestrian/cycle links to local services.  
- Public open space: play areas, playing fields, informal open space and allotments.  
- Facilities to promote sustainable |
transport use for public transport and facilities for safe pedestrian and cycle routes linking to local shops, including the Malvern retail park, employment areas, health care, education and Malvern Link Station.

MALVERN  b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)

7.35  As set out above, the delivery of the planned growth contained in the SWDP requires investment in transport infrastructure and services, as specified in SWDP 4. Malvern will require a number of town centre (Great Malvern) improvements and improved links on the connecting roads including Townsend Way, Pickersleigh Road and the A4013 to A449 link via Leigh Sinton. These highway improvements will be required in conjunction with improvements to walk, cycle and local passenger transport infrastructure and services, including enhanced access to the railway stations for all modes.

7.36  Cycle and footpath links, both new and enhancements to existing, will be needed to ensure the new developments are properly served with sustainable transport options to provide access to key trips attractors/generators.

7.37  There will be investments to increase capacity in local schools, new football and cricket pitches, and a new police post at North East Malvern (Newlands). Development proposals will need to consider the capacity at the following sewer treatment works – Malvern (Mill Lane).

7.38  Malvern does, of course, benefit from nationally significant green infrastructure in the form of the Malvern Hills AONB - and appropriate green infrastructure links will be needed to enhance this very significant asset.

7.39  A specific Green Infrastructure concept plan for the development site at North East Malvern will be prepared and will need to be taken into account during the masterplanning process.

PERSHORE  a) Policy reference points (2013)

PERSHORE  – site allocations
Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 46 Pershore Allocations</td>
<td>• Development will also contribute to wider strategic infrastructure needs, as set out in the IDP, including contributions to transport infrastructure and services as outlined in SWDP 4 (the text below this table provides further details on transport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhancements of public transport and train links between Worcester, Evesham and Cheltenham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhancement of railway station and links to the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alleviate the bottleneck of the A44/B4082 Pinvin crossroads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pershore Urban Extensions:  
SWDP 47/1 Land to the  
North of Pershore  
600 new homes  
New Link Road if relevant.  
SWDP 47/2 Land to the  
North East of Pershore  
5 ha of employment land | • Link road between Wyre Road and A44 bypass (subject to technical justification). Wychvon District Council supports a new bridge and link to road from the A44 to the B4083  
• New open space  
• Education capacity enhancements.  
• Extend the High Street regeneration scheme  
• Green Infrastructure enhancements  
• Include provision for coach parking  
• Maintain and enhance the town’s shops and services, such as the emergency services and medical facilities;  
• Contribution to the Pershore Package elements of the SWIDP and a new bridge and link road between the A44 and the B4083. |

**PERSHORE b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)**

7.40 As set out above, the delivery of the planned growth contained in the SWDP requires investment in transport infrastructure and services, as specified in SWDP 4.

7.41 The main transport issues in Pershore associated with the planned growth set out in the SWDP include:
- the performance of the A44, particularly in the vicinity of Pinvin Crossroads
- the quality of access to the railway station (by all modes of transport), and the need to improve interchange facilities at the station
- the connectivity by walk, cycle and passenger transport modes to key trip attractors/generators including the town centre.

7.42 The measures needed to mitigate the forecast adverse impacts include (but are not limited to):
- Capacity enhancements to the A44/B4082 junction (Pinvin Crossroads)
- Enhanced access to Pershore station for pedestrians, cyclists and local passenger transport
- Improved car parking facilities at Pershore station as part of an upgrade of interchange facilities
- Improved infrastructure for passenger transport users and operators in and around Pershore
• Improved local passenger transport services
• Improved cycle facilities (including cycle parking in the town centre)
• Improved infrastructure for pedestrians.

7.43 There is a proposed scheme to provide a new link road between Wyre Road and the A44. It is referenced within the Worcestershire LTP3 (SW16) and is a scheme which the promoters view as being necessary to support economic growth. The scheme is to be considered subject to a suitable business case being provided. A jointly funded study, published in April 2013, identifies robust costings for the bridge link.

7.44 Investment will be needed to increase capacity of existing schools, and there will need to be pro-rata increases in public open space. The Police station will need to be extended.

TENBURY WELLS  a) Policy reference points (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenbury Wells and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 57/1 30 dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 57/2 40 dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Land at the Haven)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services as outlined in SWDP 4.

TENBURY WELLS  b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)

7.45 The small scale of development proposed should not be taken to diminish the role that Tenbury Wells has as the principal settlement in the west of the County, serving as it does the rural hinterland including adjacent areas of Herefordshire and Shropshire. However, no specific infrastructure needs have been identified and therefore a pro-rata approach will be taken to contributions from development to education, recreation, green infrastructure and other social needs.

7.46 Developer contributions expected for the package of transport infrastructure improvements for South Worcestershire (including proportionately, the WTS) are set out in the SWIDP. The contribution towards SWIDP transport infrastructure and services will be proportionate to the transport impact of developments located in rural areas.
UPTON UPON SEVERN  a) Policy reference points (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 58</td>
<td>The text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UPTON UPON SEVERN – site allocations**  
Summary of infrastructure needs as proposed in May 2013 SWDP

**UPTON UPON SEVERN b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements (2013)**

7.47 Upton upon Severn is, of course, very constrained by floodplain issues and flood mitigation works continue to protect the town where possible. This limits the scope for significant new development despite the importance of the town at a crossing point of the River Severn.

7.48 Whilst further enhancement of the town’s tourist potential will be encouraged, no specific infrastructure needs have been identified to support this. There is an extant consent for additional holiday accommodation and expansion of moorings at the marina. In common with most rural areas, there is a need for appropriate affordable housing.

7.49 In terms of Green Infrastructure one of the County’s potential sub-regional facilities, the Clifton (Sandford) Water park may come to fruition during the plan period in a location to the north of Upton upon Severn.

7.50 Developer contributions to infrastructure will therefore be applied on a pro-rata basis.

7.51 Developer contributions expected for the package of transport infrastructure improvements for South Worcestershire (including proportionately, the WTS) as set out in this SWIDP. The contribution towards SWIDP transport infrastructure and services will be proportionate to the transport impact of developments located in rural areas.

VILLAGES a) Policy Reference points (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Reference</th>
<th>Associated Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>The text below this table provides further details on transportation and requirements for developments to contribute to transport infrastructure and services, as outlined in SWDP 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>Category 1 Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWDP 61</td>
<td>Category 2 Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3 Villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VILLAGES  b) Description of Infrastructure Requirements

7.52 The infrastructure needs of individual villages vary considerably, especially in terms of highways and schools investment. Opportunities need to be taken on a village-by-village basis where, for example, local cycle and/or footpath connections require enhancement. Similarly, public transport investment needs to be looked at in terms of whole localities rather than related to individual development sites. This does not diminish the need for pro-rata developer contributions to strategic infrastructure to serve the plan area as a whole.

7.53 Developer contributions expected for the package of transport infrastructure improvements for South Worcestershire (including proportionately, the WTS) set out in the SWIDP. The contribution towards SWIDP transport infrastructure and services will be proportionate to the transport impact of developments located in rural areas.

APPENDIX Y

7.54 Reference can be made to the more detailed information set out in Appendix Y towards the end of this SWIDP.
SECTION EIGHT: COSTINGS OF INFRASTRUCTURE

8.1 The information has been drawn from a number of sources: often starting with the County Council evidence base and then progressing with work being undertaken for the SWDP and then liaising with infrastructure providers so that figures can be refined with the latest position. This is an on-going process and, as a “living document”, this SWIDP will be updated, as and when necessary.

8.2 The information drawn together in the process described above, taken with the information on funding sources contained in Section 9 and the consideration of delivery mechanisms in Section 10 allow some key conclusions to be drawn in Section 11. The vital issue of how much the infrastructure for South Worcestershire is likely to cost and what the potential funding gap is likely to be is of particular importance for the first phase of the SWDP plan. This is a particularly challenging issue for the SWDP because of the scale of infrastructure required, especially transport infrastructure. Both the County Council evidence and the SWDP evidence is constantly being updated in a proactive way with good liaison between the four authorities but it must be emphasised that the information on costs is still being updated and the work to identify funding is an on-going process which means that a precise funding gap figure can only be estimated at this stage in the planning process. However, both the County Council and the SWC Councils have made considerable progress together in 2012 and 2013 and further updating has been included in this May 2013 SWIDP. It has been particularly important to be as clear as possible on the costing of infrastructure which will be funded wholly or partly by the local authorities and also to try and establish, as far as is possible, the expectations for developer contributions.

8.3 The information on the costs of funding infrastructure in Worcestershire is contained in the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy. However, the County Council is in the process of updating the costings of funding strategic infrastructure in Worcestershire and, at the time of writing this report, that updating had not been completed for inclusion in this version of SWIDP.

8.4 In the interim, it is important to summarise the main sources of information on costing of infrastructure for each infrastructure stream in South Worcestershire:

PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Transport. Transport costs calculated by the County Council, supported by its consultants, Halcrow, and the Highways Agency and its consultants are set out in section 4A of this SWIDP and in the Transport Background Paper. The overall total capital cost is estimated to be over £204 m. with limited guaranteed funding at the time of writing this report. In addition there is an estimated additional £48m. maintenance cost.

Utilities. Information on renewable energy was derived from the County Council. For electricity, advice was received from the National Grid and Western Power Distribution. For gas, from National Grid Gas and Wales & West Utilities. Water & waste water information came from Severn Trent Water. Information on the schemes required is now a lot stronger than in the SWIDPIPS but in most cases there is still not yet a precise figure on funding. Many of these costs are likely to be incurred by the industry itself or recouped from developers.

Flood Risk & Drainage. Information came from the additional consultancy work, commissioned by SWC from JBA Consulting for the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Study. These interim findings have been discussed with the County Council, the Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water at a series of meetings in the second half of 2012 and the first half of 2013.

Communication Infrastructure. Information came from the County Broadband Team but there is not as yet a specific figure for South Worcestershire alone.
Waste Infrastructure. Information came from the County Waste Team and, given the single large facility at Hartlebury, it is hard to disaggregate this into a South Worcestershire figure.

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Education. Information for primary and secondary schools came from the County Council Schools System Team. Information about the University came from meetings between Worcester City Council and the University of Worcester during 2012. In terms of primary and secondary school provision, the total cost is estimated to be over £66m. for South Worcestershire, about half of which the County Council needs to recoup from developers.

Health. The initial information came from the County Council base and was refined and augmented through consultation and meetings with the Worcestershire Acute Hospital Trust and the Worcestershire Health and Care Trust. At the local level there were informal discussions during consultation events with local GPs and their representatives. Because of the health service being in such a state of flux at the present, it is not yet possible to indicate total funding costs for the Plan period.

Social Care. The initial information came from the County Council but will need updating in due course by the County Council.

Community Facilities. Much of the initial information came from the County Council. This was supplemented for Community Centres and Sports & Recreational Facilities by work commissioned by SWC, as described in section 5D of this SWIDP. The information on all these facilities is much stronger than it was for SWIDPIPS. However, this is being given consideration by the three SWC Councils through spring 2013 and firmer costings need to be incorporated in a future version of the SWIDP.

Emergency Infrastructure. This was derived from the West Mercia Police, the Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Service and the West Midlands Ambulance Service but in total these costings amount to about £7.84m. for South Worcestershire with no certainty about any of these requirements being funded through public finance.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

All the information came from the County Council in the first instance and the sources for their information can be found in section 6 of this SWIDP. At the time of writing, information is not available on any of these costings. This work focuses on green infrastructure and there is also provision of green infrastructure at the local level but again, at the time of writing this report, no detailed information on costings is available. It is worth mentioning that often Green Infrastructure will be provided by developers, with a contribution to maintenance, depending on the type of Green Infrastructure (see also Section Nine).

CONSULTATION ON COSTINGS

8.5 A full list of the consultees from both the SWIDPIPS consultation process in summer 2012 and the SWIDP consultation process in early 2013 is set out in Appendix Z to this SWIDP.
CONCLUSIONS

8.6 Whilst there is still some way to go in ascertaining the full costs of infrastructure to support the SWDP, the SWC Councils have decided to include in the SWIDP an indicative ballpark aggregate figure for infrastructure based on assumptions made from the available evidence. Thus, given the transport and education capital figures of over £270m, it seems reasonable to assume a total infrastructure capital cost of over £500m. This excludes a figure for waste which it is assumed is self funding. A strong case can be made for public funding and developer funding of major items such as transport and education. Some of the funding on utilities may be self financing. It might therefore be expected that the capital funding gap will be at least half of the total estimate (excluding waste). This is broadly in line with on-going infrastructure work by the County Council. However, it is recognised that all of this information needs to be reviewed and updated for future versions of the SWIDP. Once the SWDP is adopted, the SWIDP will be used as a tool to justify and, where appropriate, make a business case for regional and national funding opportunities. It is recognised by South Worcestershire Councils that the full cost of the infrastructure requirements set out in this document cannot all come from developer contributions.
SECTION NINE: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE

9.1 Given the scale of infrastructure required, as set out in sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of this SWIDP and the costings of infrastructure, as set out in section 8, it is important to consider the delivery of infrastructure required by the SWDP in this section.

9.2 This topic is given careful consideration in the SWDP: Proposed Submission Document and specifically in policy SWDP 62 and the associated text in the reasoned justification towards the end of the SWDP. Policy SWDP62: Implementation reads as follows:

**SWDP62 Implementation**

**A SWDP 62/1.** Planning obligations through section 106 agreements will continue to be sought to provide funding to mitigate negative impacts relating to specific developments. A s106 SPD will be produced for this purpose to be used in conjunction with the Community Infrastructure Levy Schedule

**B SWDP 62/2.** Progress on the delivery of the SWDP will be reviewed at intervals throughout the Plan period with the first review to take place in 2019.

9.3 Cross reference should also be made to the reasoned justification text which needs to be read in full. However, for ease of reference, the following key topics are summarised in this section:-

- **Introduction:** This explains the importance of the successful delivery of new development in the period up until 2030 in line with the vision, aims and objectives of the SWDP and the fact that this is coordinated with strategic infrastructure provision. It states that the successful implementation of the local plan will depend on the actions and contributions of a wide range of organisations and bodies including the private, public and third sectors.
- **Delivery and funding:** This refers to the role of the SWIDP, the need for a positive Development Management approach through the planning application process and the importance of funding being secured through a range of mechanisms, with engagement of the private sector, including the Worcestershire LEP.
- **Governance and a joint delivery partnership approach:** This talks about the continuation of a joint approach to overseeing the delivery of the Plan, building on existing informal arrangements initially and extending membership to include additional key players such as Worcestershire LEP and the Homes & Community Agency.
- **The Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership:** The importance of the LEP and their specific support not just for the SWDP but also specifically for the SWIDP has already been referred to in para.1.10 of this SWIDP document.
- **The Worcestershire Partnership and Place Shaping Group** and also the Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership: The Worcestershire Partnership aims to shape Worcestershire’s future by working with key stakeholders from the public, private and third sectors to unlock barriers to growth and to ensure that the County realises its full economic potential. This Group has been jointly set up with the Worcestershire LEP. The operational arm is the Worcestershire Place Shaping Group (PSG). The aim of the PSG is to shape Worcestershire by developing a strategic voice for the key strands of economy, housing, transport and infrastructure. Its role in respect of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy, as already referred to in paragraph 1.15 of this SWIDP and it will be picked up again in section 11.
- **Public sector bodies and land holdings:** Worcestershire County Council is the major public sector land owner in South Worcestershire. The three District Councils and emergency and health services also have land holdings throughout the area and therefore have the potential to have a direct impact upon the implementation of the Plan through the control of land and buildings.
• City and Town Centre Delivery Vehicles: Worcester City Council has raised significant funds through business rates to develop a Business Improvement District within its retail core as one of many vehicles to support the delivery of the City Centre Masterplan. The towns throughout South Worcestershire have developed a similar approach on a smaller scale with the introduction of Town Centre managers in towns such as Evesham, Pershore and Droitwich.

• Working with the Community: Each of the three partner SWC Councils is committed to involving the public in the development of policies and guidance and in determining planning applications. Moreover, once the SWDP is adopted there will be opportunities for local communities to produce their own Neighbourhood Plans.

• Phasing of Development and infrastructure: This section makes cross reference to the phasing of development as set out in the table under policy SWDP 3, and SWDP 2 on the Settlement Hierarchy, and to policy SWDP 7 on Infrastructure.

There are three delivery periods for phasing of development are as follows:-
  i) Phase One; 2006-2013. This largely relates to development prior to the adoption of the Plan.
  ii) Phase Two; 2013-2019. This represents the key stages for the delivery of strategic infrastructure and brownfield regeneration.
  ii) Phase Three; 2019-2030: the bulk of greenfield development will be delivered following the implementation of strategic infrastructure, including improvements to the Southern Link Road.

• Viability: This section sets out the overall context of the important viability issue. It cross refers to the separate Overall Viability Study commissioned by the three SWC Councils which demonstrates that the SWDP meets the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, especially paragraph 173 of the NPPF. This is available as a separate part of the SWDP evidence base.
SECTION TEN: DELIVERY OF INFRASTRUCTURE: FUNDING MECHANISMS

FUNDING SOURCES

10.1 The starting point for this has been the analysis in the County Council evidence base for the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and, in particular, the paper on Infrastructure Funding & Delivery Mechanisms which is dated March 2012 but was circulated in June 2012 (see in particular pages 11-59). In summary, this analysed the following funding sources and some specific South Worcestershire text has been added, where appropriate, at the end of this section, especially in light of the discussions at the 19/03/13 SWC Infrastructure Seminar:-

a. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). A planning charge where the legislation came into effect in April 2010. It is intended to act as transparent means of securing money to fund the infrastructure required to support growth. Updated regulations were issued in December 2012 and updated Government advice was published in January 2013. The latest progress in South Worcestershire is set out in paragraph 10.3 below.

b. Planning Obligations. The purpose of planning obligations (s. 106 agreements) is to secure requirements, especially infrastructure requirements that facilitate the granting of permission, whereas CIL is intended for more general infrastructure needs.

c. New Homes Bonus. This has been designed by Government to “incentivise” local authorities to increase housing supply by rewarding them with a “bonus payment”, equal to the national average for the Council Tax band on each additional property and paid for the following six years as an un-ring fenced grant. The latest position in South Worcestershire is set out in paragraph 10.2 below.

d. Neighbourhood Planning and Community Right to Build. This was introduced by the 2011 Localism Act and enables local communities to bring forward additional developments and add to the development management policies of the plan.

e. Community Right to Buy, which could be relevant in terms of Asset Management.

f. Devolving Local Major Transport schemes. The Government is proposing that local transport bodies would be responsible for establishing a programme of local major schemes for delivery beyond 2015.

g. Local Transport Capital Settlement for schemes below £5m.

h. Local Sustainable Transport Fund. Separate national funding of £560m.

i. Transport Funding. This is a particularly important topic for South Worcestershire and cross reference should be made to the County document. Some specific points are highlighted in paragraphs 10.4 to 10.6 below.

j. Water and Flooding. Again this is very important for South Worcestershire and direct reference should be made to pp. 22-26 of the County Council document.

k. Regional Growth Fund. This is a discretionary Fund that will operate until 2015 to provide support for projects and programmes with potential to create long term private sector led economic growth and employment. The Worcestershire LEP was successful in securing funding for the Worcester Technology Park.

l. Growing Places Fund. The Government’s Growing Places Fund is intended to generate short term activity by addressing immediate infrastructure and site constraints by empowering LEPs to deliver their economic strategies by establishing revolving funds so that funding can be invested to unlock further development and the leverage of private investment. Three successful schemes secured support in March 2012 at:

- University Park in Worcester: £1 million to help bring forward the first phase development of the proposed 47-acre University Park including an enterprise science and well-being park. This will provide opportunities for business users, and for partnerships between the University and companies working in areas including enterprise, science, health care, medical engineering, and environmental engineering.
- Worcestershire County Cricket Ground, Worcester: £750,000 funding to Worcestershire County Cricket Club to speed up its £10million redevelopment plans to aid construction of improved access and infrastructure to a new 120-bedroom hotel and to the club’s new hospitality, conferencing, administration and spectator facilities.
- Springhill Farms scheme on the A44 at Pershore: £275,000 for the development of a new road traffic island on the A44 to enable the construction of a £5million anaerobic digestor to generate energy and heat for the adjacent commercial glasshouses.

m. Get Britain Building scheme. This was a £420m. fund announced in November 2011 which aims to unlock stalled sites with planning permission.

n. Business Improvement Districts. A geographical area where ratepayers have voted to invest collectively in local improvement e.g. Worcester City Centre.

o. Grants & Funds such as the Landfill Community Trust Fund, the Aggregates Levy Sustainability Fund (ALSF), funding for the Voluntary and Community Sector and the Community Generation Fund are all explained on pp. 31-35 of the County Council document.

p. European Funding, including European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), European Local Energy Assistance (Elena), the Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE), Rural Enterprise Grant Scheme (INTERREG), the Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA), LIFE+ (for environmental schemes), the LEADER scheme (which funds projects and initiatives that benefit rural areas) are all assessed on pp.36-45 of the County document.

q. Local Authority Borrowing covering two closely related mechanisms:-
   a) Prudential Borrowing. Under the 2003 Local Government Act, local authorities can borrow to invest in capital works so long as the cost of that borrowing is affordable and in accordance with the principles set out in a professional Prudential Code. The South Worcestershire situation is set out in paragraph 10.2.
   b) Tax Increment Funding. (TIF). This is a mechanism for using anticipated future increases in tax revenues to finance the improvements to infrastructure; for example, that are expected to generate those increased revenues. It is a requirement that a TIF needs to have a comprehensive development plan so that piecemeal and uncoordinated development does not take place; in particular, there needs to be clarity about what infrastructure is going to be provided. The South Worcestershire situation is set out in paragraph 10.2.

r. Green Investment Bank for green infrastructure projects since April 2012 geared to achieving a low carbon economy.

s. Big Society Bank. There are outline proposals for this to act as a social investment champion.

t. Local Asset Backed Vehicle (LABVs). These are public and private partnerships that allow public sector bodies to use their assets (usually land and buildings) to attract long-term investment from the private sector in order to deliver socio-economic development and regeneration.

u. The County Council assesses issues such as Land Auctions, Asset Management & Co-location and Co-location from a Developers’ Perspective on pp 52-56 of the County document.

v. Enterprise Zones. The Worcestershire LEP is giving consideration to this with invitations being sought for expressions of interest in line with the April 2012 Prospectus issued by CLG.

w. BDUK- National and Local Broadband Strategy. This issue is of particular importance to South Worcestershire and cross reference should be made to pp.56-59 of the County document. This matter has also already been considered in Section 4D of this SWIDP.
10.2    All of the sources of funding for infrastructure and the issues raised in both the County
evidence and emerging Strategy and the statements in the SWDP and this SWIDP required further
work and progression, following the publication of the SWIDP in November 2012. This was
considered in earnest at the SWC Infrastructure seminar on 19/03/13. It was agreed that the
Treasurers of the four Councils would give a focused narrative on the key funding mechanisms in
liaison with relevant colleagues in the four Councils. This narrative is set out below:-

a) New Homes Bonus

New Homes Bonus (NHB) payments are un-ring fenced but they are unreliable as a funding stream
for infrastructure. Whilst amounts paid to the District Councils and County Council will be directly
linked to new homes built and occupied, whether the system continues in its current form or at all is
uncertain. Furthermore, New Homes Bonus payments are now regarded by the Government as
contributing to councils’ core ‘spending power’. Therefore, the extent to which Councils can use
any NHB to fund infrastructure will diminish rapidly as further financial pressures are applied to
Councils, certainly in the first 5 years of the Development Plan period. Assumed funding from the
New Homes Bonus for longer term infrastructure is therefore nil, although the Councils in South
Worcestershire have committed to use some current New Homes Bonus for community, economic,
infrastructure and social housing purposes.

b) Business Rates

The South Worcestershire Councils and Worcestershire County Council, along with Wyre Forest
District Council, have agreed to join Worcestershire Business Rates Pool (WBRP). Members of the
WBRP consider that the Pool will be an important enabler to drive forward economic growth and
create a positive framework for targeted investment across Worcestershire. In addition, the
operation of the WBRP will allow the investment of additional benefits gained through pooling into
the local economic environment, should adequate resources exist in the Pool Risk Reserve to
mitigate the effect of volatility in local business rates. Approximately 50% of retained levy as a
result of the creation of the WBRP will be added to the risk reserve and, once the risk reserve has
reached a £2m level, then this 50% share will be available for joint investment in infrastructure
across Worcestershire. Amounts available for South Worcestershire are difficult to predict and in
any event will be subject to resets to the business rates system. However, given a realistic
estimate of business growth in line with the Development Plan, then up to £5m should be available
to support the SWIDP in years 6 – 15 of the Plan.

c) Borrowing (including Tax Increment Financing)

Prudential borrowing is not favoured by Councils across Worcestershire currently. District Councils,
with boosted cash reserves following housing stock transfer, have generally been debt free for
some time and have been reluctant to take on new borrowing for political reasons and also given
the revenue implications of doing so. Low interest rates and often higher rates applicable to debt
also mean that the County Council’s recent policy has been to repay debt using cash reserves.
This reluctance to borrow is likely to continue in the short to medium term. Tax Increment
Financing (TIF) allows for prudential borrowing by a Council to fund infrastructure in anticipation of
future increased revenue streams from increased business rates. The Government is minded to
allow a certain number of TIF schemes to proceed where the future business rates growth would
not be subject to any levy or reset, allowing more of the growth to be retained locally. The County
Council has authorised in its Medium Term Capital Plan (2013/14 to 2015/16) scheme allocations to
the value of £36.1 million in addition to the forecast grants and third party contributions that will
receive for the intended purpose of Highways and Education infrastructure. Further information is
available in the County Council’s budget report to Cabinet in February 2013. Other than further
grants from Central Government and third party contributions, there remains little opportunity to extend Prudential Borrowing commitments over and above this current plan.

d) **Mainstream District Funding**

The District Councils in South Worcestershire do not receive capital grants from the Government for new infrastructure. Capital receipts are minimal and generally already earmarked to finance existing capital programmes. The extent to which mainstream district funding could be available as a funding source for the SWIDP is therefore minimal and cannot be relied upon.

e) **Mainstream County Funding**

The County Council receives notification of Central Government grants and third party contributions either within the year or shortly before the year in which schemes are planned. The County Council has committed funding of £135.5m of Central Government Grants and £9.7 million of third party contributions towards projects contained within its medium term capital programme (2013/14 to 2014/15) and further details of the projects which this funding is supporting is contained in the February 2013 report to the County Council Cabinet. The County Council will continue to work with Central Government to access further opportunities to support local infrastructure projects and this will be dependent on future allocations from Central Government that may be better determined after the Spending Review in 2013.

f) **Community Infrastructure Levy Funding**

10.3 With regard to the Community Infrastructure Levy, the position in South Worcestershire can be summarised as follows;

- The three South Worcestershire Councils joined together with the County Council and the three North Worcestershire Councils through the course of 2012 to progress a coordinated approach to CIL, with all authorities contributing to the work stream. Consequently, the County Council commissioned, on behalf of all seven authorities, a Worcestershire CIL Viability Study. This work was undertaken by a consultant and involved two Stakeholder Workshops in July and October 2012 and two Member workshops in October/November 2012. This Worcestershire CIL Viability Study was published in early 2013.

- The three South Worcestershire Councils have given some consideration to the way forward on the next stage of the CIL work at the meeting of the SWDP Joint Advisory Panel on 16/11/12. It was agreed that it was sensible to progress separate but coordinated charging Schedules with a view to each of the three SWC Councils having its charging schedule agreed in spring 2014. An indicative timetable for achieving this was endorsed in principle.

- Provisional estimates of the potential yield from the Community Infrastructure Levy in South Worcestershire suggest a ballpark figure of £50m. over the plan period. This is only a tentative figure based on projections in the Worcestershire CIL Viability Study and is included only for indicative purposes. The actual figures to be charged via the SWC CIL
Charging Schedules will be progressed and tested during the course of 2013 and 2014 via the proper CIL process.

- The relationship between the SWIDP and the funding of infrastructure through CIL or S.106 planning obligations is a particularly important one. This will be clarified as the SWC CIL charging schedules are progressed through 2013. The SWIDP provides the basis for that progression in informing the SWC Councils of the choices which have to be made.

### g) Transport funding

10.4 Transport funding is a particularly important issue. In December 2011, Worcestershire County Council was successful in securing £14.2 million from the Department for Transport's Major Scheme Fund, the total cost of Phase 1 being £19.6 million. The proposals contained within the funding bid include:

- Strategic Highway Improvements
- Rail Station Enhancements
- Key Corridor Improvements
- Transport Information Systems
- Improved Infrastructure for walking and cycling.

Subject to Full Approval by the Department for Transport, these improvements will be delivered over the period 2012/13 - April 2015.

10.5 A recent example of successful funding bid by the County Council in respect of South Worcestershire relates to the Abbey Bridge Scheme in Evesham. Worcestershire County Council's Abbey Bridge and Viaduct scheme has received Full Approval for funding from the Department of Transport. The scheme, described by Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport, Norman Baker MP as 'excellent', will receive a DfT contribution of £5.59 million towards the full project costs of £8.2 million. The present bridge and viaduct are in poor condition so need to be replaced. The new structure will allow the weight limit to be removed so that the bridge will meet national standards. This will enable it to be used by HGVs, coaches and buses, and improve access to Evesham town centre from the south for local residents and businesses.

10.6 The County Council has also established a mechanism whereby developers contribute toward the costs of delivering the measures needed to mitigate the impact on the Worcester transport network of the cumulative growth in travel demand associated with the South Worcestershire Councils' planned growth, as set out in the SWDP. This mechanism is designed to enable developers to contribute toward the Worcester transport network elements of the SWIDP on a proportional basis, taking account of the forecast use of the Worcester transport network by development generated traffic; i.e. developments located further from Worcester will contribute proportionally less toward the costs of delivering the Worcester transport network elements of the SWIDP. Worcestershire County Council view this as being an important mechanism in helping to ensure that the schemes needed to ensure that the transport network is able to accommodate planned growth are delivered. This mechanism is to be extended to include non-Worcester elements of the SWIDP.

### h) Private sector

10.7 In conclusion, it is widely recognised that the private sector will have a fundamental role to play in the delivery of infrastructure. However, the District Councils and the County Council recognise that they have an important role to play in enabling the delivery of crucial infrastructure identified in the SWIDP through their Development Management, Regeneration & Economic Development, Asset Management, Transportation, Highways, Waste and Education functions. The
WLEP, as the voice of the business community, is well placed to articulate business needs and broker negotiations and discussions on behalf of the private sector with local authorities, Government and other key partners such as the utility providers to identify, budget for and lobby for funding to support infrastructure delivery. Meetings have taken place with a wide range of infrastructure providers as part of the consultation process as well as with Council Treasurers and the Worcestershire LEP on 18/03/13 to raise awareness of the issues with a particular focus on the first period of the SWDP up to 2019. This SWIDP is a living document and it is the intention of the three SWC Councils that this should be updated and refined, as and when appropriate.
SECTION ELEVEN: CONCLUSIONS

11.1 In this version of the SWIDP, this section is focused on the key issues on the way forward and purposefully does not duplicate all that is contained in the previous ten sections. The work has been progressed as far as is possible in the time available in consultation with the infrastructure providers. This is a living document and all the information has been refined and updated as far as possible in May 2013. The SWIDP must be an on-going document and will be reviewed on an on-going basis. There are eight key issues which are particularly important to the SWC Councils at the time of writing this document. These were discussed and assessed particularly at two high level Infrastructure Seminars in March 2013. One on 18/03/13 was with the Worcestershire LEP, and the second on 19/03/13 involved SWC Chief Executives & Directors and Chief Officers from both SWC and the County Council. This was of particular importance in taking stock and drawing this SWIDP to a conclusion for the May 2013 version of the SWIDP, especially in respect of financial and prioritisation issues. The eight issues are as follows

a) The internal consistency of the document in what has been described as a “triangulation” process, as explained in paragraph 11.2
b) Phasing
c) The site specifics and liaison with the development industry
d) Costing of infrastructure
e) The funding gap
f) Prioritisation, as explained in paragraphs 11.9 – 11.12 below
g) The relationship between Worcestershire LEP and Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy
h) The need to make the case for South Worcestershire development and the funding of infrastructure, particularly to Central Government.

11.2 Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and consistency of this document in the time available. The intensive technical consultation in summer 2012 and again in early 2013 has improved the quantity and quality of the information contained in the SWIDP (see Appendix Z for details). The consistency process has included the so called “triangulation” process in December 2012 and early January 2013 and again in April/May 2013 of the inter-relationship between the infrastructure streams (as set out in sections 4, 5 and 6 on Physical, Social and Green Infrastructure), the spatial aspects of infrastructure (as set out in section 7) and the schedule of infrastructure requirements (as set out in appendix Y). However, it is recognised that this document has had to be finalised in parallel with much other SWDP policy work and important sources of information in the evidence base (e.g. SFRA Update and Water Cycle Study Update). Therefore, if any unintentional inaccuracy or inconsistency has arisen then the SWC Councils will take the first opportunity to correct that in the next version of the SWIDP. This is a living document and it is important that it is both as accurate and up to date as possible.

11.3 Considerable work has been done on the phasing of development and the phasing of infrastructure. The May 2013 position on the phasing of development is set out in the Table under policy SWDP 3, paragraph 43 of policy SWDP 62 and in respect of infrastructure under policy SWDP 7. The position in May 2013 is set out in this SWIDP, especially in Appendix Y.

11.4 It is worth recording that that the inter-relationship between timing of infrastructure delivery and timing of development has been explored in depth during autumn 2012 to answer the question: should the timing of infrastructure dictate the timing of development, or should the timing of development dictate infrastructure provision? Clearly market forces are an important factor in this respect and there is no simple answer to the question but the exploration of this issue, especially
with County Council transport and education colleagues, means that the SWC Councils are better placed to understand the issues and to engage with the development industry through the development management process. This issue was discussed again at the 18/03/13 and 19/03/13 Infrastructure Seminars and the latest position is set out in Appendix Y to this SWIDP.

c) The site specifics issue

11.5 The finalisation of the SWDP and the SWIDP for December 2012 SWC Councils has involved close assessment of key sites on a dynamic basis throughout 2012 and early 2013 and every effort has been made to record that accurately in the SWIDP. Again, corrections and refinements have been included in this May 2013 version of the SWIDP. Moreover, there have also been some intensive discussions on key sites through the development management process. Again liaison has taken place. However, it is recognised that on-going discussions during the course of 2013 with developers through the development management process may involve future refinement and updating of the SWIDP. That engagement is welcomed by the three SWC Councils both in terms of its refinement of its SWIDP and its progression of its work on the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules. Mutually, there is everything to be gained by that engagement in 2013, especially in respect of some of the larger sites in the SWDP. This point was made to stakeholders at the CIL Workshop held on 30/10/12 and will be followed through by the SWC Councils throughout 2013.

d) The issue of costing infrastructure

11.6 Every effort has been made to include the most accurate figures which could be provided by infrastructure providers, based on the best available information and the results of the technical consultation in the summer 2012 and again in early 2013. However, this is a continuing process and any further refinements will be captured in the next version of the SWIDP. There is a particularly important continuing dialogue with the County Council both in terms of the consistency between their costings in their emerging strategic Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and in their role as a strategic infrastructure provider, especially in terms of transport and education.

11.7 Discussions between County Council and SWC are still on-going. Some County wide costs are difficult to disaggregate, such as waste management communications and water supply. In other cases, there are good estimates of the costs but less certainty on the funding. Transport is a good example of this. In the case of the utilities, the Councils have a better understanding of the picture now and most of these costs are borne by the utilities and developers and not by the local authorities. There are some cases where there are reasonable estimates of costs but little prospect of Government funding: emergency services are good examples of this. The long schedule of community facilities and sport and recreational facilities are going to prove challenging to the three SWC Councils and their partners and would benefit from updating and refinement. This process was progressed by the SWC Councils in spring 2013 but this exercise will not be complete for inclusion in this May 2013 version of the SWIDP but it should be included in a future version of the SWIDP.

e) The funding gap

11.8 As set out in paragraph. 8.7 of the SWIDP, it is hard to conclude on a precise total infrastructure cost for South Worcestershire and even harder to be clear what the funding gap is, particularly in the current financial climate, which is not seen a short term phenomenon but a factor which is likely to continue for at least through the period up to 2019. However, the SWC Councils are suggesting a ballpark total of £500m. and clearly suggesting that the infrastructure funding gap will at least be half that figure. As agreed at the 19/03/13 SWC Infrastructure Seminar, these costings will lead to further discussion involving Treasurers from the four Councils and that is to be
welcomed. The SWIDP now provides the platform for that discussion and any further refinement can be included in a future version of the SWIDP.

f) The prioritisation issue.

11.9 This has been a fundamental issue for the SWC Councils to consider in the first quarter of 2013, as explained in the November 2012 version of the SWIDP. There is a whole range of infrastructure required in the South Worcestershire area in order to deliver the SWDP proposals. That whole range is generically described as “crucial infrastructure” in policy SWDP7. And yet, in accordance with best practice, the SWC Councils were all too well aware of the need to prioritise this range of infrastructure.

11.10 Accordingly in March 2013, after careful consideration, a set of three key criteria were finally agreed as the basis for the prioritisation of infrastructure into two categories: “essential” and “necessary”, based on best practice advice from PAS:-

i) “Essential” infrastructure which is the higher priority category and highlights infrastructure which is a fundamental requirement for development to take place.

ii) “Necessary” infrastructure which is the second priority and highlights infrastructure which is required for development to take place

11.11 As finally agreed at the 19/03/13 Infrastructure Seminar, the three criteria used in the two level prioritisation process were as follows:-

a) The potential of the proposed infrastructure to support the delivery of the South Worcestershire Economic Strategy and the relationship with priorities for infrastructure established by the Worcestershire LEP.

b) The importance of the infrastructure to delivering the SWDP Spatial Strategy for a particular location or settlement.

c) The ability of the proposed infrastructure to enable the delivery of other publically programmed infrastructure.

11.12 The prioritisation process was an iterative one throughout March and April 2013 including the seminar of the SWC Chief Executives and SWC and County Council Chief Officers and a specific liaison seminar with the Worcestershire LEP. The completed results of that prioritisation process are clearly set out in Appendix Y of this SWIDP. In the final column of that Appendix Y, for each item of infrastructure, the status column indicates whether that crucial infrastructure is regarded as either “essential” or “necessary”. This has not been an easy exercise to complete, given the inter-connections between infrastructure items and the issue of phasing (considered under 11 b of this SWIDP). It was also recognised at the 19/03/13 Seminar that the SWC Councils have also to balance infrastructure provision, affordable housing and the policy requirements of the SWDP, whilst always taking into account viability considerations. However, the SWC Councils, in liaison with the County Council and the Worcestershire LEP, considered it to be important to give a clear steer on the prioritisation of infrastructure in the SWIDP.

g) The relationship between Worcestershire LEP and the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy

11.13 Both of these matters were considered in section 1 and reference should be made to that. In this section the sole focus on both matters is on the way forward.
11.14 The support of the Worcestershire LEP both in terms of the SWDP and specifically in terms of the SWIDP is most welcome. The 18th March WLEP Infrastructure Seminar confirmed that Worcestershire LEP has a key role in continuing to advocate and support the case for infrastructure in South Worcestershire, especially through its established dialogue with Government Ministers and Departments and parallel discussions, as the Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy emerges in more detail.

11.15 In terms of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy, there has been good ongoing liaison between the County Council and the three SWC Councils. The inter relationship between the non statutory Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy and the SWDP, which is subject to the statutory planning processes has been considered throughout the development of both documents. The distinction from a planning point of view is a very clear one. Nevertheless, when it comes to the prioritisation and securing of infrastructure, the role of the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy is fully recognised by the three SWC Councils.

11.16 The County Council has advised that the emerging Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy (WIS) will now be focused on challenging the way infrastructure is delivered in more sustainable integrated ways. This approach has been taken partly in response to District Council concerns about conflicts between the two levels of strategy. The WIS will not be making any statements about prioritisation of types of infrastructure, location of sites or phasing of sites. However, the County Council is working on applying the strategic objectives to the so-called “game changer” sites in the County, as prioritised by the Worcestershire Place Shaping Group.

11.17 Regarding the WIS, SWC has been advised that the County Council will seek to provide a summary of the known position on infrastructure issues within the County i.e. a very high level summary of this SWIDP based on the County Needs & Issues Paper. The County Council will then look to establish a framework that challenges the current “business as usual” models of delivery i.e. seek future infrastructure to be delivered in more sustainable forms and via private-public partnerships acknowledging that existing funding sources and models will not always be fit for purpose. This strategy will focus solely on civil infrastructure matters of water, energy, communications, transport and waste but will also highlight the work that the County Council are leading on in regards to Capital Assets Partnership which addresses matters such as education, emergency services, health etc. The Strategy will then conclude with a section on how the game changing sites can be accelerated in the delivery and how they can implement the preceding sustainable framework. The WIS will provide a framework for delivery of infrastructure and has benefited from close working with infrastructure providers. The WIS will undergo consultation, be accompanied by a sustainability statement and a quasi duty to cooperate statement and be sponsored by the Place Shaping Group/LEP but it will not have formal planning status beyond indicating the preferred direction of travel for infrastructure delivery.

h) Making the case for South Worcestershire development and infrastructure

11.18 Clearly, the scale of infrastructure needed to facilitate the requisite development in South Worcestershire is challenging. Further work needs to be done, especially by the South Worcestershire Councils and the County Council, but also the Worcestershire LEP and all of its partners on the Place Shaping Group, particularly the private sector and MPs, to make out the case for infrastructure funding for South Worcestershire. Clarity on costings and wise use of all scarce resources at a time of economic difficulty are both going to be required. That campaigning case for South Worcestershire must be made to Government by a broad alliance of partners. Indeed, as discussed at the SWDP Joint Advisory Panel, opportunities have been taken by South Worcestershire members to discuss these issues with Worcestershire MPs and Government ministers. Much of this activity is outwith the planning process but it is considered fundamental that reference should be made to it in this concluding section of the SWIDP because of
its importance in delivering the crucial infrastructure which is required to facilitate the planned development of South Worcestershire in the period up to 2030.

Published on 29th November 2012, with minor updating up to 20th May 2013.
Table to be read in conjunction with Policy SWDP 7, Infrastructure

Notes:
1. Policy numbers (in this version) are as up to date as possible at the time of finalising the Table (based on SWDP: Proposed Submission Document).
2. The transportation measures needed to support the SWDP have been identified on the basis of an assessment of the performance of the network with SWDP planned growth in place. The transport schemes proposed have been identified to mitigate against predicted future year transport issues and cover highways, passenger transport cycle and walk infrastructure and services.
3. In identifying the future year transport infrastructure and service schemes, the work has, where appropriate, drawn on existing LTP3 Transport Packages. Where additional (SWDP growth related) transport issues have been identified which were not previously covered in the LTP3, the necessary infrastructure and service enhancements have been developed and costed.
4. The transportation schemes have been identified on the basis of the cumulative impact of SWDP developments on the local and strategic transport network. Individual site policies (e.g. SWDP45/1 Worcester South Urban Extension) refer to specific schemes; however development will be expected to contribute to projects/schemes on the evidence of their cumulative impact across the transport network; therefore, it is likely that developer contributions will not be limited to just one scheme.
5. The cumulative impact of development is a key issue for Worcestershire County Council (and its key stakeholders) as it has to manage the transport network such that it supports the key policy aim of supporting economic growth. This aim would be undermined in the event of increased costs being imposed on businesses, other network users and transport operators arising from traffic congestion, inadequate levels of service on and performance of, the rail and bus networks and increased and variable journey times and costs. It is critical, therefore, that the cumulative effects of increased travel demand are properly understood and mitigating measures identified.
6. “Developer” contributions typically arise at present from S 106 payments which may be targeted at a specific project or a pooled contribution. Once the CIL charging schedules come into effect (which should be the case for most of the plan period), that will be a source of pooled developer contributions.
7. Some rounding differences may occur where costs are summarised to £million to 2 decimal places.
8. Whilst all costs are estimates at this stage it should be noted that in the “Transport” section the costs do not include land acquisition and CPO costs (if needed), passenger transport operating costs and local highways agreements under Highways Act Section 278.
9. Abbreviations:
   - C&RT = Canal & River Trust
   - County = Worcestershire County Council (as transport authority and as the local authority for other services such as adult social care, children's services, countryside services etc. etc.)
   - DfT = Department for Transport
   - EA = Environment Agency
   - FC = Forestry Commission
   - HA = Highways Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy SWDP 7, Infrastructure</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Policy numbers (in this version) are as up to date as possible at the time of finalising the Table (based on SWDP: Proposed Submission Document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The transportation measures needed to support the SWDP have been identified on the basis of an assessment of the performance of the network with SWDP planned growth in place. The transport schemes proposed have been identified to mitigate against predicted future year transport issues and cover highways, passenger transport cycle and walk infrastructure and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. In identifying the future year transport infrastructure and service schemes, the work has, where appropriate, drawn on existing LTP3 Transport Packages. Where additional (SWDP growth related) transport issues have been identified which were not previously covered in the LTP3, the necessary infrastructure and service enhancements have been developed and costed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The transportation schemes have been identified on the basis of the cumulative impact of SWDP developments on the local and strategic transport network. Individual site policies (e.g. SWDP45/1 Worcester South Urban Extension) refer to specific schemes; however development will be expected to contribute to projects/schemes on the evidence of their cumulative impact across the transport network; therefore, it is likely that developer contributions will not be limited to just one scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The cumulative impact of development is a key issue for Worcestershire County Council (and its key stakeholders) as it has to manage the transport network such that it supports the key policy aim of supporting economic growth. This aim would be undermined in the event of increased costs being imposed on businesses, other network users and transport operators arising from traffic congestion, inadequate levels of service on and performance of, the rail and bus networks and increased and variable journey times and costs. It is critical, therefore, that the cumulative effects of increased travel demand are properly understood and mitigating measures identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. “Developer” contributions typically arise at present from S 106 payments which may be targeted at a specific project or a pooled contribution. Once the CIL charging schedules come into effect (which should be the case for most of the plan period), that will be a source of pooled developer contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Some rounding differences may occur where costs are summarised to £million to 2 decimal places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Whilst all costs are estimates at this stage it should be noted that in the “Transport” section the costs do not include land acquisition and CPO costs (if needed), passenger transport operating costs and local highways agreements under Highways Act Section 278.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Abbreviations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- C&amp;RT = Canal &amp; River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- County = Worcestershire County Council (as transport authority and as the local authority for other services such as adult social care, children's services, countryside services etc. etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DfT = Department for Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- EA = Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- FC = Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- HA = Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings

*Updated up to 20/05/13

- **PT** = Public transport generally
- **SE** = Sport England
- **STWL** = Severn Trent Water Limited
- **SWC** = South Worcestershire Councils, i.e. Malvern Hills District Council, Worcester City Council and Wychavon District Council acting collectively.
- **WMP** = West Mercia Police
- **WTSMSB** = Worcester Transport Strategy Major Scheme Bid
- **WWT** = Worcestershire Wildlife Trust

### Other details

**Transport Notes (see Section 4A: Transport):**

Notes:
1. This accounts for Supervision, Evaluation, Drainage, Preliminary Design, Site Supervision, Design Services and Utilities, Landscape, Traffic Management, Groundworks/Earthworks, Maintenance, Consultation, Ecology
2. Optimism Bias represents a contingency allowance reflecting the early stage in the development of schemes. It is a standard approach developed by the Department for Transport (DfT) to avoid over-optimistic estimates of transport infrastructure costs
3. County costs EXCLUDE any land acquisition and Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) costs in the event that these are required
4. County maintenance costs are for 30 years from completion of works and are the expressed as % of total construction costs at this stage in scheme development. These costs are not included in the above table, construction costs only are shown.
5. INCLUDES allowance for: A46(T) Junctions and M5 Junctions 6 and 7 works (as separately assessed by the Highways Agency – see note 9 below). INCLUDES allowance for: A4440/Southern Link Road capacity enhancements, Key corridors enhancements, traffic signal enhancements (SCOOT/MOVA etc.), amended Traffic Regulation Orders, improvements to Worcester Foregate Street & Shrub Hill rail stations a new Worcestershire Parkway, improved bus stop infrastructure, Real Time Information Systems, new/improved walk and cycle routes and additional bridge
6. EXCLUDES City and Town Centre Public Realm Improvements
7. INCLUDES improvements to A44, A38 and A449
8. County Council transport phasing is based on periods 2012-2020 and 2020-2030
9. Highways Agency costs: *Note these costs are based on early preliminary designs and do not include measured fees for items such as traffic management, Statutory undertakers, maintenance or design. These costs are therefore subject to change as designs are finalised.
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE  
**Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings**  
*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Transport</td>
<td>(Costs exclude any land acquisition and CPO costs (in the event that these are required), passenger transport operating costs and local s278 highways works)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>(Worcester Transport Strategy)</td>
<td>Total £161.8 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Schemes</td>
<td>A4440/Southern Link Road capacity Enhancements, Key Corridors enhancements, traffic signals enhancements</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worces CC, Developers, Highways Agency, Network Rail, SWC</td>
<td>£106.2 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106 &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>2012–2020: (1) Dualling A4440 (Whittington -Ketch) (2) Key Corridors linking urban extensions with City Centre (3) Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone transport infrastructur e works 2020-2030: (1) Further enhanceme nts to A4440 and</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rail Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail Schemes</td>
<td>Foregate Street Station improvements (in addition to those funded through WTSMSB), Shrub Hill Station improvements &amp; Worcestershire Parkway</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestshire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Train Operating Companies, (indirectly: Office of Rail Regulator &amp; DfT), SWC.</td>
<td>£22.1 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), Network Rail, Train Operating Companies, DfT + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>2012-2020: (1) Foregate Street (2) Worcestershire Parkway (3) Shrub Hill Station (if Opportunity Zone development proposals advanced for this delivery in this period) 2020-2030: (1) Shrub Hill (if delivery of Opportunity Zone development delayed)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Passenger Transport Schemes</td>
<td>Including: Bus stop infrastructure, Real Time Information Systems and other passenger transport elements of Key Corridors schemes</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£22.0 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding). Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030) aligned with key corridor improvements and delivery of SWDP planned growth (in particular the urban extensions)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Y

**SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings**

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Droitwich Spa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7.5 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Schemes</strong></td>
<td>Local Highway network improvements, including A38 highway enhancements in vicinity of Droitwich.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£3.4 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail, Local Passenger Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes</strong></td>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Droitwich rail station and associated interchange</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating</td>
<td>£4.1 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme)</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>facilities (including parking, information, access routes etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Provision of walk &amp; cycle footbridges over A38 linking proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development sites to town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Improvements to canal towpath.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham</td>
<td>Highway Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.9 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including Town Centre junction enhancements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers SWC</td>
<td>£6.1 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: Excludes A46 schemes which are within the jurisdiction of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Provision of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers SWC</td>
<td>£6.1 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

**Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings**

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes</strong></td>
<td>Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Evesham rail station and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.). (3) Provision of walk &amp; cycle footbridges over A46 and River Avon linking proposed development sites to town centre, railway station, retail parks and employment centres. (4) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity (5) Improvements to town centre walking and cycling facilities</td>
<td>7 Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC, Highways Agency (in respect of the proposed A46 footbridges)</td>
<td>Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding). Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>(2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>Local highway network improvements NOTE: See Inter-Urban Highway section (below) for A449 highway enhancements in north-east Malvern</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, SWC</td>
<td>£5.0 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme)</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rail, Local Passenger Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes

Including:
1. Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access & serve SWDP development sites, and further improvements to Malvern Link station
2. Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity
3. Information kiosks
4. Improvements to town centre walking and cycling facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>£0.6 M</td>
<td>Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pershore

Total

| £3.8 M |

### Highway Schemes

Local highway network improvements NOTE: See Inter-Urban Highway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Worcestershire CC, Developers,</th>
<th>£0.8 M/ TBC in relation to Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport</th>
<th>Across both phases (2012-2020)</th>
<th>The authorities support all the transport schemes</th>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail, Local Passenger Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes</strong></td>
<td>Including: (1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to Pershore rail station and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.) (3) Improvements to walking and cycling</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worceshire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>£2.9 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding). Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Passenger Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Malvern Hills</td>
<td>(1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites. (2) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity to the existing network (3) Improvements to walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators, Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>£0.2M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £0.2 M

### Rural Wychavon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail, Local Passenger Transport and Walk and Cycle Link Schemes</td>
<td>(1) Provision of Infrastructure to enable local passenger transport services to access &amp; serve SWDP development sites.</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worcestershire CC, Developers, Network Rail, Bus Operators,</td>
<td>£2.3 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major)</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** £2.3 M
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Urban Highways</td>
<td>(2) Improvements to rail stations and associated interchange facilities (including cycle parking, information, access routes etc.), (3) Improvements to walking and cycling connectivity, (4) Improvements to walking and cycling facilities and infrastructure</td>
<td>Train Operating Companies, Sustrans, SWC</td>
<td>Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Schemes</td>
<td>Including improvements to the A44 mainline (Evesham – Worcester), A38 junctions to the north of Worcester, A449 north east of Malvern and the A449 to the north of Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Worces... Worcester, SWC</td>
<td>£6.1 M</td>
<td>Worcs CC (IT Block), Local Transport Board (Devolved Major Funding Scheme Funding), Developers (s106, CIL &amp; s278), New Homes Bonus, + other funding sources as available.</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 to 2030)</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency: Strategic Road Network</td>
<td>Strategic Road Network Schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A46 Evesham Bypass (5 Junctions)</td>
<td>SWDP 4 &amp; SWDP 7</td>
<td>Highways Agency, Developers, Worcestershire County Council</td>
<td>£5.8 M</td>
<td>Developers (s106 &amp; s278) + other funding sources available</td>
<td>Across both phases (2012-2020 and 2020 - 2030)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M5 Junction 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£4.0 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M5 Junction 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£10.3 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>OVERALL SWIDP TRANSPORT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£204.445</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy schemes</td>
<td>Hartlebury Energy from Waste Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Council &amp; Partners</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>County Council Partners</td>
<td>Operational from 2015</td>
<td>Approval granted summer 2012</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Western Power Distribution schemes</td>
<td>strategic sites generally</td>
<td>Western Power</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Developers Utility companies</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Schemes as set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>National Grid Gas and Wales and West Utilities</td>
<td>strategic sites generally</td>
<td>National Grid Gas &amp; Wales and West</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Developers Utility companies</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Schemes as set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Supply – detail of any new capital schemes being discussed with STWL. Waste – detail of any new capital schemes being discussed with STWL.</td>
<td>STWL</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Developers STWL</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Info as set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STWL</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Info as set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Flood Risk and Drainage</td>
<td>Major schemes completed or under construction. SUDS technology to be used site-by-site in future</td>
<td>Strategic sites generally</td>
<td>EA Developers County Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>County Council, SWC Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Position set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Communication Infrastructure</td>
<td>Broadband scheme well advanced - Worcestershire Local Broadband Plan</td>
<td>New policy on Broadband, SWDP 26</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>County, BDUK Developers</td>
<td>2012-2020</td>
<td>Position set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Waste Infrastructure</td>
<td>Hartlebury EfW plant – otherwise smaller schemes will be developer funded.</td>
<td>County, Waste contractor, Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Developers etc.</td>
<td>Start 2015</td>
<td>As set out in section 4E of the SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

*Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings*

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td>A Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester City - Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Worcester (Includes new Primary School)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>£2.07 M</td>
<td>County Council, Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Worcester (Includes new Primary School)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£6.0 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilbury Drive</td>
<td>SWDP 45/3</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.53 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwillam’s Farm</td>
<td>SWDP 45/4</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.53 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Ronkswood Hospital Site</td>
<td>SWDP 43/14</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.42 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>SWDP 44/4</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.74 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory’s Bank</td>
<td>SWDP 43/2</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.36 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. Offices, Whittington Road</td>
<td>SWDP 43/16</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.25 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blockhouse Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>SWDP 44/5</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.25 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of Leopard Hill</td>
<td>SWDP 43/1</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>SWDP 43/19</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.24 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small sites in City</td>
<td>SWDP 43</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£0.68 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windfall in City</td>
<td>SWDP 43</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>£1.82 M</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worcester City - Secondary</td>
<td>West Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>£2.23 M</td>
<td>County Council, Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5.61 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilbury Drive</td>
<td>SWDP 45/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.57 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwillam’s Farm</td>
<td>SWDP 45/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.57 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Ronkswood Hospital site</td>
<td>SWDP 43/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.46 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>SWDP 44/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.80 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregory’s Bank</td>
<td>SWDP 43/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.39 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. Offices, Whittington Road</td>
<td>SWDP 43/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.27 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blockhouse Opportunity Zone</td>
<td>SWDP 44/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.27 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of Leopard Hill</td>
<td>SWDP 43/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Avenue</td>
<td>SWDP 43/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.26 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small sites in City</td>
<td>SWDP 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.73 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windfall in City</td>
<td>SWDP 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1.97 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills District - Primary</td>
<td>North East Malvern (Newland)</td>
<td>SWDP 56</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>£1.48 M</td>
<td>County Council, Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Technology Centre (QinetiQ)</td>
<td>SWDP 53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.53 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern sites</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.31 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kempsey sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.29 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powick sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.06 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushwick sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.12 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lr Broadheath sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.11 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenbury sites</td>
<td>SWDP 57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.15 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upton sites</td>
<td>SWDP 58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martley Crown (West)</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.11 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Village sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.43 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Hills District - Secondary</td>
<td>Malvern District windfalls</td>
<td>SWDP 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£1.19 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East Malvern (Newland)</td>
<td>SWDP 56</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>£1.60 M</td>
<td>County, Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Technology Centre (QinetiQ)</td>
<td>SWDP 53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.57 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern sites</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.34 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kempsey sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.32 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powick sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.07 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushwick sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.13 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lr Broadheath sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.12 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenbury sites</td>
<td>SWDP 57</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.16 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upton sites</td>
<td>SWDP 58</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martley Crown (West)</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.12 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Village sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.47 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

*Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings  
*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malvern District windfalls</td>
<td>SWDP 59, 60, 61, 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£1.29 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wychavon District - primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich Copcut Lane</td>
<td>SWDP 49</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£1.57 M</td>
<td>County Council, Developers</td>
<td>As required</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWIDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vines Lane, Droitwich</td>
<td>SWDP 49</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Basin (Netherwich) Droitwich</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.17 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich, Former Land Rover Garage (permitted site)</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.18 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich – small sites</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.1 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.85 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Road, Evesham (permitted site)</td>
<td>SWDP 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.33 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore Road, Hampton</td>
<td>SWDP 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.85 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.42 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peewit Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.13 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenham Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£1.10 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Road, Evesham</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evesham other allocated sites</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.27 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road/Wyre Road, Pershore</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£1.27 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore: Three Springs Road</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.29 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

**Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings**

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore other allocated sites</td>
<td>SWDP 46</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.25 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.29 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernhill Heath sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.25 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartlebury sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honeybourne</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.16 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honeybourne – permitted sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.24 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inkberrow</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.21 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offenham</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.10 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norton: Crookbarrow Road (permitted site)</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.16 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Category 1 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.41 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Category 2 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.63 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 61</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£0.31 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wychavon Windfall</td>
<td>SWDP 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£2.04 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wychavon District - secondary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>County Council, Developers</th>
<th>As required</th>
<th>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWDP</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich Copcut Lane</td>
<td>SWDP 49</td>
<td>£1.69 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Information as set out in Section 5A of SWDP</td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vines Lane, Droitwich</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Basin (Netherwich), Droitwich</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>£0.18 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich, Former Land Rover Garage (permitted site)</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>£0.19 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich other allocated sites</td>
<td>SWDP 48</td>
<td>£0.11 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 51</td>
<td>£0.92 M</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham Road, Evesham (permitted site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.36 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore Road, Hampton</td>
<td>SWDP 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.92 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbey Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.46 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peewit Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.14 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offenham Road, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1.16 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King’s Road, Evesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evesham other allocated sites</td>
<td>SWDP 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.29 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Road/Wyre Road, Pershore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1.37 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore: Three Springs Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.31 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pershore other allocated sites</td>
<td>SWDP 46</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.27 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.31 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernhill Heath sites</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.28 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartlebury sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honeybourne sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.17 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honeybourne – permitted sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.26 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inkberrow sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.23 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offenham sites</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.11 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Category 1 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.44 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Category 2 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.68 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 3 villages</td>
<td>SWDP 61</td>
<td></td>
<td>£0.33 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wychavon Windfall</td>
<td>SWDP 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2.21 M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total cost for SWDP plan area for Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£32.32 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total cost for SWDP plan area for Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£34.05 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SWDP Education Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£66.37 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>Post 16 Education and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Funding Agency</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Education Funding Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>County involved in facilitating but not funding of further education – update needed</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td>University. County. SWC.</td>
<td>Position set out in SWIDP</td>
<td>University. County. SWC.</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Liaison with University of Worcester – position set out in SWIDP.</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Health and Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Joint Services Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Commissioning Groups, NHS Commissioning Board. County</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Further info in SWIDP</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Social Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Further info in SWIDP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Further info in SWIDP</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### South Worcestershire Development Plan - Appendix on Crucial Infrastructure

Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester in summer 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Buildings</td>
<td>Information in SWIDP</td>
<td>Faith Partners, Local Authorities &amp; Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Updated info in SWIDP</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Developers, Various service providers, Local communities</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Developers, Various service providers, Local communities. County</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Further info in SWIDP</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Recreational Facilities (all of these are to be reviewed further during Spring 2013).</td>
<td>University of Worcester Sports Arena.</td>
<td>Relevant SWDP policies</td>
<td>University SE</td>
<td>£10 M</td>
<td>University SE Trustees of the Foundation for Sports and the Arts England Basketball England Badminton Private donations</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Due to be opened May 2013</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Swimming Pool, Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45</td>
<td>SWC SE</td>
<td>£10.5 M</td>
<td>SE SWC</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>April 2013 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sites</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 court sports hall (Worcester West)</td>
<td>4 court sports hall (Worcester West)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£2.7 M (tbc)</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2016-2026</td>
<td>Plus full size synthetic turf pitch and tennis courts.</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 court sports hall (Worcester South)</td>
<td>4 court sports hall (Worcester South)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£2.7 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Plus outdoor tennis court.</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 court sports hall (Worcester)</td>
<td>6 court sports hall (Worcester)</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£4.1 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Court badminton performance centre</td>
<td>6 Court badminton performance centre</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£4.5 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football: full size 3G STP</td>
<td>Football: full size 3G STP</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£0.8 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 rink indoor bowls centre</td>
<td>6 rink indoor bowls centre</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£3.2 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 court indoor tennis centre</td>
<td>4 court indoor tennis centre</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£5.5 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 door outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>6 door outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£0.5 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MUGA</td>
<td>2 MUGA</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£1.6 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor athletics facility, Malvern</td>
<td>Outdoor athletics facility, Malvern</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>School site in rural area.</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>SWDP Policy</td>
<td>Delivery Partners</td>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>Potential sources of funding</td>
<td>Estimated Timescale</td>
<td>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lane synthetic athletics track, Malvern Hills: Malvern College</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Based on 2010 Sports Facilities Framework</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 court sports hall – indoor cricket (Wychavon)</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 50, 51, 46, 47, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£3.4 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Based on 2010 Sports Facilities Framework</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 court sports hall - (Droitwich or Evesham in Wychavon)</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 49 SWDP 50, 51</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£5.5 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 court sports hall - (expansion of existing facility) and 2 court sports hall, Wychavon</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 50, 51, 46, 47, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£5.5 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25x4 lane swimming pool (private) Wychavon</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 50, 51, 46, 47, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 court sports hall, Wychavon</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 50, 51, 46, 47, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>£2.7 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor athletics training facility, school site, Evesham</td>
<td>SWDP 50, 51</td>
<td>SWC/ County/ Developers</td>
<td>£0.25 M</td>
<td>SWC/ County/ Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Court Indoor Tennis Centre, Wychavon</td>
<td>SWDP 48, 50, 51, 46, 47, 59, 60, 61</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

*Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings*

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor athletics training facility, School Site, Pershore</td>
<td>SWDP 46, 47</td>
<td>SWC/ County/ Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>SWC/ County/ Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25m Swimming (teaching pool) Worcester West</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>SWC SE Developers</td>
<td>£3.9 M (tbc)</td>
<td>SE SWC Developers</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester South football pitch (6.4 ha)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>(See note below for total sports provision figure)</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester West football pitch (6.5 ha)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1.1 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester East football pitch (6.9 ha)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/3</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1.2 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester East cricket pitch (4 ha) (location tbc)</td>
<td>SWDP45/3</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.85M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester South - 2 ha for cricket</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.65 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester West - 4 ha for cricket</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.85 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester south – 7 ha for rugby</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1.25 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2021</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Town - 6 ha for football</td>
<td>SWDP 56</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Town / Malvern North East- 2 ha for</td>
<td>SWDP 56</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.65 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cricket</td>
<td>Evesham - 6 ha for football</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2016-2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evesham north - 6 ha for football</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£1 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evesham south or south-west 4 ha for cricket</td>
<td>SWDP 51 and 52</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.85 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016 or 2026</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evesham north - 2 ha for cricket</td>
<td>SWDP 52</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.65 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2011-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Droitwich – Copcut Lane or Pulley Lane – 2 ha for cricket.</td>
<td>SWDP 49</td>
<td>SWC, SE, Developers</td>
<td>£0.65 M</td>
<td>SWC Developers</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Autumn 2012 figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for sports facilities listed above =</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£76.35 M</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Emergency Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Station for South Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£1.63 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police station for West Worcester</td>
<td>SWDP 45/2</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£1.63 M</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Evesham Police Station</td>
<td>SWDP 50, 51</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£1.42 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension to Pershore Police Station</td>
<td>SWDP 46, 47</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£0.80 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Police Posts at:</td>
<td>SWDP 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 56 and 59 sites</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£1.06 M</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure. Includes custody facility expansion at Worcester</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Officers (set-</td>
<td>SWDP 43-</td>
<td>WMP</td>
<td>£244, 014</td>
<td>WMP</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - APPENDIX ON CRUCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

**Considered at December 2012 SWC Council meetings**

*Updated up to 20/05/13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/ Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up costs for 64no. officers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54, 56-61 sites</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional vehicles and other operational equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 43-54, 56-61 sites</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£566,565</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional central support staff (set up costs for 32no. support staff)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 43-54, 56-61 sites</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>£86,464</td>
<td>WMP Developers</td>
<td>2013-2019</td>
<td>Updated figure</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 50, 51</td>
<td>H&amp;W Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>H&amp;W Fire and Rescue Service, Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>Other Fire Service requirements include new appliances – not costed as “Infrastructure”</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance “Hub” Worcester</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWDP 43,44 and 45 sites</td>
<td>West Midlands Ambulance Service</td>
<td>£0.40 M</td>
<td>WM Ambulance Service, Developers</td>
<td>2012-2019</td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for Emergency Infrastructure listed above = £7.84 M**

### GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

<p>| Sub-Regional facility: “Worcester/ Droitwich Park” (based on the canal ring) | SWDP 43, 44, 45, 48 and 49 sites and various rural sites | County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT, BW | tbc | County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT, C&amp;RT | tbc | Concept only at this stage. To be updated in due course | Necessary |
| Sub-regional facility: “Hallow Riverside Park” (includes sites on both sides of the River Severn between Grimley and | SWDP 45/2 | County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT | tbc | County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT | tbc | Concept only at this stage. To be updated in due course | Necessary |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>SWDP Policy</th>
<th>Delivery Partners</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>Potential sources of funding</th>
<th>Estimated Timescale</th>
<th>Costs/Funding/Delivery Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-regional facility: “Sandford (Clifton) Water Park” (south of Draycott and extending south to base of Knight Hill)</td>
<td>SWDP 45/1 SWDP 59</td>
<td>County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT, Minerals operators</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>County, Developers, SWC, NE, EA, FC, WWT, Minerals operators (Landfill Community Fund)</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Concept only at this stage. To be updated in due course</td>
<td>Necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Worcestershire Councils 22\textsuperscript{nd} November 2012, with amendments up to 20/05/2013
Appendix Z:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>SWIDPIPS Technical Consultation Response Date (received)</th>
<th>SWIDP Fact checking exercise 2013 Response Date (received)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Mercia Police and Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>04/09/2012</td>
<td>22/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Trent Water</td>
<td>05/09/2012</td>
<td>27/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>06/09/2012</td>
<td>11/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal and River Trust</td>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
<td>21/2/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>13/09/2012</td>
<td>Nothing further received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust</td>
<td>13/09/2012</td>
<td>22/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>17/09/2012</td>
<td>22/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council Planning &amp; Environmental Policy, Transport and Waste &amp; Minerals teams at WCC</td>
<td>18/09/2012</td>
<td>12/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>13/09/2012</td>
<td>14/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>13/08/2012</td>
<td>21/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Power Distribution</td>
<td>19/09/2012, updated 09/11/2012</td>
<td>Nothing further received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Gas</td>
<td>08/11/2012, updated 15/11/2012</td>
<td>07/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>25/09/2012</td>
<td>14/02/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>07/09/2012</td>
<td>13/03/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales and West Utilities</td>
<td>9/10/2012</td>
<td>Nothing further received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - “APPENDIX Z”

Originally considered at December 2012 Councils and updated May 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date Considered</th>
<th>Date Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust</td>
<td>19/09/2012</td>
<td>21/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro</td>
<td>10/09/2012</td>
<td>Nothing further received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire LEP</td>
<td>13/09/2012</td>
<td>21/01/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Diocese</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27/03/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>