

Response to Matter 16 – Infrastructure and Delivery

- **Is the DPD clear on the mechanisms for delivery – who will implement the infrastructure required and when (see ABC amendments Feb 2010)**
 1. Paragraphs 7.88-95 and policy TRS19 of the DPD address these issues. These need to read alongside the existing policies in the Core Strategy that deal with infrastructure provision and the mechanisms for delivery, for example policies CS8, CS12, CS15 and CS18.
 2. The evidence base for this DPD has established that there are no large scale infrastructure issues that are major factors in the delivery of the Plan's objectives and that where there may be a local requirement, such as additional sewerage capacity, this is highlighted in the respective site policies and are matters that should be dealt with by developers as sites are brought forward.
- **The majority of housing development is to take place in the earlier part of the Plan period, of which there is only some 6 years left. Does this represent sufficient lead-in time for any of the more major works required? Is there any commitment to delivery from other organisations and parties, such as landowners and service providers, including incorporation into costed investment programmes?**
 3. As stated above, the evidence base for the DPD indicates that no major infrastructure works are required to deliver new development on the allocated sites. The scale of most of the allocations are small and only local infrastructure needed to service the sites will be needed. As such, there is no prospect of development being delayed to the extent that it is not possible to be planned and constructed within the first phase of the DPD.
 4. The only potential exception to this is the major allocation proposed in Tenterden (TENT1) but again here, the available evidence suggests that no strategic infrastructure or off-site improvements are necessary to implement the development. The Council's response to Matter 5 statement deals with this in more detail and again shows that there is no substantive reason to suggest the site will not be able to deliver its allocated quantum of development within phase 1.
 5. In all cases, the Council considers that there is commitment to deliver development from landowners, as the sites have been promoted through the DPD process by them and in many cases, formal representations submitted to support that contention. Conversely, no representations from any service

providers suggest there is any fundamental constraint to development occurring on any of the allocated sites.

- **Has this been assessed also in relation to social infrastructure – education, health services, etc – including innovative ways of providing or retaining such services in rural areas in a sustainable manner ? How do the policies of the DPD support this?**

6. The Borough Council has consulted social infrastructure providers and there is no requirement for any major new infrastructure to support the proposed developments in the DPD. In particular, detailed discussions were held with the Education Authority to determine whether the scale of allocations, especially in Tenterden, would give rise to additional educational infrastructure requirements.

7. The allocation strategy of the DPD will help to sustain existing local facilities by locating new development in the most sustainable locations within the rural part of the Borough. Site policies include references to the need to improvement or upgrading of existing recreational or play facilities and the local workshop process has provided an understanding of local needs and wishes (alongside the village and parish planning processes). In addition, policy TRS19 ensures that any subsequent infrastructure requirements (including community services) from developments in the rural areas (for instance, arising from windfall sites), shall be met before development is permitted.

8. Policy TRS6 is also relevant as it specifically allows proposals specifically designed to meet local community needs to be provided on 'exception' sites. This innovative approach should help to release land that may not otherwise be available for development to support community infrastructure.

- **Does the reference to maintenance in policy TRS19 meet the tests of paragraphs B18-B20 of Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations ?**

9. Policy TRS19 only refers to an 'appropriate' period for maintenance whilst para. 7.94 refers to at period of at least 10 years. The guidance in Circular 05/2005 only refers to maintenance payments not being required in perpetuity and long enough to cover pump priming in the case of facilities that would be utilised by a population beyond the actual development (Annex B19). For facilities for the specific use of the occupiers of the development, such payments may be in perpetuity (Annex B18).

10. The 'appropriate period' referred to in policy TRS19 enables the policy to cover both eventualities and to be consistent with the Circular guidance. More

specific guidance is proposed to be included within the forthcoming Infrastructure Contributions SPD and it is accepted that a reference to this document could be added to the DPD for additional clarity. The reference to the 10 year period in para. 7.94 of the DPD reflects what has been a standard approach to the provision of commuted sums for maintenance in the Borough for many years and is included to provide a guide for developers as to what may be expected.