

Supplementary Information
West of England Partnership Board
25 February 2010

2010/11-2012/13 DELIVERY & INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN

Purpose of Report

1. To provide a summary of the main changes to the Partnership Board report, resulting from the officer Single Conversation meeting on 19th February, referred to at paragraph 31 of the report to the Board. This meeting followed despatch of Board papers: the changes were incorporated into the report to Council Cabinets, first despatched on 23rd February.

Changes made - covering report

2. In summary, the main changes made to the report were:
 - Changes to clarify and expand statements in the report
 - Statement to confirm investment, with over-programming, at c.£73m pa over the period 2010/11-2012/13
 - Brief statements on Thornbury and Keynsham

Changes made –appendices

3. In summary the following changes were made to the Appendices:
 - Strategic case amended to reflect the very latest homes numbers for South Gloucestershire from their emerging Draft Core Strategy. These amendments were also included in the spreadsheets, maps and tables.
 - Further letter from the Highways Agency on 18th February 2010.
 - Summary of the views of Joint Scrutiny Committee on 19th February 2010.
 - Summary views of the Housing Associations provided on 19th February 2010.

Changes made- investment plan

4. At an earlier negotiation to reduce & prioritise investment sought; significant reductions were made. Subsequently B&NES questioned the equity of these reductions this was discussed at the Single Conversation meeting on the 19th February.
5. In summary the changes that had been made had left B&NES with minimal provision for thematic rural and market towns affordable housing.
6. At the meeting on 19th February the following increases were made to the thematic affordable housing in B&NES.

Yr 3: 2012/13	Yr 4: 2013/14	Yr 5: 2014/15	Total
+ £2m	+ £1m	+£3m	+£6m

7. These sums were taken from Bristol's allocation in these years for South Bristol (£5m yrs 4&5) and Suburban Intensification (£1m Year 3).
8. In addition to this a sum of £300,000 was allocated as part of over-programming, for capacity building and masterplanning in Keynsham.
9. These adjustments totalled £6m against an average investment, including over-programming, of c.£75m pa, that is c.£377m over the period 2010/11 to 2014/2015.

Author:Terry Wagstaff, Chief Executive, West of England Partnership
Telephone 0117 922 2639; Email: terry.wagstaff@westofengland.org

APPENDIX J

WEST OF ENGLAND DELIVERY AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK2010/11 - 2019/20

Laura

Thank you for taking the trouble to present the above to Ron and I on Monday. We promised to let you have any comments by the end of this week.

I'm sure you'll be pleased that, after studying the document more closely we have only a couple of comments and certainly nothing of any great concern. Moreover we welcome and support the principle of producing a plan that clearly sets out sequencing, phasing and priority of various investments needed to support growth.

Our comments relate to two places only - Weston and the North Fringe.

At Weston our chief worry is the level of out commuting. So while we support the measures identified in the plan to increase jobs there, we suggest a valuable addition to the plan would be setting out the linkage and dependencies between jobs and homes. The intention would be to make sure that pre-determined numbers of jobs are actually materialising before passing fixed housing threshold.

At the North Fringe we have the opposite problem - high levels of in-commuting. So we generally support the provision of more homes. The details set out in the plan can only help deliver these homes. Proposals for significant levels of new jobs here are likely to impact of the strategic network and may require mitigation. Currently there are two existing mixed-use consents - Filton Northfield and Emerson's Green East with identified mitigation measures on the motorway linked to trigger-points for employment floor space. These could be added to the plan for completeness - depending on whether you want to included privately funded infrastructure investment. We would of course need to understand the detailed local impacts of development proposals on the SRN. We would therefore expect planning applications to be supported by appropriate levels of transport information to enable us to fully understand these impacts and identify any mitigation measures needed which would be funded by the developers.

More generally, given the risks attached to public funding, it may be worthwhile arranging the plan in some order of priority to assist rapid response to any changes to funding levels.

The investment plan does not currently include the planned Highways Agency funded M4/M5 Managed Motorway improvement, which although part of the full WOE picture, is I agree perhaps best omitted because it is not linked in the same way as the other infrastructure investments to the particular places/growth in the plan.

Regards

David

David Wright, Regional Manager
Highways Agency | Temple Quay House | 2 The Square, Temple Quay | Bristol | BS1 6HA
Tel: +44 (0) 117 3728994 | Fax: + 44 (0) 117 3728100 | Mobile: + 44 (0) 7767 343175
Web: <http://www.highways.gov.uk><<http://www.highways.gov.uk/>>
GTN: 1371 8994

APPENDIX M

WEST OF ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP DRAFT DELIVERY AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN

Comment of Strategic Partner Housing Associations

The West of England Strategic Partner Housing Associations closely engaged in the Single Conversation process are Sovereign and Arcadia.

Sovereign and Arcadia support the long-term strategy of investing in Priority Places but have concerns about the impact any delays in these places would have on housing supply.

The view of Sovereign and Arcadia is that there is considerable scope for increasing the supply of affordable housing through the development of small and medium sized sites outside of the Priority Locations that are consistent with the Rural, Markets Towns and Suburban Intensification programmes.

The small and medium sized sites are linked to existing sustainable communities where residents want to live. These areas already have existing place-making infrastructure and so require little additional public investment outside of the National Affordable Housing Programme run by the HCA.

For this reason, Sovereign and Arcadia strongly support the development of a rolling programme of sites complementary to but outside of the Priority Locations. This would maximise the opportunity to maintain and increase the supply of affordable housing.

The West of England Strategic Partner Housing Associations have over the last two years delivered record numbers of high quality, new affordable homes representing excellent value for public money. They have achieved this by developing these small and medium sized sites eg. Inner city regeneration, windfall sites.

In addition, West of England Strategic Partner Housing Associations have access to private finance set aside for new affordable housing development and the in-house skills to support and enable new housing provision. This is both as lead developers in their own right and as partners on s106 sites with private developers.

Development of a rolling programme of small and medium sized sites will maximise access to, and use of, the resources by the West of England Partnership.

Summary of views from the Joint Scrutiny Committee on 19 February 2010

- Would the information be made available publicly at a later date?
- How far were employers involved? Members stressed the need to involve employers and it was felt that there should be a view of the nature of future employment in particular sectors and in SMEs, in particular.
- There was concern to ensure that alignment work with the Environment Agency included water catchment management plans.
- Green infrastructure was also highlighted as playing an important role, with multi functions and purposes.
- Operational planning and strategic planning of infrastructure investment needed to be distinguished and planning should be on a 10 to 20 year basis.
- The Committee was also concerned about the need for a good mix of jobs, including those appropriate to meeting local needs and skills as well as those in knowledge based growth sectors. In addition, it would be important to look at the nature of work in the future, taking account of the wider picture. Private investment should be encouraged.
- Employment land needed to be safeguarded so that it may be developed for the long term but the Committee expressed concerns that developers were already putting pressure on the councils to build housing, e.g in Weston-super-Mare.
- Housing was already being built in areas and on sites where the industry had gone, eg in Kingswood. Inspectors were currently overruling council decisions and allowing houses to be built on employment land sites.
- Investment needed to be sought for the right sort of jobs, for the people who were living in the areas now. The need included replacement jobs, not just high quality jobs, which would bring more people into the area.
- The Committee were concerned that the identification of funding gaps could prejudice negotiations with developers.