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What is this Topic Paper About?

How can we secure the infrastructure and investment needed for the future?

This topic paper has been published as part of Plymouth Plan Connections. It is one of a series of topic papers that are being published to provide information and to support the Council's ongoing discussions with local people and organisations about the future of the city.

This Topic Paper looks at the infrastructure that the city needs as well as the investment required to achieve the broader Plymouth Plan objectives. It explores how the city can identify and then provide both new infrastructure as well as the maintenance or improvement of existing infrastructure and facilities. It also discusses what processes are required to enhance the delivery capacity of the city to deliver the broader PP objectives.
Infrastructure: What is it?

“If the country is like the human body, the blood supply is infrastructure. If you’ve got a good infrastructure, you’ve got a better, fitter body.”

(CBI Infrastructure focus group participant)

By infrastructure, we mean the public systems, services, and facilities that are necessary for economic and social activity, including roads, schools, telecommunications, power and water supplies. Collectively, these constitute the physical and social foundations of our society. Infrastructure affects us every day, when the right infrastructure is in place and it works well it goes unnoticed but nevertheless continues to contribute to economic growth and social wellbeing. When it doesn’t work - when the storm drains overflow, when the power goes off, when the rail line is closed, it can have dramatic and serious implications.

Infrastructure is provided and maintained by a wide range of agencies and private companies. The key to the effective functioning and growth of the city is therefore in the planning and co-ordination of these activities, so that the necessary investments can be made at the right time to enable the delivery of the infrastructure necessary to enable us to achieve the objectives of the Plymouth Plan.

The following table identifies the main infrastructure categories and is based on the list included within the Plymouth Infrastructure Needs Assessment 2011(1) with the addition of further categories which are referred to in the National Planning Policy Framework, and in the other Plymouth Plan Topic Papers:

**Main Infrastructure Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>waste and recycling</th>
<th>road, rail, cycle, parking and other transport facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flood defence and drainage infrastructure</td>
<td>cultural facilities, including libraries, events, art infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cemeteries &amp; crematoria</td>
<td>open space, food growing &amp; natural infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical and healthcare facilities</td>
<td>public realm, heritage &amp; interpretation/wayfinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>utilities, including renewable/low carbon energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency services</td>
<td>schools, nurseries &amp; other education facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic governance facilities</td>
<td>community facilities &amp; ‘social infrastructure’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>communications infrastructure</td>
<td>infrastructure that mitigates climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food distribution facilities</td>
<td>employment, skills &amp; business infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visitor facilities including hotels</td>
<td>port, moorings, slipway &amp; waterfront access facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 1**

*Have we identified all the infrastructure categories or have we missed anything?*
Why is infrastructure important?

Creating prosperous and sustainable communities can only be done if the necessary infrastructure is in place. Effective and co-ordinated investment in the right infrastructure, of the right quality, in the right location and at the right time is essential to ensure Plymouth’s sustainable economic, social and environmental future. It also delivers an economic boost during construction and permanently raises an area’s productive capacity. It is about place-shaping and therefore essential that all partners within Plymouth work collaboratively and that the planning and delivery of infrastructure is joined-up.

Infrastructure is important for quality of life and specific benefits can include:

- Efficient transport infrastructure can increase the amount of free time people have to undertake leisure or social activities, thus improving personal wellbeing and social cohesion. It can also reduce the costs of business, improving productivity and competitiveness, and raise levels of economic activity.
- Improvements to the public realm can increase community safety as well as improving the attractiveness of an area for private investors.
- Investing in infrastructure for cycling and walking, as well as for example low-emission buses, can improve local quality of life and reduce carbon emissions. If one in ten journeys were made by bike, the NHS would save an estimated £250 million a year.

Infrastructure is also important because of its enabling effects. The NPPF identifies the crucial role of infrastructure provision in the delivery of sustainable economic development (NPPF para 7). It states that planning policies should recognise and seek to address potential barriers to business investment (working with businesses to identify these barriers), including ... any lack of infrastructure (para 21). Effective transport is, for example, a key component of the city infrastructure system and the Centre for Cities has identified the key reasons why transport in cities is a key enabler for economic growth:

- Job access: Efficiency and affordable transport options can help people access the jobs they need; either attracting high-skilled mobile workers in, or enabling local low-skill workers to find work; The agglomeration economy: A long-witnessed phenomenon, crucial to the rise of cities as engines of national growth, but undermined when a lack of public transport, high traffic and poorly maintained infrastructure deters investment
- Attract new businesses and firms: 60% of UK firms say transport is a major factor in their business location decisions
- Unlocking new developments: Transport infrastructure investment facilitates and enables wider local regeneration (for example the Birmingham New Street station redevelopment acting as a spur for further regeneration in the South of the city)

---

How do we identify what new infrastructure is required?

The Plymouth Infrastructure Needs Assessment, 2011 (PINA) provides an overview of the infrastructure needs of the city as identified at the time of its preparation. Whilst not all infrastructure areas were then considered in detail, such as higher and further education and emergency services, it identified most of the strategic level infrastructure expected to be delivered in the city over the coming years in order for the city to grow in a sustainable manner. The Assessment will be refreshed during the process of preparing the Plymouth Plan.

PINA is as an evidence base document and not a ‘plan’ or strategy, (i.e. it does not seek to prioritise investment or provide timescales for delivery). The evidence was informed by the views and proposals of infrastructure providers as to what they felt needed to be delivered to support the future growth of the city and meet their operational objectives. In this respect, together with a funding gap analysis document\(^3\), it formed part of the evidence base by which Plymouth’s Community Infrastructure Levy was put into place.

The starting points for updating the assessment of the city’s infrastructure needs are the ambitions, objectives and proposals being promoted through the Plymouth Plan across the full range of spatial and thematic topic areas. For example, the Plymouth Plan will provide for the key infrastructure needed to realise the strategic growth potential of Plymouth’s key economic nodes (the City Centre / Waterfront and Derriford) as well as the considerable growth potential along Plymouth’s Eastern Corridor. Additionally, it will need to respond to the wider social, economic and environmental needs of the city, for example through providing for infrastructure to deliver improvements in health inequality, new forms of service to meet adult social care needs, the achievement of the city’s cultural ambitions such as Mayflower 2020, and improvements to Plymouth’s green spaces.

There is a need to assess not only what new infrastructure is required, but also what existing infrastructure needs to be protected or improved, and indeed whether any of our existing infrastructure is no longer necessary. Infrastructure maintenance is currently a real challenge for Plymouth as it is for many cities. Much of our infrastructure such as transport, schools, flood defences etc. needs regular and sustained investment to keep it functioning effectively. A rolling programme of maintenance and improvement needs to sit alongside the plan for delivery of new infrastructure.

Question 2

What is the best way of identifying the city’s infrastructure needs?

---

Question 3

Are you able to provide information that can help us update this part of the evidence base?
How do we decide what infrastructure is important?

The PINA divides infrastructure into 3 categories:

**Critical**

Some infrastructure is identified as being ‘critical’. This means that the delivery, improvement or maintenance of the infrastructure is critical because the consequences of not providing it in a short time frame are economically and/or socially unacceptable, or because growth is unlikely to happen in the timeframe envisaged unless the infrastructure in question is put in place ‘up front’. It is especially important that we can identify how and when such infrastructure can be secured so that risks to its timely delivery can be reduced and to ensure that this does not undermine the delivery of the PP itself.

**Necessary**

Most of the infrastructure we identify will be classed as ‘necessary’ to achieving one or more of the Plymouth Plan objectives. This means that it does not necessarily need to be implemented ‘up front’ to unlock development and growth, but can be implemented as development takes place, or over time as resources become available.

**Desirable**

Some infrastructure is identified as being ‘desirable’ rather than ‘necessary’. Whilst it will support the vision for Plymouth, and will be of genuine benefit at a neighbourhood, city or sub-regional level, the achievement of the Plymouth Plan is not reliant on its implementation.

Each category can, in-turn, be subdivided into 2 further sub-categories:

- **Strategic infrastructure** is defined as “infrastructure that is often provided at a higher spatial level than that of the neighbourhood or locality of the city, to serve the wider needs of the city and its hinterland. It includes the ‘big kit’ infrastructure necessary to provide for the sustainable growth of the city and surrounding areas; centralised facilities (in one or more locations) that provide the critical mass necessary for providing high quality services; and natural infrastructure (the environment) which is impacted by population growth.”

- **Neighbourhood infrastructure** is that which has only a local impact. Facilities that serve a local area, such as a community centre or a new bus shelter are classified as local.

This Topic Paper looks mainly at strategic infrastructure needs. Local facilities and the infrastructure that is required locally to support individual neighbourhood aspirations, as well as facilities required to reduce inequalities across the city are considered in the Local Community topic paper, and will also be able to be considered in detail through neighbourhood planning processes.
Paying for infrastructure

Over the past 10 years the city's regeneration and growth has been accompanied by considerable investment in infrastructure, some important examples include:

- £250m invested in Schools including the rebuilding of 16 schools
- £200m invested in transport including reworking of the George junction and the East End improvements.
- A range of flood defence schemes
- New hospitals including a CAMHS unit, reconfiguring Derriford, a medical centre and dental school
- New business centres at Cattedown, Union Street, Derriford and Plymouth Science Park
- £200m invested in the substantial expansion of the University
- Replacement or refurbishments of 70% of the city’s libraries
- Over £45m invested in the Life Centre which now provides a facility of regional significance
- £250m invested in the replacement of the city’s waste infrastructure with the capping and environmental controls at Chelson Meadow, the building of the energy from waste plant, new refuse transfer station and improvements to the HWRCs.
- Drake’s circus shopping centre
- Roll out of city wide Broadband
- Saltram and Plym Valley country parks

The success of the past 10 years show that achieving the funding necessary to deliver infrastructure to support growth is not unattainable. It does however remain a challenge to all the agencies that are responsible for ensuring the city’s infrastructure runs smoothly.
Sources of Funding

Who pays for infrastructure depends on the type of infrastructure but broadly conforms to the following:

- infrastructure principally funded from the public purse (e.g. roads and flood defences),
- infrastructure that is provided using a mix of private and public money (e.g. rail and waste) or
- infrastructure paid for mainly by the consumer (energy and water)

Sources of funding for infrastructure include:

- Developer Contributions
- The Council's own resources and borrowing capability
- Government grants such as those from the Department for Transport (DfT) and Department for Education (DfE)
- Other external grants and loans such as those from Heritage Lottery Fund and Heart of the South West Local Economic Partnership (LEP)
- Partner contributions
- Private finance such as pension funds, sovereign wealth funds
- Tax increment financing
- Municipal Bonds
- Guarantee schemes
- Direct provision.

The following pie chart shows how the Council’s Capital Programme has been funded over the past three years. Given that most of the Capital Programme is ‘infrastructure’ - roads, schools, leisure facilities etc., this gives a good indication of where much of the funding for the city’s infrastructure has come from.
Developer Contributions

Developer contributions play an important role in supporting the delivery of the infrastructure needed to enable an area to grow without damaging the environment and quality of life.

Planning obligations negotiated through Section 106 Agreements have traditionally been the primary mechanism for securing contributions to address the cumulative impact of development on the infrastructure needs of an area. However, since 1 June 2013 Plymouth has also been operating a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). CIL is generally chargeable on the net increase in gross internal floorspace of all new development. The mechanism for securing CIL is a Charging Schedule, which identifies charges based on the floorspace area of different types of developments.

Section 106 obligations are also used for other purposes – for example, to provide affordable housing or deliver site specific measures to enable a development to proceed. However, the text below relates only to the use of Section 106 to secure infrastructure contributions.

Infrastructure contributions secured through planning obligations must meet the requirements of the CIL Regulations, in particular Regulations 122 and 123 which set out legal tests governing a lawful obligation, and include restrictions relating to the pooling of planning obligations for infrastructure. The level of charge needs to be evidence based and negotiated on a case by case basis. The Council has made a general assessment of the costs of new infrastructure arising from development in its Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Evidence Base Update, January 2012. (4)

CIL charges must be set at a level which does not put at serious risk the overall development of the area, and must therefore be informed by evidence on development viability. Charging Authorities must also draw on infrastructure planning that underpins the development strategy for their area, and there needs to be evidence of a funding gap in relation to the delivery of infrastructure in order to justify introducing a CIL.

The money raised through the CIL can be used to support growth by providing funds to help with addressing demands that development places on the city, including funding infrastructure that the city, local communities and neighbourhoods need – for example, new road schemes, park improvements or improvements to local school capacity. The Council must specify what it intends to spend CIL receipts on in what is known as a ‘Regulation 123 List’, so named after CIL Regulation 123.

The current Charging Schedule was adopted in April 2013, near the end of a protracted period of deep recession in the UK, and development values generally were lower than they are now. Given that CIL will be a critical component of infrastructure delivery over coming years, a review of the Charging Schedule is now required, and this will take place alongside the preparation of the Plymouth Plan.

There are advantages and disadvantages to planning obligations and CIL as primary means of securing developer contributions. These are summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Obligations</th>
<th>Community Infrastructure Levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible – can be adjusted depending on the viability of a particular scheme, therefore also helping to optimise the level of contribution secured</td>
<td>• Standardised – enabling accurate costing of costs to be calculated by landowner / prospective developer in advance of selling / buying land; this also makes the system more transparent and fair, as there is no room for negotiating different levels of contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easily adaptable – given that it is driven by policy and site specific evidence, not regulation.</td>
<td>• Enforceability – given that it operates in effect as a local tax with clear legal parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Certainty – given that a local tax must be paid if it is due, there is no negotiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If CIL is the only means used to secure development contributions, speed of planning decisions will be enhanced, as there will be no need for negotiating s106 contributions.

Do not have to be directly linked to the impacts of a particular development, therefore enabling an authority to take...
Our existing approach to developer contributions is summarised below:

- It has aimed to keep its CIL Charging Schedule very simple, with single rates for the entire city, with the exception of the City Centre which has very different viability characteristics.
- As a consequence, it has needed to set its CIL rates at a relatively low level in order to safeguard the viability of development in lower value areas.
- This has resulted in the continuing use of planning obligations as a tool to secure developer contributions, given that the level of CIL secured is insufficient to mitigate the overall impacts of the growth of the city on its infrastructure.

This hybrid-approach maintains some of the advantages and disadvantages of both mechanisms.

The Plymouth Plan process provides an opportunity to consider alternatives to this hybrid approach. Three alternatives are summarised in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Relative advantages and disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maintain existing hybrid approach       | This approach involves setting CIL rates at a low level to reflect the viability considerations of lower value areas of the city. | Key advantages over other options:  
- Simple and standardised approach across most of city  
Key disadvantages over other options:  
- A hybrid approach is more complex given that two systems need to be operated in tandem. |
| CIL dominated approach (no infrastructure contributions negotiated through s106) | This approach requires CIL receipts to be optimised. This can only be achieved through an area based approach to the setting of CIL rates, where higher levies will be charged in higher value areas. | Key advantages over other options:  
- Highest CIL yield and certainty about funding given that CIL is in effect a local tax  
- Simplified and quicker planning application process  
- Council chooses how to spend all receipts in accordance with its priorities  
Key disadvantages over other options:  
- Potentially a risk to some developments where the infrastructure they need is not prioritised  
- The identification of appropriate areas for differential CIL rates will be a challenging process given the complexity of development values across the city; it will be important to get this right if development in lower value areas is not to be put at risk. |
| Planning Obligations dominated approach (CIL abandoned) | This approach would involve formally abandoning Plymouth’s CIL, and reverting to the use of planning obligations as the means by which contributions are sought. | Key advantages over other options:  
- Each contribution bespoke to each scheme, enabling viability to be considered on case by case basis  
Key disadvantages over other options:  
- Reduced level of overall contribution given pooling restrictions of Reg 123 of CIL Regulations and the |
Relative advantages and disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation of Reg 122 which sets out the key tests for a lawful planning obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Puts the most pressure on planning application process to deliver, slowing the time made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4**

Do you agree that these are the main alternative approaches; are there any missing?

Provided that an area-based approach to CIL rates can be achieved without unacceptable risk to development viability in lower value areas, option 2 (a CIL dominated approach) is considered to have particular merit. The increased certainty around infrastructure funding likely to come forward will be particularly beneficial given the significant challenge of delivering the infrastructure necessary to grow the city in a sustainable way. The next step in working up our preferred approach to developer contributions will be to provide spatial evidence and mapping of the city’s viability characteristics.

An understanding of the city’s broad viability situation is clearly of great importance to determining our approach to developer contributions. In Plymouth there is acknowledged market failure and low development values in some areas making many developments only marginally viable. This can seriously impact on a development’s ability to contribute proportionately to the provision of the required infrastructure.

Paragraph 173 of the NPPF provides the context for viability analysis. “Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the size and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable”.

However, the National Planning Policy Guidance (Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 10-019-20140306) also makes it clear that developments must be acceptable in planning terms in order to obtain planning permission: “Assessing viability should lead to an understanding of the scale of planning obligations which are appropriate. However, the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that where safeguards are necessary to make a particular development acceptable in planning terms, and these safeguards cannot be secured, planning permission should not be granted for unacceptable development”. (for more information on this see Viability testing local plans: Advice for planning practitioners (PDF))
Other key issues that will need to be considered in the review of our approach to developer contributions include:

- Ensuring that the CIL rate is set at a level that reflects the current state of the economy
- Considering whether certain categories of development should have different CIL rates dependent on the scale of the development; for example, schemes below the threshold for affordable housing provision might have greater potential viability and justify a higher CIL rate
- Learning from our experience of having operated a CIL for over a year, and the experience of other local authorities
- Updating our policies on developer contributions (including Policy CS33 of the Adopted Plymouth Core Strategy, 2007, to reflect the provisions of the CIL Regulations as currently in place
- Updating the Regulation 123 list of schemes to which CIL funding will be allocated, as part of a wider investment planning process for the city
- Lobbying for the ability to borrow against future CIL receipts to enable critical infrastructure to be forward funded, and for other delivery mechanisms that can make best use of CIL

Question 5

Do you have any views on the viability of development in Plymouth?

Question 6

How does this affect our ability to negotiate S106 agreements and set a CIL charge level?
**Investment and Delivery**

Identifying, planning and coordinating the provision and maintenance of infrastructure is clearly a critical activity. It is however only part of the story. Infrastructure is a key component in achieving the wider objectives of the Plymouth Plan both in terms of the wider quality of life outcomes but also in terms of its ability to enable and unlock development and growth. The interrelationships between these wider objectives and the provision of infrastructure require very careful planning in order to achieve effective delivery. It is important therefore that we establish the sequencing of the necessary interventions and the investment required to make them happen. We also need to demonstrate to the satisfaction of an independent Inspector, at least over the short term (i.e. 5 years), that the wider objectives are achievable. A robust delivery process is therefore required.

Planning and co-ordinating the provision and maintenance of infrastructure is a critical activity, especially given the multiplicity of agencies involved in its delivery and its fundamental role in quality of life and growth. The Planning Advisory Service suggests taking account of the following:

- Ensure a focus on delivery
- be proportionate and take account of information to hand
- identify the funding commitments of short term projects where possible
- justify the likelihood of funding - this may be necessary for longer term aspirations
- identify and involve key stakeholders from the outset
- use your local strategic partnership where possible
- work with other council departments.

**The role of the Plymouth Plan in delivering infrastructure**

The Plan should set out the strategic priorities for the provision of infrastructure (NPPF, para 156), and should plan positively for the development and infrastructure required (NPPF, para 157). The NPPF also advises that infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time, taking into account district wide development costs, so that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion (para 177). Consideration should also be given to producing joint planning policies on strategic matters and informal strategies such as joint infrastructure and investment plans (para 179). Local planning authorities should also work collaboratively with private sector bodies, utility and infrastructure providers (para 180).

Our proposed approach to meeting these needs is illustrated in the diagram and narrative below:
The Investment Plan

An Investment Plan will be at the heart of the investment planning process. The Plymouth Plan will contain strategic policies for infrastructure provision as well as delivery and investment, and its linked Investment Plan will outline in more detail how the Plymouth Plan is to be delivered over its lifetime and establish the city’s investment priorities. Both the Plymouth Plan itself and the Investment Plan will be underpinned by evidence on infrastructure needs and viability, which will also support the review of Plymouth’s Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Investment Plan will set the direction of travel of delivery and investment for the entire plan-period to 2031 and will include a detailed programme for at least the first 5 years of the Plan. It will take a sub-regional view, in cooperation with neighbouring authorities and infrastructure providers. It will explore alternative delivery and funding mechanisms, as well as contingency planning. It will provide the broader context for the more detailed and focussed delivery plans and roadmaps. It will also provide the basis for the Investment Prospectus.

Identifying investment priorities in the Investment Plan

Identifying priorities for investment is a challenging process, particularly given the constrained funding environment. The priorities will be driven by the City Vision which is discussed in the separate Strategic Overview topic paper, and the strategic objectives of the Plymouth Plan which seek to deliver this vision. They must also respond to the demands for investment on organisations and agencies that have responsibilities to customers for delivering quality services. Investment will therefore support economic, financial, social, environmental and sustainability objectives.

To deliver the Plymouth Plan’s strategic ambition, there will be a need to prioritise investment in accordance with identified spatial priorities. This issue too is considered in the Strategic Overview topic paper. At the spatial level, for example within a development area such as the City Centre, there must be a clear idea of the critical path so that decisions can be made at the right time to ensure that investment is secured and infrastructure delivered, thereby facilitating achievement of the wider objectives.

Some of the key infrastructure investment issues that Plymouth currently faces are summarised briefly below:

Strategic connectivity (particularly road, rail, and air) to support the city’s future prosperity. This is about how well connected Plymouth is to the rest of the country and external markets. The issue, which is also a key priority of the Local Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan, is considered further in the Connectivity topic paper.

5 For more detail, please see the relevant Plymouth Plan topic papers, which can be found at: http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/pptopicpapers
6 http://www.heartofswlep.co.uk/strategic-economic-plan
Transport investment needed to unlock the city’s growth potential. This is particularly about delivering infrastructure improvements as part of a wider transport strategy which secure sustainable travel benefits and address network constraints which would otherwise constrain the growth potential of the key growth opportunity areas of the City Centre, Derriford / Northern Corridor and Eastern Corridor. This issue is considered further in the Local Transport topic paper.

Economic infrastructure. This is about putting in place the key investments to support the sustainable growth of Plymouth’s economy. The Local Economic Strategy ReviewPlymouth’s Local Economic Strategy Review 2013/14 can be found at summarises the issues that need to be addressed if the vision for the city is to be realised. It acknowledges the key role of the Plymouth and Peninsula City Deal which places the city at the centre of wider sub-regional growth, recognising its ability to deliver significant productivity and employment growth beyond its administrative boundaries. It suggests that Mayflower 2020 could be a pivotal moment for the city’s economy. If designed and delivered as a dynamic and innovative event, it has the potential to drive forward many aspects of the city’s economy. Investment will be needed in visitor facilities including hotels, ensuring we have sufficient facilities to deliver our visitor economy ambitions including Mayflower 2020. This issue is considered further in the Strategic Overview and Economy topic papers.

High quality natural spaces available so that growth is sustainable and everyone has access to these opportunities for health and quality of life, whilst also protecting designated habitats and features around Plymouth. This is about interventions that improve access to natural spaces for all communities as well as providing high quality new strategic natural sites (e.g. Saltram and Derriford Community Parks), enabling the city to grow in a sustainable manner. This issue is considered further in the Natural Environment topic paper.

Strategic public realm and city gateway improvements, to make Plymouth a more welcoming city that its people can be proud of. This is particularly about delivering investment in the City Centre, the Waterfront and key city gateways such as the railway station and coach station. The welcoming city agenda is considered further in the Strategic Overview topic paper.

Low carbon infrastructure to help respond to climate change whilst also addressing social inequalities. This is about promoting and making provision for renewables and low carbon energy, as well as delivering more localised solutions which address fuel poverty. The issue is considered further in the Low Carbon topic paper.

Education infrastructure required in order to meet the needs of a growing city. This is about providing new and expanded schools, nurseries and other education facilities to support high levels of attainment as the city grows through demographic change and economic performance improvements that lead to net in-migration. New primary schools are already planned in Plymstock and Derriford to address the issue of growth. The issue is considered further in the Education and Learning topic paper.
Question 7

What other infrastructure issues do we need to address and what should the priorities be?
Delivery Plans and Roadmaps

Once the high level infrastructure and delivery strategy and objectives have been determined and included within the Plymouth Plan itself and its associated Investment Plan, and the Plymouth Plan has moved on to the more detailed stage, delivery plans and/or roadmaps can be prepared for each key spatial area / theme. Some policies and themes are relatively self-contained and will therefore rely on their own delivery and action plans to implement the strategy identified in the Plymouth Plan. However, there will be other more complex Plymouth Plan objectives where a higher level of coordination will be required to ensure delivery; these would be covered in the detailed Delivery Roadmaps. Such roadmaps need to identify in some detail, the critical path for achievement of the objective, together with any supporting infrastructure and the investment required. They also need to remain flexible and responsive to changes in circumstances and to take advantage of opportunities that might arise.

Delivery roadmaps are particularly likely to be required for driving delivery in the city’s growth opportunity areas of the City Centre, Derriford and the Eastern Corridor, as well for strategic thematic initiatives such as coordinating activities and delivery around the Mayflower 2020 celebrations.
The Investment Prospectus

The Investment Prospectus will create the means by which investment opportunities can be communicated and marketed to potential investors and funding agencies. It will be a medium term promotional and negotiating document, which seeks to secure the investment required to deliver the city’s ambitions. The Prospectus will include both infrastructure and other key projects that require capital investment.

Question 8

Is this the right approach to delivery and investment and have we identified the right components of an effective system?
What happens next?

Any comments received on this topic paper will be considered in the preparation of the Plymouth Plan. You can make comments at www.plymouth.gov.uk/PlymouthPlan or by email plymouthplan@plymouth.gov.uk. Alternatively, please post your comments to:

Strategic Planning & Infrastructure Department

Plymouth City Council

Ballard House

West Hoe Road

Plymouth

PL1 3BJ

The closing date for consultation responses is **25 October 2014**.

**List of key Plymouth Plan evidence base documents**

- Plymouth Community Infrastructure Levy documents: [http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/homepage/environmentandplanning/planning/history/planningobligations/affordablehousing/communityinfrastructure levy.htm](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/homepage/environmentandplanning/planning/history/planningobligations/affordablehousing/communityinfrastructure levy.htm)
- Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD – Second Review; July 2012: [http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/planning_obs_affordable_housing_spd_2nd_review.pdf](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/planning_obs_affordable_housing_spd_2nd_review.pdf)
- Plymouth’s Local Economic Strategy Review 2013/14: [www.plymouth.gov.uk/localeconomicstrategy](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk.localeconomicstrategy)