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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
This study focuses on the identification of the future infrastructure and services that the London Borough of Newham will require during the plan period up to 2026. This has been achieved by assessing the baseline of existing provision to establish how demand is currently met; assessing future infrastructure requirements to support growth estimating costs and means of funding; and establishing governance arrangements.

This is the third report of the Newham Community Infrastructure Study. This report is intended to inform the Council of the infrastructure requirements of the borough, determining the borough’s future needs.

It is important for Council together with other members of the Local Strategic Partnership to have a firm grasp of the infrastructure needs of the future, and how they relate to existing plans of service providers to improve service delivery. This is because the planning process provides a forum in which to align providers’ plans with the expected population and household growth in Newham; because it is important to identify any remaining funding gaps for infrastructure provision after these plans have been assessed; and because there needs to be a sound basis for the collection of developer contributions.

It should be noted that the study was completed prior to the government’s Comprehensive Spending Review, and this is likely to have a significant impact on the proposed funding programmes of the Council and other public sector partners. This reinforces the need for Newham to regularly update its Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to ensure the most effective use is made of resources.

GROWTH ASSUMPTIONS
This report uses the housing trajectory compiled in Autumn 2009 by the London Borough of Newham (LBN) as the key basis for this community infrastructure study. The trajectory was produced using the work undertaken by LBN and the GLA for the 2009 London Housing Capacity Study and is consistent with the figure for Newham proposed in draft of London Plan (October 2009). It proposed a total of 35,447 dwellings over the plan period to 2027.

Housing trajectory figures have since been refined in light of housing capacity and land availability data, resulting in a slightly higher figure of 37,500, with some small variations across the Community Forum areas. The plans of infrastructure providers will need to be reviewed regularly to ensure that infrastructure keeps pace with new housing, for example, through the Annual Monitoring Report.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE
Based on the estimates in the growth of the number of passengers using public transport, TfL and Network Rail have a programme of upgrading existing and to a lesser extent, providing new transport facilities in London. Much of the proposed infrastructure improvements that are scheduled to take place in the next fifteen years are based on increasing the capacity of existing services with some new projects also being constructed. Of these projects 11 are funded including DLR Extension to Stratford International, Jubilee Line Capacity Upgrade, Cycle Super Highway Route 3, London Overground Upgrade and Central Line Upgrade. However, there are also 7 projects where funding is unconfirmed, including Thames Gateway River Crossing, Cycle Super Highway Route 2, and DLR Dagenham Dock Extension.

ELECTRICITY AND GAS
Despite the current down turn in the market, significant investments in the electricity infrastructure are planned at the following sites during the period 2010-2015, which will result in a major increase in capacity and resilience of the network.
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There will be new 32/11kV substation at Nelson Street and the ExCel Centre. There are plans for a new 66kV transformer and switch board replacement at Silver Town. Overhead power lines will be replaced between West Ham and Orchard Place.

National Grid’s schematic network plan sets out the following proposals to increase gas supply in the borough. This includes an Above 7Bar Pressure reduction station rebuild and a below 7Bar Holder main support replacement in Beckton.

There are plans to incorporate Newham into the London Thames Gateway Heat Network, led by the LDA. The project’s delivery is expected over three year phases from 2010-2019.

Current and planned future communities will be serviced by a main transmission line and a network of connections running through the heart of the Borough including Canning Town, Royal Docks and in the planned Olympic Park.

WATER AND WASTE WATER TREATMENT

The Thames Water Resource Management Plan provides detailed information at the London Water Source One (WTZ) level of the baseline water supply demand balance and the prospects for catering for future growth.

Thames Water has produced a strategy to handle an expected shortfall in water supply in the London area as a whole by. The company’s submitted Business Plan provided for a certain level of expenditure on a variety of means to deal with water supply and waste water treatment in the period 2010-15, not all of which has been agreed by the regulator OFWAT.

FLOOD DEFENCE

Newham contains extensive existing flood defence infrastructure and large parts of the borough are protected to a high standard, this includes the Thames tidal defences, the Thames Barrier and the Barking Barrier. The high levels of development within Newham and the future impacts of climate change will mean that the existing defences will have to be adapted over time, but rather than replacing them like for like, the approach will be to consider alternative options such as different combinations of flood storage, river defences and floodplain attenuation.

WASTE

East London Joint Waste Development Plan Document (DPD) is one of a set of documents which will form part of Newham’s Local Development Framework. It is being prepared jointly by the four East London Waste Authority (ELWA) boroughs of Newham, Barking and Dagenham, Havering and Redbridge.

The need for waste management facilities to accommodate waste growth will be based on the national recycling and composting targets. The submission Development Plan Document identifies sixteen established waste management facilities to be safeguarded and seven new sites for waste management facilities across the four boroughs. Six of the safeguarded waste management facilities are in Newham. Of the seven new sites proposed for the development of waste management facilities, one is in Newham – at Beckton Riverside. In Newham, the Beckton Riverside Preferred Industrial Location, located to the south of the Sewage Treatment Works, is identified as a site suitable for a large scale recovery facility.

EDUCATION

Future needs for primary education are bring met through the Primary Capital Programme totalling £49 million. The capital investment will be used not only to address accommodation issues but also as a key resource to transform delivery of primary education in Newham. However, needs in the late part of the 2010s are not funded.

Over the past three years school place planning for the secondary sector has been carried out as part of the preparation for the Newham Building Schools for the Future programme. This is a scheme to transform standards in secondary education through capital investment in secondary schools over the next decade.

The Building Schools for the Future Programme will provide an estimated £222 million over a 7 year period to finance the rebuilding and refurbishment of Secondary Schools in the Borough. Added to this is an ICT support budget of
around £29m. Based on current funding and cost predictions there is an estimated shortfall (between additional costs and income available) of £4.8 million per annum (BSF Strategic Business Case).

Since this report was drafted Wave 5 of Newham’s Building Schools for the Future programme has been suspended, pending the Comprehensive Spending Review in the Autumn. More generally, infrastructure requirements for the borough and committed funding will need to be reviewed regularly in order to keep the Infrastructure Development Plan ‘live’.

In the longer term, new provision will be required to support new communities emerging in the new regeneration areas. The Council has agreed to formally support the proposal for an Academy on the Stratford City (or Olympic Village) site. This would be an all through school, with a five-form entry secondary section (with a sixth form) that would open in 2013 once the Olympic Village is handed back to the site developers for long-term occupation. The Academy is not funded through the Building Schools for the Future programme.

**Further Education**

Newham College has invested heavily in its estate some £55m. However, to continue to develop its enterprise curriculum, and to ensure fit-for-purpose modern learning facilities, there is a strategic intention both to rationalise, remodel and modernise the East Ham campus, and relocate its main Stratford operations nearer to or in Stratford City.

**Higher Education**

The University of East London (UEL) is the principal higher education facility in the borough. The capital projects that are contained within UEL’s current estate strategy include the construction of a new Sports and Leisure Building, a new library building and reception for the university’s Docklands campus building.

UEL is collaborating with development with Birkbeck College and will provide an academic and performing arts facility on a new site adjacent to the Stratford Shopping Centre called Stratford Island University Campus.

**Healthcare**

The vision of the Newham Primary Care Trust aims to reconfigure the way that primary healthcare is delivered in Newham. This will increase capacity and responsiveness by bringing services closer to communities. However the forward strategy has not been finalised by the PCT who are currently considering options.

The PCT intends to create a polysystem for delivering future healthcare services. Under this approach, Primary Care Networks / Spokes, containing hubs, will deliver the full range of primary and secondary healthcare services in a co-ordinated and joined up manner in an environment closer to local communities. The PCT proposes four Polysystems covering the north west (Stratford), north east (Manor Park), central (East Ham) and south (Canning Town/Royal Docks/Beckton) quadrants used by the PCT for facilities planning. Each comprises 60,000-70,000 residents.

Key services will be provided from hubs in each network. The alignment of services to polysystems is the first step of shifting services out of hospitals to be closer to homes. This approach will seek to redesign community services to be provided in more innovative ways that support delivery of primary and secondary care within the polysystem setting.

**Leisure Facilities**

The Olympic Aquatics Centre (OAC) will be built at Stratford at a cost of approximately £100m. LBN have agreed to contribute £5m towards the capital costs of this facility.

The Borough currently contains five 25m pools. The Olympic Aquatics Centre will add two to this total, increasing pool capacity in East London by 24%.

By 2020, 1,500 new Health and Fitness stations will be required and the shortfall is likely to remain. Development at Stratford alongside OAC will help meet the shortfall.

Newham is estimated to require approximately ten new tennis courts by 2020, based on national standards. The court catchment is 30 minute drive; therefore any new facilities should be focused in the south of the borough.
By 2020, there will be a requirement of 391m² ice rinks, based on Sport England national standards. Such a facility is regarded to have sub-regional status. Development of the Olympic Park will increase accessibility to Lea Valley Ice Rink.

The Future of Leisure Centres report 2007 sets out three options with regard to future investment. The first option is to continue running four leisure centres over the next 20 years as they are now. This will cost in 49.7 million. The second option is to reduce provision by closing Atherton and Balaam and invest in OAC, costing £29.3m. The final option is to replace pools at Canning Town and Green Street and invest in OAC, which will cost £33.4m.

**Community Facilities**

Workplace is a recruitment service in Newham that is committed to helping employers find the right local people to work for them and to supporting local people who want those jobs. Workplace has two fixed sites in Stratford and Canning Town, and also conducts regular outreach at children’s centres, libraries, and community centres across the borough. Workplace East Ham is due to open in 2010.

The future model of provision envisaged for Newham enables customers to access Council services through a number of channels to maximise choice and delivery, including a central telephone contact centre, and Front Offices (FOs) which will be located at Stratford, Canning Town, East Ham and Manor Park to provide locally-based services for customers. Wherever possible, each will also contain a ‘library-plus’. These will be located at Beckton, Forest Gate, Green Street, Royal Docks, Plaistow and Custom House. Partner Offices will also be located in facilities where appropriate.

**Emergency Services**

There are currently no plans to build any new fire stations in Newham to provide extra capacity outside the committed rebuild of Plaistow fire station and three temporary stations within the Olympic Park.

The Metropolitan Police Authority has an estate strategy and Asset management Plan for Newham. It is evolving but it likely to involve a hierarchy of different operational themes such as Neighbourhood Police bases, front counters, office accommodation, patrol bases and custody centres.

The London Ambulance Service is likely to vacate its site from Silvertown site in 2011 to 2012. As part of this strategy the London Ambulance Service (LAS) is considering two options. The first option is to identify a similarly sized site, located closer to Stratford for replacement services. Alternatively, under the second option, a “super station” would be created. This would amalgamate the three existing stations into one single facility. This station would also be supported by a series of standby points, to be strategically located throughout the Borough.

**Green Infrastructure**

Newham Parks and Open Spaces Development Plan 2009-2014 provides a framework for the improvement of our parks and open spaces to ensure that they better serve the needs of local communities. The plan allows the Council’s intentions for our parks and open spaces to be shared with both our communities and our partners.

The Baseline Report explains the current condition of baseline information on open space in the Borough. This baseline is currently being updated and a site audit of all sites is being undertaken. Once complete it will be possible to identify quantitative and qualitative and accessibility standards for open space provision, and where deficiencies in provision exist.

**Financing Mechanisms**

Local authorities have a requirement to invest in their communities and to develop the infrastructure to support them. This is not a responsibility that falls to the local authority in isolation. The development of localities requires investment from a range of sources including health, water and sewerage and national agencies. Where there is a substantial programme of development or regeneration, there is a need for the investment strategies of the various agencies to be effectively coordinated through integrated infrastructure planning.
In Newham’s case a Community Infrastructure Study is being undertaken for the Council. The study should provide the basis for planning the development of the additional infrastructure that Newham will require over the planning period.

The adoption of the infrastructure plan should be a key document in the determination of the Council’s capital programme. However, it is not the only influencing factor. There will be other demands on the Council’s resources which will emanate from the Council’s corporate and service plans and the asset management strategy. It is essential that the Council gives careful consideration to its overall capital programme and the financing thereof.

**Governance Arrangements for Infrastructure Delivery Plan**

As part of this project and also with support from PAS, LB Newham officers and partners have received opportunities for briefings on the role on IDPs and the potential role of the LSP. These have been held in the period September-December 2009 and have included briefings for planning officers and other senior council officers provided by PAS.

At each meeting, there was a presentation about the delivery role of the LDF and also the changing role of the LSP.

LB Newham will need to consider how they wish to take forward this process in order to support their future integrated approach to infrastructure investment and planning.

**Conclusions and Way forward**

We recommend that the key public sector organisations in the Newham Council area move on to establish a key role for the Local Strategic Partnership in overseeing capital investment in future, and in particular that the asset management and capital planning activities of the Council, PCT and Police are brought more closely into alignment.
1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Document
This is the third report of the Newham Community Infrastructure Study and covers the future needs provision position for each of the services covered by the study.

1.2 Appointment and Purpose
Capita Symonds, in association with Colin Buchanan and Partners, Sector and Professor Janice Morphet, have been appointed by the London Borough of Newham (LBN) to undertake a borough-wide Community Infrastructure Study.

The Community Infrastructure Study assesses what infrastructure currently exists as well as what is currently planned against what infrastructure will be needed over the next 15 years, a period in which large areas of LBN will be transformed by growth.

Out of this research, an Infrastructure Plan will be drawn up setting out proposals for the provision of additional infrastructure to meet future capacity levels, including what investments are required and how these could be funded.

The Community Infrastructure Study and accompanying Plan will form part of the evidence base for LBN’s Local Development Framework, more specifically the Core Strategy. However, the Plan has a longer term purpose. Some wider functions include:

- Newham Parks Development Plan (via the open space study carried out for the Community Infrastructure Study);
- Newham Education Primary Capital Programme;
- Schools for the Future;
- Early years’ childcare provision;
- Newham Council property Asset Management;
- Spatial planning by the Newham Primary Care Trust; and,
- Liaison with the Newham Sustainable Community Strategy.

The Sustainable Community Strategy places emphasis on infrastructure provision, particularly as LBN is expecting to experience substantial housing and population growth. In order to foster sustainable communities through this period of change, it is important to ensure that the growing population have access to services and facilities such as schools and health centres, and that social inclusion is encouraged.

1.3 The Project
The Study is designed to engage all stakeholders, including infrastructure providers, to plan infrastructure required and to ensure a collaborative and integrated approach. The programme constitutes the following tasks:

- Task 1 Inception – agree approach and establish stakeholder communications;
- Task 2 Best Practice – understanding of current state of service provision including innovations in infrastructure delivery to underpin the Study;
- Task 3 Standards – consultation with providers to enable reporting on current standards, gaps in standards and how they might change in the future;
- Task 4 Baseline – identify existing infrastructure assets and establish schedule of assets linked to a Geographic Information System (GIS);
Tasks 5-6 were completed in December 2009 and reported in the Interim Report.

This Final Report follows on from the Baseline Report and Interim Report. It forms part of the outcome of Task 5 and 7 as indicated by figure 1.1. The report includes the following sections:

- Section 1 – This introduction;
- Section 2 – Growth Assumption;
- Section 3: Physical Infrastructure: Transport;
- Section 4: Physical Infrastructure: Energy and Water;
- Section 5: Flood Risk;
- Section 6: Physical Infrastructure: Waste;
- Section 7: Social Infrastructure: Education;
- Section 8: Social Infrastructure Healthcare;
- Section 9: Adult Social Care;
• Section 10: Leisure and Community Facilities;
• Section 11: Emergency Services;
• Section 12: Green Infrastructure;
• Section 13: Infrastructure Delivery Plan;
• Section 14: Funding;
• Section 15: Infrastructure Governance; and,
• Section 16: Conclusions and Way Forward;
2. Growth Assumptions

2.1 Forecasting Methods

Broadly speaking, infrastructure providers assess future demand for their services on one of two methods:

- Population basis and;
- Household basis

Services provided to individual people, such as schools will tend to use population basis; physical infrastructure will tend to use households, as single person households use more energy and water per person than multi-person households.

There are however linkages between the approaches. Population forecasts produced by local government (e.g. Greater London Authority) tend to be based on planned housing numbers, using standard multipliers. This should result in a high measure of consistency between agencies. However for various historic reasons certain agencies use national population projections (OPCS) which are essentially not based on future plans, but on past trends. This can lead to difficulties in areas where a large amount of future growth is planned, such as Newham. There can also be difficulties establishing a baseline population when a number of years since the last Census has elapsed, owing to the methods used to calculate change since the Census, and this can lead to further discrepancies. London Borough of Newham Corporate Policy and Regeneration are much alive to these issues and the real funding implications they have.

2.2 2009 Housing Trajectory

We have used the housing trajectory compiled in Autumn 2009 by LBN as the key basis for this community infrastructure study. The trajectory was produced with the benefit of the work done by LBN and the GLA on the 2009 London Housing Capacity Study and is consistent with the figure for Newham proposed in the draft London Plan (October 2009). Figure 2.1 overleaf illustrates projected housing totals per community forum and the principal projected housing sites, giving a total of 35,447 homes to 2027.

Housing trajectory figures have since been refined in light of housing capacity and land availability data, resulting in a slightly higher figure of 37,500, with some small variations across the Community Forum areas. The plans of infrastructure providers will need to be reviewed regularly to ensure that infrastructure keeps pace with new housing, for example, through the Annual Monitoring Report.
Figure 2.1: Projected Housing Forums

Legend
- Blue square: Projected Housing Totals by Community Forum
- Red square: Major Projected Housing Sites
- Grey square: Newham Community Forums

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. 2003 1002113271.
3. Physical Infrastructure: Transport

3.1 Need For New Infrastructure: Rail

Studies undertaken by National Rail and TfL have established the current levels of capacity (in terms of passengers required to stand per square metre) for rail services in London. The most recent published data is for 2006. Using projections of passenger growth and taking into account the proposed levels of infrastructure improvements, the likely levels of crowding on the rail services has been reassessed for the years 2026 and 2031.

These are shown in the following diagrams below and overleaf.

Figure 3.1: London Underground DLR Crowding

Source: TfL 2009
Figure 3.2: Tube and DLR Crowding 2031

Standing passengers per sq metre
- < 1 standing per sq metre
- 1 – 2 standing per sq metre
- 2 – 3 standing per sq metre
- 3 – 4 standing per sq metre
- > 4 standing per sq metre

Source: TfL 2009
Figure 3.3: Rail Crowding 2031

Source TfL 2009
Table 3.1 below summarises the passenger density for services within the borough of Newham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Underground</th>
<th>Standing Passengers per SQM</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith &amp; City</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docklands Light Railway</th>
<th>Standing Passengers per SQM</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Arsenal Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Overground</th>
<th>Standing Passengers per SQM</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overground</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Rail Services</th>
<th>Standing Passengers per SQM</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shenfield – Liverpool Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>4&gt;</td>
<td>4&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford – Stansted</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenchurch Street - Barking</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TfL, 2009

As can be seen from the diagrams, levels of crowding with rail cars increase as you get closer to major employment centres such as Canary Wharf and the City of London. Even with the proposed upgrades to the public transport system predicted increases in the use of public transport keep up or even exceed the capacity improvements.

Passenger overcrowding can be cited as a reason for persons not using public transport. Whilst some sections of rail services within the borough have low levels of passengers standing, in could be inferred that congestion elsewhere on the network could still deter passengers from using services.

3.2 **NEED FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE: BUSES**

Using Keypoint data from TfL an assessment of the available capacity on buses on routes that pass through Newham has been undertaken to indentify the locations of bus stops where passing services have an occupancy level of 50% or more at during the morning, midday and evening peak periods which are summarised in Figure 3.4.

Keypoint data provides information regarding the number of people getting on and off buses at specified bus stops for the AM, PM and Midday peaks. The Node ID for each bus stop allows the location and direction of service to be identified. The Keypoint data sheets also list the capacity of buses providing the service and the number of buses arriving at the bus stop during the service thus an indication as to the occupancy levels of the buses can be gained.
Our assessments of the current capacity of buses within the Borough (in our revised baseline report) – using Key point data from TfL – indicates that at a number of locations in the borough buses are more than 70% full at stops (See figure 3.4). With the exception of Stratford and Canning Town, these locations are not those where the greatest increases in homes and population are planned. However this analysis does throw up the possibility that developments in the community forum areas of Forest Gate, Manor Park, East Ham, Green Street and Plaistow could cause increased pressure on the bus network.

It should be noted that as other transport modes are improved or introduced, such as the DLR extension to Stratford International, there will be an impact on bus patronage for services near or connecting to these modes. Buses are a highly flexible and cost effective means of meeting local and sub regional travel demand and can be re-planned and assessed with current data at relative short notice.
3.3 ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Figure 3.5 overleaf shows walk times to a means of public transport within the borough of Newham. As can be seen, the areas where shorter walk times of less than 3 minutes are possible are close to major highway and hence bus services and rail infrastructure with walk times increasing as the road network either reduces in capacity or density.

It is clear from Figure 3.5 many of the areas identified as having long walk times to public transport coincide with many of the chosen development sites within the borough (e.g. Stratford City and Olympic Park). However two developments will affect this: the construction of new transport facilities (e.g. Stratford International DLR station and Javelin stop) and opening of new public paths (e.g. through Olympic area). We have not managed yet to gain access to modelling data which would enable the model to be run to take account of this.

In order to demonstrate the accessibility of areas around Newham for public transport, an assessment has been undertaken for journey times to a number of influential destinations selected on the basis of their potential attraction as places of work, shopping and leisure.

The assessment has been prepared using Accession Software which models journey times to a given destination. The database for this modelling contains the timetables for public transport facilities as well as the location of each bus stop and rail station thus enabling multimodal journeys to be assessed. The software also accounts for the journeys between transport modes by assuming a walk speed of 4.8km/h (80m/minute).
Figures 2.4 to 2.8 in the Updated Baseline Report show journey times across public transport modes to selected destinations. The plans have been rendered to show areas of good accessibility as hotspots with the areas that require longer journeys as cool spots. A key is provided for each figure identifying the colour and its journey time in minutes.
3.4 FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS: OVERVIEW

Based on estimates in the growth of the number of passengers using public transport, TfL and Network Rail have a program of upgrading existing, and to a lesser extent, providing new public transport facilities in London.

Whilst bus service provision may need to be increased (The bus network is currently under review according to the Mayor’s Transport Strategy and associated Sub-Regional Documents).

Where new development takes place, TfL will wish to have involvement from an early stage in order to assess the need for bus services to support the development.

As noted previously, much of the proposed infrastructure improvements that are scheduled to take place in the next fifteen to twenty years are based in increasing the capacity of existing services with some new projects also being constructed.

Within the 15 year timescale that Newham are focusing on, the following infrastructure improvements are either proposed or committed (Mayor’s Transport Strategy, October 2009: Map from Group Planning TfL).
### Table 3.2 Funded Transport Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Likely completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLR Extension to Stratford International</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East London Transit Phase 1a</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR Beckton extension 3 car upgrade</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Line Upgrade</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Overground upgrade</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Park infrastructure</td>
<td>2012-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East London Transit Phase 1b</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossrail</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Superhighway Route 3 – Barking to Tower Gateway</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3: Proposed Schemes – Unfunded/Postponed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLR Dagenham Dock extension</td>
<td>unfunded/postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallions Reach Transport Interchange</td>
<td>unfunded/postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford International Station interchange improvements</td>
<td>unfunded/postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham Station improvements</td>
<td>unfunded/postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Gateway River Crossing</td>
<td>Safeguarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvertown Crossing</td>
<td>Safeguarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle Superhighway Route 2 – Ilford to Aldgate</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4.1 River

As part of the TfL update report into the East London Rover crossing (July 2009), improvements to the north/south movement of people and goods have been considered. Whilst the report makes references to other modes of transport, the following projects have been shortlisted as feasible options although commitment to the projects has yet to be agreed.

Since the TfL update report, TfL have announced a proposal for a cable car crossing the Thames between Newham and the Greenwich Peninsular, to give pedestrians and cyclists a fast and regular service and support growth and regeneration in the area. It would also be a major attraction, improving access to entertainment and Olympic venues as well as connecting communities and visitor destinations on both sides of the river. It could open ahead of the 2012 games subject to private funding being secured and planning permission being granted for the scheme. The estimated cost is £25m and discussions are ongoing with a number of interested private sector organisations.

---

1 As part of the development of the 2012 Olympic Park a range of transport improvements serving the Park are already underway, including an extension to the Docklands Light Railway (DLR), increased capacity on the Jubilee Line and the upgrade of Stratford Regional Station. These will remain as part of the Legacy of the games. Furthermore, the communities surrounding the Park will enjoy access to the open space via a network of canal towpaths, footpaths and cycleways. A summary of the transport legacy for the Olympic Park is provided from their report “Transport Plan for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games – second edition consultation draft”
The above text should go with table 3.5 which appears later in the report (referring to unfunded schemes)
Figure 3.6 below identifies many of the proposed schemes within and adjacent to Newham.

**Figure 3.6: Proposed Schemes**

East London Sub-Region: Newham – transport context

Source: TfL 2009

3.5 **RAIL: FUNDED**

3.5.1 **DLR STRATFORD EXTENSION**

TfL has stated that the aims of the Stratford Extension are to:

- Act as a catalyst for regeneration in the Lower Lea Valley, bringing forward new jobs, homes, shops and other leisure facilities to the area;
- Provide improved public transport capacity, reliability, accessibility and frequency on the corridor between Stratford and Canning Town by converting the NLL to DLR use;
- Enable people to take advantage of employment opportunities and amenities in the Lea Valley and other parts of east and south-east London through direct connections to the Royal Docks and Woolwich Arsenal;
- Create intermediate stations on the line to serve existing and future communities and provide a new link and station to Stratford International to serve high speed train services calling at this station;
- Offer passengers an environmentally friendly alternative to the car; and significantly improve orbital journey opportunities between north, north-east, east and south-east London; and
- Meet the travel demands associated with the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.
Additional stops are to be provided at Stratford High Street, Abbey Road, and Star Lane to assist in these aims. The route is expected to open in summer 2010.

3.5.2 **Jubilee Line Capacity Upgrade**
A new signalling system and improvements to the Jubilee line’s tracks, trains and control centre will allow more passengers to enjoy much quicker journeys.

The line has experienced dramatic growth in recent years and will be a vital transport link to many 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games venues.

The upgrade should allow the running of more trains and increase capacity by 33 per cent. Additionally, journey times will be cut by around 22 per cent. By 2012 all Jubilee line stations will have been modernised.

3.5.3 **DLR Beckton Extension 3 car upgrade 2011**
Transport for London and Docklands Light Railway DLR has confirmed funding for an £18.2m upgrade which will increase capacity by 50 percent on its Beckton route in time for the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The Beckton line is a route which is growing fast as it serves the ExCeL exhibition and conference centre and the University of East London and need the additional trains in order to keep pace with growing passenger numbers. The entire DLR network should be three-car ready by early 2011.

3.5.4 **Central Line Upgrade 2011**
The Central line was upgraded with new trains, tracks and signalling in the 1990s. The line’s 85 trains have eight cars each and were introduced between 1993 and 1995. They are automatically operated, which means faster and smoother journeys. The line should be able to provide up to 30 trains an hour, however, they currently suffer from overcrowding during peak travel times. A key outcome of Crossrail could be to reduce overcrowding on the Central Line and so help the line to better improve its reliability.

3.5.5 **London Overground Upgrade 2011**
London Overground operates on the Richmond to Stratford, Clapham Junction to Willesden Junction, Gospel Oak to Barking and Watford Junction to Euston lines. In 2011 the network will connect to the extended East London line at Highbury & Islington - the start of an orbital service around London.

The extended East London line will become part of the Overground network when it opens in 2010 - running from Dalston Junction to West Croydon, Crystal Palace and New Cross. It will eventually link with the North London line at Highbury & Islington in 2011, creating the beginning of an orbital service around London.

Work is underway on a £326 million upgrade of Transport for London’s (TfL) Overground network which will provide reliable connections to the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Park.

Funded by TfL, the Olympic Delivery Authority, Network Rail and the Department for Transport, the work will:

- Upgrade more than 200 signals;
- Renew 7km of track and 69 sets of points and;
- Lengthen 30 platforms and make general improvements to a further seven stations.
When the upgrade is complete, London Overground will run up to eight trains an hour during peak times on parts of the network, double the current number, and with a more reliable timetable for those trains. New and longer platforms will allow more carriages per train, increasing seating capacity and reducing overcrowding.

TfL’s station improvements include upgrades to CCTV, lighting and passenger information screens as well as new lifts at some locations.

3.6 CROSSRAIL

Crossrail will link network rail services between east and west London that currently require passengers to use other modes to cross central London (see Figure 3.7). Crossrail is currently scheduled to begin services in 2016.

Its aims are to increase capacity, reduce overcrowding, and improve journey times on east-west axis through central London. Particularly so it directly serves Heathrow (airport), West End/City/Canary Wharf (commercial centres), and southern Thames Gateway (key regeneration zone); also reducing necessity for interchanging.

Whilst the effect of Crossrail on Newham is not immediately obvious, it has the potential to provide Relief to LU lines, primarily Central, H&C, Bakerloo and Jubilee.
3. Transport

Figure 3.7 Crossrail proposal showing connections across Crossrail network

Source: TfL 2009
3.7 RAIL: POSTPONED OR UNFUNDED

**DLR Extension to Dagenham Dock**

October 2008 The Docklands Light Railway (DLR) asked the Department for Transport (DfT) to delay the start of the Public Inquiry into the proposed extension of its network to Dagenham Dock. DLR has asked for the delay - and the DfT has agreed - because it needs time to clarify the situation with the Government in relation to funding for the extension. Prior to this the proposed year of opening year was 2016/2017. Whilst sections of the route have been safeguarded there is no clear indication of when this project will restart.

The scheme was seen as a significant link to unlock areas for development in Newham (Beckton) Barking and Dagenham (Barking Riverside). As well as providing part of the infrastructure to support the redevelopment of these areas, the DLR Extension would have allowed a shift in transport modes/routes to access the Royal docks, particularly from the east.

People working or living in the Royal Dock area would have the ability to travel east (and vice versa) by a more direct route, using the DLR to gain access to the underground network and Network Rail at Dagenham Dock rather than circuitously via Canning Town/West Ham or Stratford International.
3.7.1 Bus Services Funded: East London Transit Phases 1A and 1B

East London Transit is a part-segregated bus rapid transit whose first phase opened in 2010 with an additional phase planned to open in 2013.

The aim of East London Transit (ELT) is to provide benefit to passengers including the following:

- Quicker journeys;
- New vehicles;
- Better information; and
- New, modern stops and shelters.

The first phase, from Ilford to Dagenham Dock via Barking town centre, has been introduced. This provides:

- New parking and loading facilities as well as major junction improvements to smooth traffic flow;
- New crossings and street lighting, to improve safety;
- Improved footway paving and rejuvenated green spaces that have helped revitalise the area;
- New bus shelters at all ELT stops, with the kerb raised for easy boarding; and
- Real-time passenger information at busy stops.

Other improvements include:

- New double-decker buses with next stop announcements and an air-cooling system; and
- Bringing buses into the heart of Barking town centre, where our works have played a vital role in the transformation of the town centre.

The second phase, from Barking town centre to Dagenham Dock via Barking Riverside, is expected to begin construction in 2011. When services begin in 2013 they will deliver:

- Dedicated bus lanes in selected areas to improve journey time and reliability;
- Reduced congestion by removing parking and loading from traffic lanes;
- Improved footways and pedestrian access;
- Upgrades and improvements to some traffic signals and junctions; and
- Improved passenger information.
Figure 3.9 below illustrates DLR extensions and connections to East London Transit.

Figure 3.9: Plan showing DLR extensions and connections to East London Transit

### 3.8 ROAD: UNFUNDED OR STOPPED

#### 3.8.1 THAMES GATEWAY BRIDGE CROSSING

Thames Gateway Bridge Crossing

The Thames Gateway River Crossing was to provide new river crossing between Newham and Thamesmead. The link was to take the form of a four-lane dual-carriageway road for general highway traffic between the A13/A406 junction at Beckton and the A206 in Thamesmead.

The bridge would have provided four lanes for general traffic and two segregated lanes for public transport across the Thames Gateway Bridge. These would have allowed for connections the proposed public transport networks of the Greenwich Waterfront Transit and the East London Transit Schemes.

As well as providing a springboard for regeneration the crossing had the potential to absorb some traffic that would otherwise use the Blackwall Tunnel or the Woolwich Ferry.

However whilst the proposal for the Thames Gateway River Crossing is unlikely to come forward within the period of this study, the TfL update report into the East London River crossing (July 2009) investigated other proposals to increase the north/south movement of traffic across the River Thames and therefore reduce the stress on existing...
crossings of the River Thames. A summary of possible river crossings, timescales and cost estimates is listed below in Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5: Possible Future Thames Crossings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Key benefits</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Initial Cost/Funding Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Ferry enhancements</td>
<td>More capacity for commercial vehicles and less queuing time</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Could be included within contract for Woolwich Ferry refurbishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable Car</td>
<td>Gives pedestrians and cyclists a fast and regular service to the Greenwich Peninsula, supporting growth and regeneration in the area and linking leisure attractions</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Approx £25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New vehicle ferry at Gallions Reach in addition to Woolwich</td>
<td>An alternative option for commercial vehicles which would give quicker access to the Royal Docks from North Bexley than using the Woolwich ferry or Blackwall</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>Approx £40-60m Includes cost of road access and operating concession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvertown bridge or tunnel</td>
<td>Provides relief to Blackwall and local connections supporting business and regeneration</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Up to £300m (further work on costs to be undertaken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Gallions Reach bridge</td>
<td>Post Silvertown Link, provides less relief to Blackwall but improves access in an area where cross-river journeys are limited. Good for business and regeneration</td>
<td>2020 +</td>
<td>Up to £300m (further work on costs to be undertaken)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TfL Update on East London River Crossing Review 8 July 2009

**East London Transit Phase 2**

Whilst East London Transit phases 1A and 1B are located outside of the borough in Barking and Dagenham, ELT Phase 2 was also proposed linking Barking to Gallions Reach. This also had the potential to link into the Thames Gateway River Crossing. The first phase of the scheme as noted previously will link the main town centres in Barking, Ilford and Romford and also connect National Rail, Underground and DLR stations.

The East London Transit was to use either buses or trolley buses running on dedicated roads, or where shared with public highway, having priority over general traffic. Whilst bus like in form, the dedicated corridors would allow significant improvements in service provision and regularity. Whilst the first phases provided improved public transport outside of Newham as well as connections to the DLR extension, the two schemes together would have provided major transport links between the boroughs enabling significant regeneration opportunities.

With the current suspension of the program for the DLR Extension, the Phase 2 Section of the ELT could offer benefits by improving the public transport links the in the Gallions Reach/Beckton Riverside area by providing a north/south link between the Royal Docks and Beckton.
3.9 CYCLING

Newham will be one of the first boroughs to benefit from a Cycle Superhighway.

A Cycle Superhighway will be a clearly marked cycle route designed to make it easier to travel by bicycle. Cycle Superhighways are being introduced to encourage people to commute by bike between outer and inner London and to make it safer and easier to do so. Cycle Superhighways will be safe, fast, direct, continuous, informative, visible and comfortable.

The Cycle Superhighways routes were chosen on the basis of providing continuous provision of good conditions for cycling across London through one or a combination of:

- wide traffic lanes, which enable traffic to overtake cyclists without moving into other lanes in the same or opposing direction;
- bus lanes;
- cycle lanes;
- sections without much traffic and with low speeds;
- cycle tracks alongside the carriageway (segregated off-carriageway), or potential for provision; and
- good conditions for cycling through improved measures

The route from Barking to Tower Gateway has been chosen to be one of the first Superhighways as it has excellent cycling provision but it lacks continuity in places and is underused. To encourage better use of the existing facilities and ensure value for money, TfL plans to connect the existing infrastructure and introduce a range of measures to encourage Londoners to travel by bike. These measures include cycle training and providing more cycle parking.

The proposed Superhighway 3 through Newham is shown on the following figures overleaf.
Figure 3.10: Cycle Superhighway

Cycle Superhighways
Indicative routes subject to consultation

Source TfL 2009

Figure 3.11: Proposed Superhighway: Tower Gateway to East India

Source TfL 2009
3.9.1 BOROUGH WIDE CYCLE ROUTES

It is evident from the Transport for London Cycle maps that there are few routes of dedicated off road cycle lanes. Much of this is alongside the A13 and will become part of the Superhighway. Provision is notably lacking in the area between the River Lea/Bow Creek and the A1011 Manor Road corridor. However, much of this area is scheduled for redevelopment, either through the Olympic Park or other regeneration schemes.

With the exception of the “route for cyclists that may be on busier roads” there are lacks of routes that provide direct linkages across the borough.

A number of routes are identified as in need of development/improvement through the Local Implementation Plan programme and via the Olympic Cycle Route Programme:

- The Greenway Vision Strategy, prepared by The ODA, Thames Water and the Council includes schemes to improve connections to The Greenway from adjacent areas such as to Newham General Hospital, West Ham Memorial Park, Gallions Shopping Centre and to the River Thames.
- LCN Route 12 along Romford Road – a key route into Stratford and on to central London.
- Factory Road, North Woolwich Road, Dock Road and Lower Lea Crossing, which connects the Woolwich Ferry and Foot Tunnel with Canary Wharf. The route has off road segregated cycle track along it and the aspiration is to realise a full length cycle track all the way from Factory Road through to Dock Road.
- Four cycle routes to the Olympic Park (within Newham) - The Greenway, Lower Lea, Limehouse Cut and Epping Forest routes. Various improvements are currently being carried out to make these viable cycling routes.
- Greenways - a network of local routes connecting green spaces and mostly going along quiet roads that an 11 year old child should be able to cycle along.
Aspirational Routes

A number of other aspirational routes have been identified which could significantly improve cycle connections within the borough for access to jobs and leisure facilities including:

- a viable north-south cycle route, i.e. one connecting the regeneration areas of the Royal Docks with Stratford. Such a route could run from the Docks, up through Beckton District Park, onto The Greenway and onto Channelsea Path to Stratford.
- a route along the Roding Valley Way more closely aligned with the River, connecting the Thames and up to Redbridge and beyond.
- Better access to Lea Valley Park from the lower lea valley (includes ‘Fat Walk’ being development by London Thames Gateway Development Corporation and partners)

3.10 Standards

The Transport Standards identified in the Inception Report will be met.
4. Physical Infrastructure: Energy and Water

4.1 ELECTRICITY: EDF

4.1.1 FUTURE PROVISION

EDF is responding to the current downturn in the economy by adjusting the forecasted load growth across the majority of the network. The company predicts very low growth levels over the next few years. It sees its asset replacement programmes as providing opportunities to rethink the way in which its infrastructure is developed to meet future customer needs, particularly for connections to green and renewable energy sources.

However, significant investments are planned at the following sites during the period 2010-2015 which will result in a major increase in capacity and resilience of the network.

EDF Schematic Network Plan LPN 2010-15

A significant 132kV network is planned to be laid from West Ham to Brunswick Wharf. There is also the possibility that this could be extended to West Ham BR. Overland power lines at this location are also due to be refurbished in 2012:
• Two new 132/11kV substations will be built at Nelson Street and the Excel Centre;
• EDF also plan to reinforce Wood Grange Park Substation and replace 3kV cables;
• A 66kV transformer reinforcement and switchboard replacement will be undertaken at Silvertown;
and,
• Overhead 132kV power lines will be replaced between West Ham Primary and Orchard Place.

We contacted EDF to confirm that the electricity infrastructure improvements will provide adequate capacity for projected population growth. EDF responded stating that at present the network capacity is adequate for meeting existing customer demand.

If presented with a development proposal for the Newham area, the EDF Energy ‘Projects Gateway Team’ would be happy to examine the proposal, its impact on the existing network and provide an economic design for connection.

4.2 GAS: National Grid

4.2.1 DEMAND OUTLOOK

A 9% decrease in annual gas demand is forecast by 2018/19 with the peak demand forecast to reduce by 2.6%. Demand over this period is expected to reduce as a combined consequence of factors including the volatility of energy and financial markets, record unit costs for energy consumers and economic recession. The demand outlook also recognises the effect that thermal efficiencies and climate change reduce the overall need for gas. Figure 3.2G indicates the historical and forecast peak demand profile across the North Thames Local Distribution Zone (LDZ) source from the LTDP.
4.2.2 **Future Investments**

New consumers are not necessarily located in areas where sufficient infrastructure exists, so although the overall trend is expecting a reduction in gas demand there will still be a need to provide new infrastructure for gas. Over the ten year period NG expects to invest an average of £500M per annum on maintenance/enhancement of existing gas infrastructure (c70%) and operations (c15%).

4.2.3 **London Supply Strategy**

The general trend suggests that on the whole average gas consumption is falling across the North Thames LDZ. Gas demand is increasing on the western side of London and declining elsewhere. Much of the network serving London is reaching the end of its serviceable life and needs replacing. Owing to the congested nature of any city replacing these assets can be disruptive and often very difficult to access. Replacing these large diameter cast iron mains forms part of an investment plan that is currently being prepared and stakeholder consultation is expected to take place over the next 2 years.

4.2.4 **Planned Infrastructure**

Based on forecast gas demand, National Grid has undertaken a review of its existing infrastructure and operations to plan investment for the future. Their network analysis models currently use information from Local Authorities which is incorporated into the demand distribution, and as such include new demand growth. The models are assessed each year to determine which projects are required to meet the forecast demand, and this is done as part of our usual planning process. Any projects that are identified are published in the Ten Year Plan.
Between 2009/10 and 2014/15 there are number of significant projects (schemes having a values greater than £0.5M approved within National Grid’s Long Term Development Statement). Most of the named projects are for works to the high pressure (above 7bar) system. These projects are planned for the North London network as a whole entity and are not specific to load growth in the Newham or any one particular small area. However we have noted and mapped those which happen to be nearest Newham. In addition there is one relevant below-7Bar project. We also note that National Grid proposes to invest £300m per annum overall on below- 7Bar schemes costing less than £0.5M.

Major Gas Projects in Newham are listed below:

- Below 7Bar: Holder main support replacement (2009-2010); and

National Grid is also committed to replacing all iron gas mains within 30 metres of buildings within a 30 year period to comply with Enforcement Policy initiated by the Health and Safety Executive.

National Grid confirms that the housing trajectory figures for Newham up to the 2020s are unlikely to change the strategy as across the network the impact is very small.

4.3 **DECENTRALISED ENERGY**

According to the London Plan (published in November 2009) all boroughs should in their DPDs require all developments to demonstrate that their heating, cooling and power systems have been selected to minimise carbon dioxide emissions. The London Borough of Newham is in a privileged position as there are plans to incorporate the borough into a planned low carbon district heating network, the London Thames Gateway Heat Network, led by the London Development Agency. The London Thames gateway Heat Network Vision Map shows that the London Borough of Newham has significant areas where fuel poverty is greater 5.5%. It is envisioned the LTGHN could contribute to reducing fuel poverty by providing an affordable, reliable source of heat (helping to meet National indicator N187 and Sustainable Development Indicator 63).

The Network is a transmission system to supply affordable low carbon heating and hot water. The network comprises two pipes: hot water in and cooler water out. Heat will be distributed via a distribution main up to 67km long, which will take surplus heat from Barking Power Station, Tate & Lyle sugar refinery and other low carbon sources and distribute it to properties to be used for hot water and heating. The project’s delivery is expected over a three year phase period from 2010 to 2019.

Hospitals, schools, public buildings, residential, and commercial premises will be able to connect to the network, which could service up to 120,000 homes.

The LDA have commissioned research which shows that heat available from Barking Power Station is enough to meet demand of all development at Barking Riverside, South Dagenham, Barking Town Centre, Royal Docks, Gallions and Albert Island, Canning Town and the Lower Lea Valley (LDA 2009).

With adaptation and mitigation to climate change forefront in the public arena, Sustainable, affordable energy provision is vital to achieve a local carbon economy and energy security. The London Thames Gateway Heat Network offers the opportunity for Newham Council to lead from the front in terms of decentralised energy provision (see figure 4.3 overleaf).
Figure 4.3: London Thames Gateway Heat Network in The London Borough of Newham

Source: GLA 2009
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4.3.1 **Future Provision**

There are planned district heating networks in the south west of the Borough, near the Royal Docks and in the planned Olympic Park at Stratford. A Combined Cooling Heat and Power scheme is being built to serve the Olympic Park and Stratford City Development zones. The scheme could act as a catalyst for a wider district heating scheme in the Stratford Town Centre and High Street, Hackney Wick and Bromley by Bow. Over the next decade these areas will be subject to considerable development, including building 10,000 new homes. The current proposed housing scheme will not be able to meet all of its energy requirements. Therefore the London Borough of Newham, London Borough of Tower hamlets and London Thames Gateway Development Corporation are working with the LDA Decentralised Energy Delivery team to provide support for scheme.

Current and planned future communities will be serviced by a main transmission line and a network of connections running through the heart of the Borough, including Canning Town, Royal Docks, and the planned Olympic Park.

Community heating has the potential to serve 5.5 million properties, equating to 90% of flats and 20% terraced houses in the UK. There are potential retrofitting opportunities in the Southern part of Borough.

There are existing and potential heat sources in London Borough of Newham near the Royal Docks and in the planned Olympic Park. There is potential for these heat sources to be connected to the transmission lines. Tower Hamlet’s “Securing sustainable energy in Tower Hamlets suggests that Newham has a substantial opportunity to install Combined Heat and Power/Combined Cooling Heat and Power centrally at the proposed Energy centre in Stratford, on a sub-area basis, (linking groups of properties such as municipal housing blocks already connected to district heating systems, with council-owned or commercial premises).

4.3.2 **Funding Opportunities**

Financing is expected to be through a combination £60 million in public sector funding and private investment (an estimated £90 million). As the Network becomes established, with risk levels reducing to an acceptable level, public sector funding will be replaced by a combination of commercial equity and debt.

The Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) is an initiative led by the European Commission and European Investment Bank (EIB) which provides member States with the opportunity to use part of their EU grant funding to make repayable investments in projects to regenerate urban areas (see section 13.3.10 for more information about JESSICA).

The LDA is seed funding the London Thames Gateway Heat Network to leverage additional capital from the UK and EU Sources. Public sector funding is being applied both to initiate and to safeguard projects through the following programmes:

- London Green Fund; and
- JESSICA.
Figure 4.4: Funding Mechanism for LTGHN

Source: GLA 2009
4.4 **Wind**

Figure 4.5 shows there are wind sites in the Northeast east of the Borough in the Olympic Park at Stratford. There is also the potential for large scale potential wind developments in the South East of the Borough.

**Figure 4.5: Potential Wind Developments identified across London**

![Wind Map](image)


4.5 **Water Supply**

Fresh water is provided to the London Borough of Newham by Thames Water. London Borough of Newham is part of its “London Water Resource Zone” (WRZ) and its needs are planned for as part of planning for this zone, which is of a similar size to the GLA area but excludes part of the GLA and includes parts of the surrounding counties. Thames Water has recently (Sept 09) published an updated version of its Water Resources Management Plan. This provides detailed information at the London WRZ level of the baseline water supply-demand balance and the prospects for catering for future growth.

The baseline is taken by Thames Water to refer to the balance of supply and demand in a situation where current spending plans (in the “AMP5” period up to 2015) are implemented but no further measures are taken after that. The measures in the AMP5 period include measures to reduce leakage, promote household and non-household water efficiency and voluntary metering. The impact of these measures on water supply – demand balance is shown in Figure 4.6.
Figure 4.6 shows that in the short term supply will exceed demand as a consequence of investment from the AMP4 period in a desalination plant at Beckton due to open in 2010 at a cost of £250 million which can supply up to 140 million litres a day if needed.

**Figure 4.6:** London WRZ baseline scenario (dry average annual demand)

![Graph showing water supply and demand](image)

Source Thames Water WRMP Sept 09

**4.5.1 OPTIONS FOR MEETING FUTURE DEMAND**

It is clear that in the absence of further measures, the London area would face water shortages at periods of peak demand (essentially dry summers) in the fairly near future.

The planning problem is described as a deficit of 23 million litres per day in 2012-3 increasing to 344 million litres per day in 2034-5. Thames Water's Resource Management Plan evaluates a number of options for meeting the gap. The preferred solution is a combination of mains replacement to reduce leakage, and demand management measures. Table 4.1 overleaf indicates the components of the demand management and leakage programme for the whole of the Thames Water area (including other but smaller WRZs).
### Table 4.1: Thames Water: Demand Management and Leakage Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>AMP5</th>
<th>AMP6</th>
<th>AMP7</th>
<th>AMP8</th>
<th>AMP9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leakage Reduction</strong></td>
<td>Mains replacement</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Metering</strong></td>
<td>Optant Meters</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Meters Compulsory Targeted</td>
<td>365,193</td>
<td>414,540</td>
<td>510,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Water Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Household self-audit questionnaire</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household self-audit packs</td>
<td>266,511</td>
<td>203,645</td>
<td>339,270</td>
<td>537,694</td>
<td>424,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Plumber assisted audits</td>
<td>27,685</td>
<td>65,755</td>
<td>43,148</td>
<td>116,800</td>
<td>53,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product Subsidy</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Butts</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household cistern displacement devices (disrupted)</td>
<td>343,942</td>
<td>343,942</td>
<td>311,817</td>
<td>188,033</td>
<td>311,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non Household Water Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Non Household Cistern Displacement Devices (distributed)</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-household self audit questionnaire</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>26,845</td>
<td>26,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Household Audits</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector partnership and audit and retrofit (including schools)</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Thames Water WRMP Sept 09

To a limited extent the company is proposing new water resources investment. Table 4.2 overleaf sets out schemes and start years.
4. Energy and Water

### Table 4.2: Schemes for water resources investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Yield (Mill L / Day)</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern New River 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELRED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLARS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2022/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTR (100 M m3)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2026/27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source Thames Water WRMP Sept 09*

The first scheme ELRED (East London Resource Development Project = groundwater development. ELRED is a new water supply wellfield in East Ham, Newham, built entirely from redundant infrastructure 100m under the ground.

The second scheme South London Artificial Recharge Scheme (SLARS) is located in South London.

The third scheme Northern New River is a collection of wells and springs fed by the river Lea and the New Gauge, located in the Lower Lea Valley.

The forth scheme, the Upper Thames Resource (UTR) is effectively a reservoir near Abingdon, Oxon.

#### 4.5.2 Supporting the Core Strategy

Thames Water’s Final five-year Business Plan set out proposals to maintain and improve its services during the period 2010 to 2015. This Plan was based on the housing numbers in the adopted London Plan 2008, which for Newham were 3500 units per year. Thames Water submitted the final Business Plan to the regulator, OFWAT, on 7 April 2009. The plan will be subject to a public inquiry in June 2010 and the results presented are therefore subject to significant change depending on the outcome of this enquiry.

OOFWAT made its final price determination to all water companies in November 2009. In general this allowed for rather less expenditure on addressing the supply / demand balance than water companies had bid for. Our understanding is that for London in particular OFWAT did not accept the figures in the 2008 London Plan as accurate forecasts of demand.

At a more local level infrastructure reinforcements to serve individual developments should be anticipated. However in Thames Water’s opinion this should be determined once detailed proposals are put forward by promoters of individual developments. In January 2010, Thames Water accepted Ofwat’s Final determination for AMP5. However, Thames Water’s programme of capital projects for AMP5 is currently being finalised so they are not in a position to confirm which schemes are being delivered in the Newham Borough. Although we made information on the major developments in the housing trajectory available to Thames Water in view of the overall positive strategic situation in London Borough of Newham the company has declined to make comments on these individual proposals.

Therefore, the Council or developers are recommended to make contact as early as possible with respect to individual proposals so that if there are any water-supply issues which need resolving this can be discussed at an early stage. Thames Water have also suggested that the Council should contact them in early May, once their AMP5 has been finalised, as the company will be in a better position to comment on planned schemes being delivered in the Borough.
4.6 WASTEWATER TREATMENT

As in the case for all north London boroughs, sewage is collected using the system originally designed in Victorian times and channelled to a single treatment works at Beckton in East London. Sludge, both originating from the Beckton wastewater treatment process and pumped from Riverside Sewage Treatment Works (STW) is treated either within the Sludge Powered Generator (SPG) or the sludge liming plant located at Beckton Sewage Treatment Works.

Notwithstanding these provisions, Thames Water has further identified the need to provide additional sludge treatment facilities at Beckton STW. The reasons are twofold. The first is the predicted growth in the amount of sludge that will be generated from sewage treatment processes at Beckton STW. As things currently stand, this would lead to an increase in the reliance on sludge liming as a means of treating sludge unless alternative treatment is installed.

Secondly, as the Beckton SPG approaches twenty years old, in the period between 2015 and 2020, it is considered necessary to undertake a major overhaul of the SPG. During this period there will be times when the sludge processing capabilities of the SPG will be reduced, for example, one of the three operational streams may be taken out of operation Thames Water therefore considers it is important to have alternative treatment capacity to deal with sludge not able to be processed through the SPG after 2015.

Thames Water considers that additional sludge treatment capacity therefore needs to be in place during the SPG overhaul period and to meet the growing demand for treatment. This means ensuring continuity of capacity at Beckton STW.

There are two main methods for the treatment of sewage sludge: thermal destruction, with residues disposed to landfill; and biological treatment and recycling of by products to agricultural land. Treated sludge has been safely utilised on agricultural land for a substantial number of years and is recognised as the best option both environmentally and practically for dealing with residues from the treatment of wastewater in most circumstances by the EU and the UK Government.

Thames Water examines recycling options before thermal destruction. Thames Water has considered all of the alternatives to thermal destruction that are available for the management of sewage sludge, including consideration of enhanced anaerobic digestion using thermal hydrolysis. This process included consideration of appropriate outlets for the residual end product of each option assessed, and the security of those outlets to service the option chosen. Through this it has been possible to identify that there would be sufficient agricultural landbank available to recycle the resulting treated sludge from enhanced digestion.

Enhanced digestion will also provide for a reduction in the volume of material that is treated, and therefore reduce the amount of material and associated off-site vehicle movements required to transport the treated sludge to land, when compared to conventional sludge treatment by liming. In addition, the digestion process produces biogas that can be recovered to generate a significant quantity of renewable energy.

Having fully considered these advantages, and taking into account technological advances in the treatment and digestion of sludge, Thames Water has determined that it is now feasible and both environmentally and practically acceptable to implement a sludge recycling operation that utilises the enhanced digestion process.

The proposed ‘enhanced digestion’ facility would provide sufficient sludge treatment capacity for Thames Water to reduce its reliance on sludge liming for typical day to day operations and ensure that there is sufficient capacity available to meet the demand for sludge treatment in the Beckton STW catchment arising from population growth.
and improvements in the sewage treatment process. The proposed plant would also be operational in advance of the proposed overhaul of the SPG.

One of the key benefits of the proposals is that it would provide Beckton STW with a number of outlets for the treatment of sludge:

- Thermal destruction via the SPG;
- Recycling of sludge to agricultural land via the Enhanced Digestion facilities at Beckton STW and Riverside STWs; and
- Sludge liming as a contingency during routine maintenance and emergencies.

Thames Water considers that there is merit in having several sludge outlets, reducing the risk from relying on one means of disposal and ensuring that the benefits that can be derived from digestion and recycling sludge to land (energy generation and nutrient and organic value of sludge as a fertiliser) are achieved for a proportion of sludge generated at Beckton STW.

Ofwat have approved funding for the provision of Enhanced Digestion at Beckton STW during AMP5 (2010-2015).

Consideration of ongoing future requirements indicates that the provision of the extension to the Beckton STW, granted planning consent in December 2009, will (a) enable the provision of additional sewage treatment capacity required for the management of waste water from the Lee Tunnel, one of the London Tideway Tunnels, and (b) provide continued capacity to service the catchment beyond 2015 (see 4.6.1 below).

4.6.1 THAMES TIDEWAY TUNNELS

The London Tideway Tunnels is a major sewerage investment project. It aims to reduce sewage discharge into the rivers Thames and Lee by capturing the most polluting sewer overflows then transferring them to Beckton Sewage Works in East London. Its purpose is to improve river quality at times of rapid run off in storms and the first of two programmed tunnels, the Lee Tunnel, was recently granted planning consent by the London Borough of Newham. However the Thames Tunnel does not yet have planning permission. The London Tideway Tunnels are not directly connected to the purpose of supporting the growth in the Core Strategy.
5. Physical Infrastructure: Flood defence

The London Borough of Newham is characterised by generally urban areas protected by to some degree by a mix of fluvial and tidal defences. Typically redevelopment rates are high and offer one of the most beneficial ways to reduce the existing flood risk through the application of PPS 25 in land use planning (sequential approach, Sequential Test and Exception Test) and the use of resilience and resistance and design measures and emergency planning. Decisions taking full account of flood risk on the location, layout and design of the development will reduce the risk and the dependency on the existing defences in the future.

5.1 Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP)

The Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (CFMP) seeks to set high level flood risk management policy for the next 50-100 years. The Thames CFMP has been used to inform the future flood risk for the Lower Lea and the River Roding. The CFMP does not assess the tidal flood risk from the Thames.

The Thames CFMP includes key messages for the Lower Lea and Lower Roding catchment which should be incorporated by Newham into their land use planning and flood risk management in the Borough:-

- The Lower Roding has been designated under Policy Unit 4 - accept the risk, but in the long term take action to ensure that risk does not increase from current level.

- The Lower Lee has been designated under Policy P5 - reduce the risk by lowering the probability of exposure to flooding and/or the magnitude of the consequences of a flood and hence the risk.

5.1.1 Thames Estuary 2100

In addition to the Thames CFMP the Environment Agency is developing a strategy for the future management of flood risk in the Thames Estuary for the next 100 years, taking account of the predicted rise in sea level as a result of climate change. The strategy is known as Thames Estuary 2100.

The TE2100 consultation draft document splits the study areas into a number of policy units. Newham is located entirely within the ‘Royal Docks Policy Unit’ of ‘Action Zone 3’. The recommended policy is P4:

‘TAKE FURTHER ACTION TO SUSTAIN THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FLOOD RISK INTO THE FUTURE (RESPONDING TO THE POTENTIAL INCREASES IN RISK FROM URBAN DEVELOPMENT, LAND USE CHANGE AND CLIMATE CHANGE)’.

For completeness the Isle of Dogs and Lea Valley Policy Unit is also referenced. The recommended policy for the Isle of Dogs is Policy P5 to “take further action to reduce flood risk”.

The draft strategy has been reviewed for this study and the key points in relation to future flood defence infrastructure are summarised overleaf.

**First 25 years**

To maintain, enhance, improve or replace the river defence walls and active structures through east London over the first 25 years of the Plan from 2010 to 2034.

The draft Lower Roding Flood Risk Management Strategy (EA, March 2006) identified improving flood defences in Ilford as an option; however this did not make the preferred option list. The EA advised works identified upstream are likely to have limited benefit to Newham.
To agree a programme of managing flooding from other sources in the defended tidal floodplain.

**MIDDLE 35 YEARS**

To maintain, enhance and improve or replace the defence walls and active structures through east London during the 30 year period of the Plan from 2035 to 2069.

To implement a programme of defence raising, through east London (including Newham) from 2065 to 2070.

**UP TO 2100**

To maintain, improve, enhance or replace the river defence walls and active structures through central London post 2070 and into the 22nd century. Whether or not defences are raised, all defences will still require ongoing maintenance, repair and replacement (and hence engineering works) and this has been allowed for in the Plan investment profile. The Environment Agency were asked to comment further on what the Plan investment profile is but no information has been received to date.

5.2 **PROPOSED FLOOD DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE**

At the time of writing work was being carried out as part of the Olympic development in Stratford, the work aims to reduce flood risk within the Olympic zone and also the wider area, including Newham. The work includes the culverting and extension of Hennikers Ditch; this aims to reduce the overland flow path caused from the River Lea overtopping its banks further upstream, allowing for water to re enter the River Lea further downstream near the A12, via an inlet structure. This will reduce flooding in the Stratford, Plaistow, and Canning Town areas. Also under construction is an online wetland between Delivery Zones 5 and 6, on the River Lea providing additional storage and conveyance. Areas of the Olympic Park that are currently shown to be at actual risk of fluvial flooding pre-construction are likely to change following these works carried out by the ODA and will reduce the risk to surrounding area.

Flood defences are being set back on Waterworks River by the ODA. This work is being funded and constructed by the ODA, not the Environment Agency. This combined work is expected to result in a reduction in flood risk as shown in Figure 5.3; however the actual post development extent is not currently confirmed.

The Three Mills Lock, often referred to as Prescott Lock, retains the water on Prescott Channel and Waterworks River at a controlled, but natural flowing, level, and ‘locks-out’ tidal waters, returning the system to its previously navigable state. The lock does not have any direct impact on flood levels but if a flood is predicted it increases the fluvial flood storage within the Bow Back River system through providing increased flood storage. The Environment Agency were consulted about the costs of the flood relief work for the Olympics flood relief works, but the data is not currently available for this study.

There are no other large scale flood defence works proposed for either the Lower Lea or the River Roding.

The London Tideway Tunnels are two major projects proposed to reduce the amount of untreated sewage overflowing into the River Thames and its tributary, the River Lee. Thames Water have submitted planning applications for the proposed scheme that will include construction and operation of a sewage storage and transfer tunnel, known as the Lee Tunnel and an extension to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works. The proposed work will provide for future population growth and meet new treatment standards, potentially providing a reduction in flooding from combined sewers.

5.3 **POTENTIAL IMPACT OF GROWTH AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

The effects of climate change are expected to result in higher intensity storms and increased runoff in the future. The latest guidance recommends a 20% increase in flows is used to assess the impacts of climate change on rivers for time horizons between 2025 and 2115.

The location of the River Lea and River Roding upstream and downstream of the Thames Barrier results in a marked difference in the effects of climate change on flooding in Newham. Due to the River Thames being tidal the ability of both the River Roding and the River Lea to discharge fluvial flows is effected by how high the tide is. As climate change increase sea levels, water levels in the Thames will be higher. However, advice from the Environment Agency is that the
Thames Barrier will close more frequently as the effects of climate change are realised, meaning peak levels during extreme events are actually lower upstream of the Barrier.

The Barking Barrier currently operates under the same operational rules as the Thames Barrier; therefore it is assumed the Barking Barrier will also close more frequently. The increased closure of the Barking Barrier in the future could result in increased flooding along the River Roding due to the backing up of river flows unable to discharge into the River Thames because of higher water levels. It is expected that the operational rules of the Barking Barrier could be revised at a later date to take into account the effects of climate change on Newham.

New development on greenfield land, as well as intensifying existing development, does have the potential to result in increased runoff rates and volumes from urban areas into rivers, further exacerbating flooding. Current planning policy (e.g. PPS 25) requires all new development on greenfield land to restrict runoff to existing rates and volumes. The London Plan Policy 4A.14 ideally requires greenfield runoff rates on all sites. Restricting runoff from small scale redevelopment is often more difficult to control through current planning processes, however the Pitt Review into the Summer Floods of 2007 identified the need to control this form of development (e.g. people hard paving over driveways).

The Environment Agency also regularly seeks opportunities to reduce runoff from existing urban areas as part of regeneration development control. Although future development has the potential to exacerbate flooding, current flood risk planning policy means the effects are likely to be relatively limited (both in location and overall effect) when compared to the overall impact of climate change.

5.4 IDENTIFIED GROWTH AREAS

Table 5.4 details the projected housing sites provided by London Borough of Newham for this study for the next 15 years. Based on the Environment Agency Flood Zones the majority of the proposed developments are at risk of flooding. Although the actual risk of fluvial or tidal flooding is considerably lower when the presence of defences is taken into account. Flood defences cannot protect against all flooding, and it is often not sustainable or cost effective to continue to construct defences to higher levels to protect against either existing flood risk or a changing climate. Any area is potentially susceptible to surface water flooding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Forum Area</th>
<th>Number of Projected Homes</th>
<th>Environment Agency Flood Zone</th>
<th>Actual Risk (present and future)</th>
<th>Residual Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stratford and West Ham</td>
<td>114956</td>
<td>Extensive Flood Zone 2 and 3</td>
<td>Parts at risk now and in the future during 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) event, however likely to reduce as a result of Olympic proposals.</td>
<td>Risk of flooding from an extreme fluvial event (e.g. 1 in 1000 year return period) on the River Lea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Town and Custom House</td>
<td>8810</td>
<td>Extensive Flood Zone 2 and 3</td>
<td>Parts at risk in the future during 1% AEP (1 in 100 year) event, however flood risk likely to reduce as a result of Olympic proposals.</td>
<td>Significant hazard from a breach in tidal defences due to low topography. Risk of flooding from an extreme fluvial event (e.g. 1 in 1000 year return period) on the River Lea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaistow</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Partially in Flood Zone 2 and 3</td>
<td>Predominantly outside area at ‘actual risk’</td>
<td>Limited hazard from a breach in defences due to low topography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Street</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
<td>Outside area identified at actual risk of fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
<td>Not at residual risk from fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Park</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>Majority in Flood Zone 1, some fluvial flooding from the River Roding.</td>
<td>Limited actual flood risk at present. Some increase as a result of climate change.</td>
<td>Limited risk of flooding from an extreme fluvial event (e.g. 1 in 1000 year return period) on the River Roding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ham</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Majority in Flood Zone 1, some fluvial flooding from the River Roding</td>
<td>Limited actual flood risk at present. Some increase in the 1% AEP event in the future near the River Roding.</td>
<td>Limited risk of flooding from an extreme fluvial event (e.g. 1 in 1000 year return period) on the River Roding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton</td>
<td>3624</td>
<td>Partially in Flood Zone 2 and 3</td>
<td>Outside area identified at actual risk of fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
<td>Potential hazard from a breach in tidal defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>8981</td>
<td>Partially in Flood Zone 2 and 3</td>
<td>Outside area identified at actual risk of fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
<td>Significant hazard from a breach in tidal defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>Flood Zone 1</td>
<td>Outside area identified at actual risk of fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
<td>Not at residual risk from fluvial/tidal flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the current reliance on flood defence infrastructure in Newham consideration should be given to the location of future development so that it is not dependent on new or improved defences. This should follow the sequential approach (Sequential Test) set out in PPS 25, informed by a strategic flood risk assessment.

The high levels of development within Newham and the future impacts of climate change will mean that the existing defences will have to be adapted over time, but rather than replacing them like for like, the approach will be to consider alternative options such as different combinations of flood storage, river defences and floodplain attenuation.
Table 5.4 identifies a number of growth areas currently at ‘actual risk’ of fluvial flooding. This risk will increase as a result of climate change. The Olympic proposals are expected to reduce the extent of flooding from the River. However, there are expected to be areas of Stratford, West Ham on the River Lea and East Ham and Manor Park on the River Roding at ‘actual risk of flooding. There are currently no proposals to further reduce this risk of flooding.

As identified, the current reliance on flood defences means that a number of the growth areas are at significant ‘residual risk’ of flooding as a result of a breach in defences, in particular Canning Town and Custom House, Royal Docks and Beckton. Although the probability of a breach is low, the consequences can result in very high flood hazard to people and property (deep, fast flowing water). The sequential approach (Sequential Test and Exception Test) should be used by land use planners in prioritising the growth areas in Newham and locating development in the areas of ‘lowest hazard’. Following the sequential approach, where growth areas must be located in areas at residual risk of flooding, developments should include flood resilience and resistance measures.

It should also be recognised that locating development in flood risk areas (either at ‘actual’ or ‘residual’ risk of flooding, has the potential to place additional burden on the emergency services and government departments where people need to be rescued and ‘clean up’ is required post-flooding.

5.5  FUTURE FUNDING FOR FLOOD DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE

The evidence to support the amount that is likely to be spent on flood risk infrastructure in the future is not easily accessible. The Environment Agency were consulted about the actions stated in TE2100 policy unit for Newham and the associated costs with implementing them over the next 100 years. At the time of writing no information had been received regarding future spending in Newham.

The costs of work needed are not known and therefore it has not been possible to identify the projected costs of individual schemes in accordance with the projected housing figures.

Generally the Environment Agency considers that if the guidance in PPS 25 is followed (in particular the sequential approach) then this should reduce the need for new development to be built in high risk areas. However, it is recognised that Newham is already heavily urbanised, and the capacity to develop outside of Flood Zone 2 and 3 is likely to be constrained.

Although the Olympic proposals will reduce the ‘actual risk’ of flooding from the River Lea, consideration could be given to further reduce flood risk in the borough through implementing strategic flood risk management solutions; however this is likely to involve partnering with neighbouring local authorities (Barking and Dagenham, Waltham Forest and Hackney).

Future further expenditure on capital works projects should be done strategically (including development contributions), rather than on an opportunistic basis which often occurs at present. However, it is the responsibility of landowners to maintain the flood defences on their land and where growth includes land adjacent to defences the London Borough of Newham should consider the standard of protection over the lifetime of the development, and condition of the defences. Where appropriate development can be used to improve the standard of defence, reducing flood risk overall, as well as the burden on government to continually fund flood defences.

5.6  KEY MESSAGES AND IDENTIFIED GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE

The key messages to come out of the Newham Infrastructure capacity review for flood defence are:

Newham contains extensive existing flood defence infrastructure and large parts of the borough are protected to a high standard, this includes the Thames tidal defences, the Thames Barrier and the Barking Barrier. Parts of Stratford, Plaistow and East Ham remain at actual risk from fluvial flooding from the River Lea and River Roding.

Works are currently being carried out as part of the Olympic development site in Stratford to reduce the flood risk within the Olympic zone and also the wider area including Newham. There are no large scale flood defence works proposed for either the Lower Lea or the River Roding.
Future development should not rely on the provision of flood defence infrastructure. PPS 25 should be used at all stages of the planning process to locate new development in the lowest risk areas.

The high levels of development within Newham and the future impacts of climate change will mean that the existing defences will have to be adapted over time, but rather than replacing them like for like, the approach will be to consider alternative options such as different combinations of flood storage, river defences and floodplain attenuation.

The impact of climate change will mean that the Thames Barrier and the Barking Barrier will close more often. The TE2100 project actions include the improvement works to enhance, improve or replace the river defence walls and active structures through east London, it is has not been possible to get any information on specific future expenditure within Newham.

Management of the residual risk of flooding (e.g. defence breach) to the growth areas should be undertaken at the development level through resilience and resistance measures, following application of the Sequential and Exception Test by Newham. Emergency planners should be consulted on growth areas so they can identify the additional burden it may place on emergency services in a flood event.

Information on the future costs of implementing the planned works (Olympic proposals) within Newham was not made available for this study; it has not been possible to assess the projected investment needed within Newham for future flood defence infrastructure from the Environment Agency.
6. Physical Infrastructure: Waste

6.1 BACKGROUND

The Joint Waste Development Plan Document (DPD) is one of a set of documents which will form part of Newham’s Local Development Framework. It is being prepared jointly by the four East London Waste Authority (ELWA) boroughs of Newham, Barking and Dagenham, Havering and Redbridge.

The purpose of the Joint Waste DPD is to set out a planning strategy to 2020 for sustainable waste management, deliver national and regional targets for waste recycling, composting and recovery and provide sufficient waste management capacity to manage the waste arisings. Planning applications for any new waste management facilities will be considered in the light of the Joint Waste DPD policies.

Municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste arisings to be managed to 2020 are identified in the London Plan borough level waste apportionment. Construction, demolition and excavation waste and hazardous waste arisings have been identified by the boroughs’ own data and the Joint Waste DPD must also provide sufficient capacity to manage these waste streams. The Joint Waste DPD seeks to provide sufficient waste management capacity to manage these arisings by safeguarding the capacity of selected existing waste management facilities and identifying opportunities for additional facilities, whilst aiming to ensure that the ELWA boroughs do not manage a disproportionate amount of waste from other London boroughs.

6.1.1 ISSUES

The number and mix of facilities that will be required within the ELWA area is dependent not only on the amount of waste that will require treatment but also how it is treated. The established targets for implementation in the Joint Waste DPD are:
Table 6.2: Established Targets for implementation on Joint Waste DPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSW 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>C&amp;I</th>
<th></th>
<th>C,E&amp;D</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>Recycling &amp; Composting</td>
<td>Other recovery</td>
<td>Total recovery</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


These targets highlight a commitment to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy and divert more waste from landfill and are endorsed in the National Waste Strategy 2007 and the London Plan.

Based upon these targets for the management of waste in the ELWA area, and the existing waste management capacity in the ELWA boroughs (as detailed in Table 2) the ELWA boroughs need to provide capacity as summarised in Table 3 below in order to manage the apportionment of MSW and C&I waste in the London Plan. A detailed explanation and spreadsheet of these calculations is included in the Joint Waste DPD technical report.

Table 6.3: Summary of average capacity surplus/deficit within the ELWA boroughs required to meet the London Plan apportionment for MSW and C&I waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste management route</th>
<th>Capacity Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (MSW and C&amp;I)</td>
<td>662,251 tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting (MSW and C&amp;I)</td>
<td>-79,427 tpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery (all facilities)</td>
<td>-195,949 tpa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 1: A deficit, or future capacity requirement, is shown in bold with a minus sign in front. Surplus capacity is shown in italic text.

NOTE 2: Table 6.3 is based on the assumption of 75% capacity utilisation of existing facilities transferred out of London through inert transfer stations. As such it is not considered that additional permanent new C,E&D recycling facilities are required.

6.1.2 CONSTRUCTION, EXCAVATION AND DEMOLITION WASTE

It is estimated that a large portion of recycling and re-use of construction, excavation and demolition waste currently occurs on site rather than in designated licensed facilities, or is transferred out of London through inert

3. Municipal solid waste (MSW), also called urban solid waste, is a waste type that includes predominantly household waste (domestic waste) with sometimes the addition of commercial wastes collected by a municipality within a given area. They are in either solid or semisolid form and generally exclude industrial hazardous wastes

4. Recovery means to obtain value from waste through one of the following means:
   - Recycling
   - Composting
   - Other forms of material recovery (such as anaerobic digestion)
   - Energy recovery (combustion with direct or indirect use of the energy produced, manufacture of refuse derived fuel, gasification, pyrolysis, or other technologies)
transfer stations. As such it is not considered that additional permanent new C,E&D recycling facilities are required.

As an alternative to allocating sites for C,E&D recycling facilities, Joint Waste DPD Policy W1 encourages the reuse of C,E&D waste at or near to construction sites with on-site recycling wherever possible. There is increasing opportunity for the use of recycled aggregate (sourced from a variety of construction, excavation and demolition wastes) in a wide range of applications within the construction industry, and as a result of landfill legislation changes, on-site remediation of contaminated soils is increasing. Additionally, Policy W4 ensures that the potential benefits of landfilling inert C,E&D waste are maximised.

6.1.3 **HAZARDOUS WASTE**:

The *Study of Arisings and Management of Non-Municipal Wastes in the ELWA area* (ERM, 2005) considered it not appropriate for the ELWA boroughs to aim for self-sufficiency in the management of hazardous waste or to allocate specific sites suitable for hazardous waste management due to the variety and nature of hazardous wastes and the specialist management techniques and facilities required. This is supported by Policy 4A.29 of the London Plan which states that the Mayor will work with the Boroughs, the Environment Agency and industry to provide and maintain direction on the need for hazardous waste management capacity.

The definition of hazardous waste includes substances that commonly make up household, commercial and industrial construction (including WEEE) and construction, excavation and demolition waste streams (including asbestos and contaminated soils). Whilst London Plan Policy 4A.29 states that Development Plan Documents should make provision for hazardous waste treatment plants to achieve, at a regional level, the necessary waste management requirements there is no definition of such facilities. Any application for a waste management facility that manages hazardous waste would be determined in accordance with the policies of this Joint Waste DPD.

The existing hazardous waste management capacity within the area covers special waste [470,000tpa] and clinical waste [6,000tpa] transfer stations and clinical waste incineration [7,000tpa]. On-site soil treatment facilities, including temporary facilities, provide additional capacity. While just the recovery (incineration) capacity is classified as ‘treatment’, special waste transfer stations play an important role in the storage and reprocessing of hazardous waste streams, especially as the Hazardous Waste Directive and Regulations require more sophisticated levels of separation of the different categories of hazardous, non-hazardous and inert waste.

6.2 **ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT**:

The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive (WEEE) aims to minimise the impacts of electrical and electronic equipment on the environment during their life time and when they become waste. The Directive applies to a wide range of products including fridges, washing machines, TVs, computers, fluorescent tubes and electronic games/toys and encourages and sets criteria for the collection, treatment, recycling and recovery of waste equipment. All four of ELWA’s Reuse and Recovery Centres are Designated Collection Facilities (DCFs) which separate and recycle used electrical equipment with a current recycling rate in excess of 90% by weight.
6.3 **POLICIES**

The Joint Waste Plan proposes five policies for adoption by the four ELWA boroughs:

**Policy W1 – Sustainable Waste Management**
Sets out how the four boroughs will promote waste minimisation, waste reuse, recycling and recovery to help deliver national and regional targets for recycling and composting.

**Policy W2 – Waste Management Capacity, Apportionment and Site Allocation**
Sets out that the London Plan waste apportionment for municipal, commercial and industrial waste will be met by safeguarding selected existing waste management facilities and identifying sufficient new opportunities to manage this waste (as set out in Schedules 1 and 2 of the Plan). Due to the revised apportionment figure a relatively modest level of new facilities have needed to be identified. Therefore in Newham, the following location is identified as a site suitable for a large scale recovery facility: Beckton Riverside (Preferred Industrial Location). Opportunities are also identified in Barking and Dagenham and Havering.

The Submission stage of the Joint Waste Development Plan Document makes clear that where an applicant can prove there are no opportunities for waste management in those areas listed in Schedule 2 of the Joint Waste DPD then the next preference is for sites elsewhere within designated industrial areas. The report confirms that all applications will be required to meet relevant borough design guidance and preferred policy W5 (below). The London Plan requires all existing waste management sites to be safeguarded unless appropriate compensatory provision is made. In developing the Joint Waste DPD officers have been able to refine this requirement so only those facilities which will make a contribution to future waste management are safeguarded. Consequently the Joint Waste DPD safeguards the following sites in Newham (Schedule 1):

- Bywaters, Twelvetrees Crescent, Lea Riverside (Materials Recycling Facility)
- Jenkins Lane Waste Management Facility (Household Waste Amenity Site)
- Jenkins Lane MRF (Materials Recycling Facility)
- Jenkins Lane Bio-MRF (Biological Treatment Facility)

**Policy W3 – Energy Recovery Facilities**
A planning consideration for all major developments involving waste recovery and treatment will be whether energy produced can be incorporated in local schemes. Again, all applications will be required to meet relevant borough design guidance and preferred policy W5 (below).

**Policy W4 – Disposal Inert Waste by Landfilling**
Sets out the limited circumstances where planning permission for waste disposal of inert wastes by landfilling may be allowed.

**Policy W5 – General Considerations**
This policy aims to ensure that new waste facilities are of the highest quality and that the impact of waste management development does not significantly adversely affect people, land, infrastructure and resources. It sets out a comprehensive list of related matters which applicants must address in their planning application.
6.4 FUTURE NEEDS

As with the Preferred Options Report, the submission Joint Waste Development Plan Document identifies that over the period to 2020, the amount of municipal and commercial waste to be managed throughout the ELWA boroughs, will be 1,394,847 tonnes at 2010; 1,847,421 tonnes at 2015; and 2,170,554 tonnes at 2020. To deal with this waste and reduce the need for new waste management facilities, the submission Joint Waste Development Plan Document proposes to increase recycling and composting rates in line with national targets, i.e. Municipal Waste – 40% at 2010, 45% at 2015 and 50% at 2020; Commercial & Industrial – 70% at 2020; and Construction & Demolition – 95% at 2020 (note: Newham is not at a stage to have a 40% target for Municipal Waste by 2010 but is aiming to achieve the 45% target by 2015).

The ELWA boroughs will need to provide sufficient waste management capacity at 2020 for:
• 2.170 million tonnes of MSW and C&I waste;
• 1.267 million tonnes of C,E&D waste; and
• 0.095 million tonnes of hazardous waste.

The need for waste management facilities to accommodate waste growth will be based on the national recycling and composting targets. The submission Development Plan Document therefore identifies sixteen established waste management facilities to be safeguarded and seven new sites for waste management facilities across the four boroughs. Six of the safeguarded waste management facilities are in Newham. Of the seven new sites proposed for the development of waste management facilities, one is in Newham – at Beckton Riverside.

6.5 SITE DESIGNATION

As a result of the revised London Plan apportionment, a relatively modest level of new facilities have needed to be identified. In Newham, the Beckton Riverside Preferred Industrial Location, located to the south of the Sewage Treatment Works, is identified as a site suitable for a large scale recovery facility. Opportunities have also been identified in Barking and Dagenham and Havering. The Joint Waste DPD safeguards the Jenkins Lane Waste Management Facility and the Bywaters Materials Recycling Facility in Newham.

The Joint Waste Plan lists existing and proposed facilities at Schedules 1 & 2 respectively. These are shown overleaf in Figure 6.1.
Figure 6.1: Map showing existing and proposed waste facilities in Newham
7. Social Infrastructure: Education

Newham has an exceptionally young and rising population, with 40% of its population under the age of 25 years old. The Borough has the highest birth and fertility rate in the country averaging 2.56 children per woman, compared to 1.87 nationally, which has an impact on childcare and school place demand.

Compared to other London Boroughs Newham has a high level of mobility, based on 2001 Census information. Royal Docks and Beckton had the highest level of migration in the Borough and migration rates are known to be on the increase.

25% of Newham’s population are aged 0 – 16 years. The projected child population for Newham for 2007 was as follows:

Table 7.1: Child population of Newham (GLA low RLP projections 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage Of Child Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aged 0-4 years</td>
<td>22,074</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 5 – 10 years</td>
<td>23,530</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 11-16 years</td>
<td>19,514</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 Early Years

7.1.1 Assessing future needs and planning future provision

Childcare prices in Newham are lower than the average for outer London. Newham currently has 580 neighbourhood nursery places all of which are priced in line with set criteria. The price per week is not allowed to exceed the current threshold for childcare tax credit, which is £175 per week.

Newham, childcare providers have been providing flexible childcare using supply side subsidy funded by the Sure Start unit and the London Development Agency. Participation in the CAP has been very positive in Newham. Nearly 80% of Newham’s private and voluntary sector providers currently take part.

At the end of quarter 3 of 2006/07 a substantial number of places were filled by children of eligible parents. This meant that Newham was able to claim just over 81% of the total funding allocation with just over 60% of total available places being filled. Newham’s figures are much higher than the London average of 32% take up. According to figures provided by Government office for London in June 07, Newham is the 3rd best performing local authority in London.

All prices for childcare in Newham are within the Government’s guidelines for affordable childcare and average prices do not exceed the threshold for claiming the childcare element of the Working Tax Credit. Many Newham families earn below the national income levels and should therefore qualify for support through the tax credit system.

However, although the prices of all types of childcare in Newham are much lower than those recorded for outer London, parents are still referring to cost as a barrier to accessing formal childcare. CAP has aided the cost of flexible care and made it affordable; however, the concern amongst childcare providers is the period after this...
subsidy ends. Providers are being subsidised to meet parents'/carers’ needs in terms of flexibility and affordability, but this would not be sustainable without the CAP funding.

Early indications from surveys conducted with parents of children in Newham in the Childcare Sufficiently Assessment (CSA) suggest that there is a lack of awareness of childcare available to children with additional needs. Further consultation with parents with children with additional needs is recommended by the CSA in order to establish the full picture. In addition, it is recommended that childcare providers should be consulted on inclusion perhaps using the users of the 2 year olds pilot scheme.

Childcare provision for children under 5 is typically open from 7.30am or 8am to 6pm or 6.30pm Monday to Friday. In many childcare settings, times are flexible and no major need for different times of operation for this age group has been expressed. When consulting children in this age range on the times that they attend out of school care, it was evident that they were satisfied with the time spent in out of school care.

It is evident that there are low levels of childcare for all age groups compared to outer London figures. However, large vacancy rates also indicate that provision is available across the borough. A particular gap identified is provision available for children over the age of 8, where provision levels are very low. However, many alternative activities are available for this particular age group such as out of hours learning activities and the development of open access play.

For children under the age of 5, there are gaps in the market in the wards of Boleyn, East Ham South and Plaistow North. However, children under 5 in these particular wards are travelling to neighbouring or other wards in the Borough to access provision. Where levels of provision for children aged 8 and over are particularly low such as East Ham North, Beckton and Canning Town North, open access play projects will be developed in the next financial year.

Ofsted figures point to a gap in quality of childcare in Newham compared with the rest of the country. Outstanding and good inspection results are a third lower in Newham than the national average. When looking for childcare, parents/carers sited quality as a very important factor when choosing childcare. Poor quality was also one of the main reasons stated by parents when saying that their childcare needs were not being met. Quality is being tackled through a variety of means and is being continuously monitored to tackle parents’ concerns and to promote choice.

According to the assessment carried out as part of the CSA, lack of awareness of Newham’s Children’s Information amongst parents is prevalent. Many parents/carers are unaware of its existence and function.

Capital funding for new facilities is thin on the ground currently. Newham has recently completed a 10 year programme to establish 20 children centres across the borough and any additional funding will be focused on enhancing current provision rather than providing new facilities. There is some money coming through other funding streams including the Access and Inclusion Fund, however these streams are not early years specific.

7.2 PRIMARY EDUCATION

7.2.1 NEED

The plan for future provision uses net capacity as defined by the DCSF. This method considers capacity as the main measure for assessing future needs. It is based on the capacity of the school according to the Government’s methodology, or otherwise as agreed by a statutory Admissions Forum. In some cases these have altered earlier measures of capacity so there have been implications for the overall capacity in the Borough at
both primary and secondary levels. This has been taken on board in planning since 2004. For a number of schools, Admission Numbers (used to determine how many pupils are admitted to a school) vary from Indicated Admission Numbers (as determined by formula from the Net Capacity assessment) but as the case for future investment can only be made on deficiencies against net capacity figures this measure is used here.

Table 7.2: Forecast surplus / deficit of primary and secondary school places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary Surplus Capacity</th>
<th>Reception Surplus Capacity</th>
<th>Secondary Surplus Capacity</th>
<th>Year 7 Surplus Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>-283</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-336</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>-778</td>
<td>-398</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>-1,771</td>
<td>-422</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>-2,522</td>
<td>-440</td>
<td>-321</td>
<td>-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>-3,246</td>
<td>-462</td>
<td>-934</td>
<td>-386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>-3,716</td>
<td>-472</td>
<td>-1,601</td>
<td>-572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Newham has a significant number of surplus places. However, projected population data indicates that the surplus will diminish throughout the next decade, moving into deficit by 2012/13. The position for the intake years (reception and year 7) is set out in Table 6.2 above. The data indicates that there will be a shortfall in Reception places by 2009/10. New school places (in new schools) will be required to accommodate these additional pupils towards the end of the decade.

Current estimates indicate that for the September 2010 / January 2011 intake the Authority will need up to 20 additional bulge classes. This is noted as a short term solution to capacity issues. The PCP is delivering the expansion of five schools in the Manor Park and East Ham areas, as well as a new school at Langdon. These are unlikely to be constructed until after September 2011. The additional Forms of Entry will take up the “bulge” classes. However there will be a need for new “bulge” years to manage the volume of pupils from the current baby boom arriving in our schools as 5 year olds. The Borough does not have all of the Capital funding identified to carry out the current expansions.

This lack of places is somewhat alleviated by the fact that they are no longer concentrated in the East of the Borough; the slowing of regeneration and the fact that there is an increasing net migration of children out of the Borough between birth and their arriving in Newham schools have diluted the demand in this area. Furthermore, as indicated above, there will be a significant need for new Primary schools and further expansions of existing schools in the medium term - post completion of the first phase of Primary Capital Programme development - just to cope with the demand for children who are already born. Due to the significant projected increase in primary age pupils expected in the next 10 years, figures suggest that even with the proposed primary schools in Stratford City and on the Langdon School site, Newham will need to greatly increase the number of places available throughout the Borough to accommodate the huge rise in the numbers of 5-11 years by 2017 (estimated at 197 Forms of Entry).
7.2.2 **PRIMARY CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

The Primary Capital Programme is a 15 year programme starting in 2008/2009 intending to create primary schools equipped for 21st century learning at the heart of the community with a full range of children’s services in reach of *every* family. This programme will be delivered through a strategic approach to capital investment, which supports national policy aims and addresses local needs and priorities. The aim of the PCP is to refurbish, remodel or replace 50% of all primary schools throughout the country over the next 10 to 15 years.

Newham has been approved by the DCSF to become one of 23 Primary Capital Programme (PCP) pathfinders. This will enable Curwen and Essex Schools to be remodelled as an early part of the PCP, beginning in 2008/2009.

For securing resources through the PCP the Authority is required to develop a Primary Strategy for Change document in consultation with stakeholders. This follows on from the Test strategy submitted in July 2007, which was appraised as “good” by DCSF.

It is also expected that the Council will take account of the overall requirements for school places in the Borough and the relatively small number of school sites in Newham where there exist genuine opportunities for cost-effective expansion in accommodation. It is also necessary to take account of the stricter requirements of the Education (School Buildings) Regulations 1999 in respect of areas suitable for playing team games.

The Authority is proposing that in the first years of the PCP, basic need capital resources are aligned with the PCP to fund expansions of schools in Manor Park and East Ham in order to cope with rising numbers of pupils and address the main condition issues affecting the schools. The Authority will seek to meet demand for places within local communities, having regard for the role of schools at the heart of sustainable communities.

Newham has a target of rebuilding or taking out of use at least the 20% schools in worst condition. Higher targets will be implemented for schools in the “most deprived” areas of the Borough.

The scope of the PCP allows consideration for the replacement of school buildings if there are sufficient advantages to do so. This is a welcome approach to addressing problems with existing school buildings. However this approach would be difficult to deliver on existing school sites due to the restricted sizes. Investigations are taking place to set out those schools where replacement of the school buildings can be justified and be deliverable.

Newham is working to identify whether or not there are any suitable Council owned sites of at least 0.8 hectares in the Borough where a primary school might be constructed. No suitable Council owned sites have yet to be identified and, as a result, the Authority sees the PCP funding mainly being used to modernise and improve existing school buildings. However, the Authority will be working in partnership with the Local Planning Authority to provide new Primary Schools to serve regeneration areas.

The Mayor and /Cabinet agreed on 20 March 2008 the 2008-2011 Children and Young People’s Services (CYPS) Capital Programme, which includes a number of schemes for rebuilding or refurbishing primary schools. This Programme will be regularly reviewed to align with priorities of the PCP. The suggested start dates will be kept under review to fit into the available budget and whether any urgent project might need to be included in the PCP.
Table 7.3: Primary Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Suggested Start Date</th>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curwen Primary School</td>
<td>£6,196,119</td>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Primary School</td>
<td>£5,708,668</td>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dersingham Infants School</td>
<td>£3,496,685</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheringham Juniors School</td>
<td>£4,232,850</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens School</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>PCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon Community Secondary School</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarage Primary School</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Primary School</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Primary School</td>
<td>£6,426,075</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham C of E Primary School</td>
<td>£6,315,833</td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£49,607,316.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the PCP programme is developed, there will be further opportunity to align with other funding streams, including School Devolved Formula Funding. It is proposed to bring together basic need and the PCP together to enable school buildings to be developed to meet the outcomes expected by the DCSF as set out in the Children’s Plan, as well as increase pupil numbers at schools and also address condition and suitability issues. The overall capital resources identified are in the region of £49m to deliver the PCP projects, (including the two Pathfinders) from 2007/2008-2010/2011 including the primary provision at Langdon School (to be funded outside the PCP). Schools DFC is to be added to these resources (see below).

The initial priorities of the PCP have been guided by the need to increase school places in the east of the Borough. The setting of priorities for future investment will be guided by the priorities set out in the AMP for suitability, sufficiency and condition to enable a co-ordinated approach to prioritising capital needs and deciding the level of resources required for improving education buildings, thereby helping improve standards in schools, ensuring VFM in our use of resources and delivering long term sustainable fit for purpose investment.

However, the PCP is not just another building programme. The capital investment will be used not to just address issues about accommodation but as a key resource to transform delivery of primary education in Newham. In this connection, delivery of the capital investment will be guided by the outcomes of Excellence for All, and meeting Government policies.

Newham set out £200,000 in the 2007/2008 financial year to develop the two Pathfinder Projects, as well as reviewing AMP data for primary schools to start the preparation of master plans for priority schools. Resources amounting to £400,000 have been approved in 2008/2009 to develop projects with NLP in advance of construction start in 2009/2010.

Newham will ensure that modernisation funding (for community and Voluntary Controlled schools) and LEA Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme (LCVAP) funding (for Voluntary Assisted schools) is not wholly submerged by the Strategy for Change. Schools will be prioritised for modernisation and LCVAP funding and, in the case of LCVAP funding, will be subject to agreement by the relevant Diocese will be made aware of these priorities once the work has been completed.
For schools that do not feature as a priority for major capital investment under the Primary Strategy for Change (PSfC) Devolved Formula Capital will help schools to realise their development plans. In addition, some projects in the Primary Strategy for Change intend to reach out to all schools, such as the proposals for ICT investment.

The Authority will review the overall funding strategy on a yearly basis and will set out the different funding stream that will be used, both though the PCP and to those school not included within the programme. All sources of funds would be linked together to benefit primary school via the DCSF Primary Modernisation, Basic Need and Access allocations, together with the CYPS Capital Planned Maintenance programme.

Much of this funding is used to address the most urgent condition priorities as identified in the AMP system. Newham will use this funding for condition items at non-PCP schools, with the PCP to address major schemes with suitability / other issues School DFC would also be available - and this would include schools in the PCP programme. The Authority will continue to lobby the DCSF about the requirement for additional Basic Need recourses to address serious sufficiency problems in certain areas of the Borough which if secured would be aligned and delivered through the PCP.

7.2.3 **POSSIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALL-AGE ACADEMY**

Newham’s vision is to use BSF to complement and enhance the proven teaching and learning successes of all existing schools and prepare schools to welcome and work collaboratively with the Stratford Academy which will developed as part of the Stratford City development. The Sponsor has agreed with DCSF and the Authority that the Academy will be all-age. This will include a 2 FE nursery, 3 FE primary school, 6 FE secondary school and post 16 provisions for 250 students. The Academy aims to be international in style and ethos and to celebrate the diversity of the students and community it serves. It will be established at the heart of a wider education campus which will also include primary health care, youth and community provision, nursery provision, library and lifelong learning and a gateway to jobs.

7.3 **SECONDARY EDUCATION**

7.3.1 **FUTURE NEED**

Over the past three years school place planning for the secondary sector has been carried out as part of the preparation for the Newham Building Schools for the Future programme. This is a scheme to transform standards in secondary education through capital investment in secondary schools over the next decade. The Building Schools for the Future Programme will provide an estimated £222 million over a 7 year period to finance the rebuilding and refurbishment of Secondary Schools in the Borough. Added to this is an ICT support budget of around £29m. Based on current funding and cost predictions there is an estimated shortfall (between additional costs and income available) of £4.8 million per annum (BSF Strategic Business Case).

From a school organisation perspective the key features of the programme are:

- That most schools will be rebuilt or refurbished on their current sites with their current capacities.
- That Brampton Manor School will become a ten form entry school (currently has eleven forms of entry)

---

5 Devolved Formula Capital (DFC) is an amount allocated each year to primary and secondary schools to be spent by them on their priorities in respect of buildings, ICT and other capital need. It may be combined with capital funding from other sources, pooled with DFC allocated to other schools, and saved up to fund larger projects. Priorities are set at school level, but should have regard to planned expenditure in a local authority’s asset management plan, or equivalent Voluntary aided plan.
• That Rokeby School will move to a new site on the Barking Road (the former Cumberland School site) from September 2009 as a five-form entry school (currently has capacity for eight forms of entry) and;

• That Stratford School will move to the former Rokeby school site in central Stratford from September 2011 as an eight-form entry school (currently has six forms of entry).

In the longer term, new provision will be required to support new communities emerging in the new regeneration areas. The Council has agreed to formally support the proposal for an Academy on the Stratford City (or Olympic Village) site. This would be an all through school, with a five-form entry secondary section (with a sixth form) that would open in 2013 once the Olympic Village is handed back to the site developers for long-term occupation.

7.3.2 **BSF PHASE 1**

Brampton, Rokeby, Eastlea, Lister, Royal Docks (Phase 1), Langdon, Forest Gate and Sarah Bonnell schools are being rebuilt as part of Wave 1 BSF programme.

The first phase of Newham’s BSF Project is funded as part of Wave 1 of the National Programme. In discussion with Partnership for Schools a funding allocation has been agreed to support this phase. This represents approximately 50% of the total Borough allocation from PfS over the entire programme. The remainder of the funding is proposed to be drawn down in Wave 5 of the BSF programme. As a result, a total of 8 schools have been identified within the first phase project scope.

Schools have been prioritised within the first phase based on their current and foreseen need for investment and support as assessed by School Improvement staff at LBN and also by having regard to programme logistics, cost and market preference issues.

A detailed options appraisal has been completed for each of the Wave 1 schools and options have been discussed and agreed with head teachers and governors. As a result, preferred options have been developed and costed as outlined overleaf in Table 7.4.
Table 7.4: Wave 1 BSF Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave 1 BSF Programme</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Build period</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rokeby School</td>
<td>To construct a new 6 FE boys school for Rokeby School on the former Cumberland School site on Barking Road.</td>
<td>Jan 09 – Sep 10</td>
<td>£16.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lister Community School</td>
<td>To construct a new 9 FE mixed school on the existing main site</td>
<td>Jan 09 – Sep 11</td>
<td>£29m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bonnell School</td>
<td>To refurbish the school’s accommodation with some new build</td>
<td>Jan 09 – Sep 10</td>
<td>£12.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton Manor</td>
<td>To refurbish the existing accommodation</td>
<td>Jan 09 – Sep 10</td>
<td>£6.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastlea School</td>
<td>Construction of a combination of new build major remodelling to complete the building development plan and resolve condition and suitability problems</td>
<td>May 10 – May 12</td>
<td>£10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Docks Community School</td>
<td>Provision of a new PMLD unit on the site and a 2 form entry expansion for the school</td>
<td>Jan 11 – Dec 11</td>
<td>£1.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon School</td>
<td>Refurbish existing accommodation and explore whether any new build is required</td>
<td>Feb 11 – Feb 13</td>
<td>£14.9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Gate Community School</td>
<td>Building remodelled together with elements of new build</td>
<td>Aug 09 – Aug 11</td>
<td>£9.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.3 BSF Phase Two

Wave 5 is the second round of capital projects as part of the Newham BSF programme. The details of individual schemes are given overleaf.

Little Ilford, Stratford, Plashet, Saints 6th Form, St Angela’s and St Bonaventure’s are being rebuilt as part of Wave 5 BSF programme. The possibility of a proposed 2 FE expansion at Royal Docks is being considered. In addition there are plans to establish an Academy on the Stratford City site in the North East of the Borough.

Since this report was drafted a ministerial announcement on 5th July 2010 stated that Wave 5 of Newham’s Building Schools for the Future programme has been suspended, pending a review of capital spending by the Department for Education and the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review in the Autumn. More generally, infrastructure requirements for the borough and committed funding will need to be reviewed regularly in order to keep the Infrastructure Development Plan "live".
Table 7.5: Wave 5 BSF Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Scope of work</th>
<th>Build Period</th>
<th>Funding (Capex At 1Q 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Ilford</td>
<td>New build replacement of Community school for 1350 mainstream and 35 ASD students on existing site.</td>
<td>Sep 10 – Aug 13</td>
<td>PFI (£34.48m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>New build Foundation school, bringing together two existing sites onto single new site, for 1200 mainstream and 35 ASD students</td>
<td>Sep 10 – Aug 12</td>
<td>PFI (£29.38m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plashet</td>
<td>Phased remodelling and refurbishment, with some new build, of existing Community girls school for 1350 mainstream students.</td>
<td>Sep 10 – Aug 12</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£19.09m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunmarsh KS3 PRU</td>
<td>New build replacement of PRU facilities for 66 students (FTE) on existing site (shared with LBN Learning Support Services office accommodation).</td>
<td>Oct 11 - Nov 12</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£3.79m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F Kennedy Special (PMLD)</td>
<td>Refurbishment/remodelling, with some elements of new build, of special school for 110 students with complex needs on two existing sites.</td>
<td>Sep 11 - Feb 13</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£6.40m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Smith Special</td>
<td>New build school for 55 SEBD students, bringing together two existing sites onto single new site.</td>
<td>Mar 13 - May 14</td>
<td>PFI (£7.87m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saints Sixth Form</td>
<td>Refurbishment and some new build at current Stratford Annexe site to create new Joint Saints Sixth Form</td>
<td>Dec 12 - May 14</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£12.26m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Angela’s</td>
<td>Phased refurbishment of existing VA girls school for 900 students.</td>
<td>Mar 14 – Aug 15</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£5.46m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bonaventure’s</td>
<td>Phased refurbishment of existing VA boys school for 900 students.</td>
<td>Mar 14 - Aug 15</td>
<td>D&amp;B (£8.71m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4 **FURTHER EDUCATION**

7.4.1 **FUTURE NEED**
Since incorporation in 1993, Newham Further Education College has invested heavily in its estate - some £55 million. However, to continue to develop its enterprise curriculum, and to ensure fit-for-purpose modern learning facilities, there is a strategic intention both to:

- rationalise, remodel and modernise the East Ham campus, perhaps with a commercial partner lending additional enterprise-focused development; and;
- relocate its main Stratford operations nearer to or in Stratford City.

Particularly, this latter inspiration is to:

- Place the College at the heart of the modern civic infrastructure being developed in Stratford;
- Make the campus more accessible by being closer to public transport routes;
- Increase the profile of the campus in Stratford;
- Provide more opportunity for real enterprise-based curriculum within the commercial trading environment of Stratford town centre and City; and
- Enhance the contribution to local skills development alongside the massive regeneration currently underway in Stratford through the Olympics and Stratford City.

Currently, Newham Further Education College is embarking on liaison with other public agencies to explore collaborative development potential, including Newham 6th form College, and the Olympic Legacy Company. As such, the college are not able to provide specific details in relation to its infrastructure needs.

Newham Further Education College will be keen to engage with planners in ensuring that the needs presented by post-16 education and training in the Borough are recognised in local planning strategies and will welcome the opportunity to provide more detail when opportune.

7.4.2 We have not received any information from New Vic Further Education College.

7.5 **HIGHER EDUCATION: UNIVERSITY OF EAST LONDON**

7.5.1 **PARTNERSHIP WITH BIRKBECK**

On 21 November 2006, the new UEL/Birkbeck, University of London Partnership at Stratford was launched when a memorandum of understanding between the two institutions was signed. The partnership aims to improve participation in higher education in east London by attracting new students who would not otherwise participate through the provision of new opportunities and progression pathways.

Birkbeck was awarded nearly £5m in April 2006 by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to take its evening teaching provision to east London, which has the lowest higher education participation levels in the London region. Birkbeck courses have been offered at the Stratford campus of UEL since September 2007 as part of the Birkbeck strand of the new partnership, now called Birkbeck Stratford.

7.5.2 **FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**
The capital projects that are contained within UEL’s current estate strategy are:

- Construction of a new Sports and Leisure Building for the university’s Docklands campus. This will provide a sports hall, academic and office accommodation and external multi-use games areas. The target completion date is early in 2012;
• Construction of a new reception building at Docklands campus. The target completion date is middle of 2011;

• Construction of a new library building on the Stratford campus. The target completion date is late 2013; and

• Stratford Island University campus. This is a collaborative development with Birkbeck College and will provide an academic and performing arts facility on a new site adjacent the Stratford Shopping Centre. Target completion date is late 2013.

In view of the Stratford Island extension, LBN are seeking Mayoral approval to dispose of Council owned land to enable Birkbeck and UEL to develop a new Campus building on the Salway Rd site in Stratford town centre. This will extend the education offer in the Borough and improve access for local people with Birkbeck’s evening offer being particularly attractive to those already in work but keen to improve their skills. The proposal is to dispose of the site on a 125 year lease for a peppercorn rent in return for a premium. Although the disposal would be at less than best consideration reflecting the constrained budget available to the promoters of the scheme. The Cabinet were recommended to approve the proposal for the following reasons:

• Birkbeck have had positive support for their aspiration to establish a permanent built presence for their academic offer in the town centre. UEL are essential to the project’s delivery;

• The sale of the land will deliver a high profile new seat of learning to Newham Birkbeck’s focus on an education offer which is targeted at those in work is particularly welcome;

• The campus building will be a flagship development which will establish a permanent and beneficial use on a conspicuous and long vacant town centre site. The use will integrate well with and add value to Stratford’s existing creative/cultural offer and; and

• It will provide stimulus to its ongoing regeneration whilst delivering physical, economic and education benefits for the wider area.

UEL have just commenced their internal corporate development process to generate their next estates strategy which will cover something like the next 10-15 years. Therefore specific financial information relating to planned improvements is not currently available. UEL stated that funding would be provided by the University itself and whilst other funding sources are actively being sought, UEL will not rely on them for the development programme.

UEL suggest that their estate is now close to capacity and there is little room for re-organisation of facilities as part of the redevelopment process. UEL estates department are currently embarking on a space audit of all their facilities. This should give some indication as to the priorities for potential future expansion. The space to expand the institution is primarily to be found around the Docklands site; the Stratford site is very constrained and has to work with the Victorian streetscape of Stratford town centre.
8. Social Infrastructure: Healthcare

8.1 Primary Healthcare

The vision of the Primary Care Trust aims to reconfigure the way that primary healthcare is delivered in Newham. This will increase capacity and responsiveness by bringing services closer to communities.

The PCT will create a polysystem for delivering future healthcare services including Hospitals, Under this approach, Primary Care Networks / Spokes, containing hubs, will deliver the full range of primary and secondary healthcare services in a co-ordinated and joined up manner in an environment closer to local communities.

The PCT proposes four polysystems, each comprising 60,000-70,000 residents, at the following locations:

North West (Stratford, West Ham, Forest Gate), North East (Manor Park), Central (Plaistow, Green Street, East Ham), and South (Canning Town, Royal Docks and Beckton).

Key services will be provided from hubs in each network. The alignment of services to polysystems is the first step of shifting services out of hospitals to be closer to homes. This approach will seek to redesign community services to be provided in more innovative ways that support delivery of primary and secondary care within the polysystem setting.

The exact level and type of services to be provided in each network / spoke is yet to be determined as the PCT are currently considering a number of options:

- Closure of existing PCT facilities – Following the Estates Strategy work the following PCT facilities have been identified for closure over the next 5 years: Community House, Joyce Campbell Clinic, West Beckton Health Centre, and West Ham Lane Centre. The current services in these buildings will need relocation;

- Children’s Development Centre – Newham currently lacks an appropriate, purpose built Children’s Development Centre for young people with complex issues. The Council is opening a series of Children’s Centres within the Borough which can provide a range of services including ante- and post-natal care. However there is still a need for a single Centre which can offer a one-stop assessment and treatment service for complex problems;

- Therapies – “Healthcare for London” assumes that therapy services will be provided at each Polyclinic to ensure local access for patients. Newham would plan to make this the general case for the Hubs. However it is accepted that some clinical activities require specialised facilities e.g. a physiotherapy gym or audiology sound proof room. Further planning work will be required to establish the location of these types of facilities within the Borough;

- Mental Health – The PCT is assuming that all of the Hubs will include space for mental health services. Further work is required with East London NHS Foundation Trust to establish the precise requirements; and

- Dental & Pharmacy Capacity – Each Hub will include adequate space to create a Pharmacy and Dental suite. Other provision will be left to the market to organise.
8.2 REGENERATION AND CAPITAL PLANNING

New developments will need to achieve three aims:

• create capacity for patients currently being served by practices in sub-standard accommodation or experiencing poor access;
• create capacity for population growth; and,
• create facilities for the extended range of services to be provided in the community and improve patient experience and access.

As set out above, the PCT is currently considering options to develop healthcare polysystems and therefore no capital costs are available.

NHS Newham provides facilities through an exclusive contract with East London LIFT Co. The Local Improvement Finance Trust (LIFT) funds and develops facilities which are then leased back to the Trust. During the current economic climate, particularly in relation to land costs the PCT is in some cases required to adopt alternative solutions to secure funding.

8.3 PROVISION METHODOLOGY

There are three methods of procurement of new facilities:

• Capital Build – the PCT builds a new facility using Public Sector Capital and owns the facility;
• Lease – the PCT leases a facility constructed by another agency e.g. East London LIFT Co or a Development Company; and
• Incorporated Facility – constructed as part of a shared facility with London Borough of Newham or other agency. The PCT will lease space in the facility.

The Business Case process will determine the appropriate delivery vehicle for each facility. The PCT has had discussions with London Borough of Newham in respect of their future plans and will aim to create integrated facilities with the Borough where ever possible. These discussions are expected to be most fruitful in respect of East Ham and Royal Docks (Silvertown Quays).

Newham is working with the Department of Health’s Equitable Access to Primary Care Services Procurement Team to incorporate these new developments into the procurement of services which is happening nationwide.

8.4 INTERIM FACILITIES

In some circumstances it may not be possible to maintain the status quo in advance of the creation of new facilities. Where necessary the PCT will establish interim facilities, minimising the cost as far as possible. The need for interim facilities has been identified at Stratford High Street and Silvertown Quays/Britannia Village and the PCT is exploring options to have temporary facilities in place by 2009/10.

8.5 ACUTE CARE

8.5.1 FUTURE NEED

No information has been provided by Newham University Hospital despite a number of repeated requests by various means.
9. Social Infrastructure: Leisure and Community facilities

9.1 INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

9.1.1 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

Due to concerns over the condition of buildings and capital assets, the Council is currently considering the future of Atherton and Balaam leisure centres. Options include reducing provision or closing the facilities. There are concerns about a forecast decline in usage and therefore there is a need for change.

The Olympic Games will greatly assist in the provision of indoor sports provision in Newham. The Olympic Aquatics Centre (OAC) – to be located in Stratford – will add to indoor swimming provision in Newham. The legacy facility will provide a 50m competition pool, 50m training pool, diving pool, health and fitness suite and other complementary facilities.

In order to forecast future needs, the Council applies Sport England population multipliers to determine demand for facilities. These calculations have been undertaken as part of the Future of Leisure Centres report\(^6\).

Requirements in the Borough for indoor sports facilities to 2020 are as follows:

- **Swimming Pools** – Sport England standards require that six 25m community pools be provided in Newham based on population of 300,000. The Borough currently contains five 25m pools. The OAC will add two to this total, increasing pool capacity in East London by 24%. This represents a significant increase and there may be surplus provision which will allow the Council to consider remodelling existing provision to better meet local needs. If Atherton and Balaam leisure centres close, then new facilities, including community pools (not necessarily 25m), might be proposed at Canning Town and Green Street;

- **Sports Halls** – by 2020 there is expected to be a deficit 11 of badminton courts;

- **Health and Fitness Suites** – by 2020, 1,500 new stations will be required and the shortfall is likely to remain. Development at Stratford alongside OAC will help meet the shortfall. Beyond this, smaller centres should be developed rather than larger ones, and be closely aligned with new sports hall provision, in areas of greatest demand such as Canning Town and Stratford;

- **Indoor Tennis Courts** – applying the London average, Newham is estimated to require approximately ten new courts by 2020. The court catchment is 30 minute drive, therefore any new facilities should be focused in the south; and

- **Ice Rinks** - by 2020, there will be a requirement of 391m\(^2\). Such a facility is regarded to have sub-regional status. There are no plans for the Council to develop such a scheme but there is scope for a commercial scheme, for example in Royal Docks or Canning Town. Also, development of the Olympic Park will increase accessibility to Lea Valley Ice Rink.

Access to facilities is likely to remain an issue in the short-term. Overtime, there is a need to extend community access, availability and public awareness of sites. This is particularly relevant to school sites.

---

\(^6\) Continuum, 2007
9.1.2 **Costs**

LBN currently supports four leisure centres through Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) at an annual cost of £530,000 (excluding accounting and debt charges). This figure is expected to decrease for the remainder of the GLL contract to 2012, due to cost savings and extra income generation.

The Olympic Aquatics Centre (OAC) will be built at Stratford at a cost of approximately £100m. LBN have agreed to contribute £5m towards the capital costs of this facility.

As a result of potential closure of Atherton and Balaam leisure centres, new facilities may be required. The development of the OAC and new pools in adjoining Boroughs will lead to a huge increase in swimming provision at little cost to the Council. There may also be future opportunities to integrate future indoor sports provision with the Council’s BSF programme.

The Future of Leisure Centres report 2007 sets out three options with regard to future investment:

- Continue running four leisure centres over the next 20 years- 49.7 million;
- Reduce provision (closure of Atherton and Balaam) and invest in OAC – £29.3m; and
- Replacement provision (new pools at Canning Town and Green Street) and invest in OAC – £33.4m.

9.2 **A Third Sector View of Community Facilities**

On March 12th 2010 a workshop was held at the Old Stratford Town Hall with the Third Sector, facilitated by Urban Engagement. LBN council offers and a representative from Capita Symonds also attended. Part of the objectives of the workshop related to assessing the Third Sector’s infrastructure needs for their projects. The results of the workshop which are applicable to this report are presented in bullet-point form in Table 9.1, exactly as they were written on comment cards at the workshop, so that the original sense of the comment is retained rather than being interpreted by the facilitator.

Table 9.1 Service improvements needed to address gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unmet needs and service gaps</th>
<th>New or improved service/facilities needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need links to provide accessibility for disabled people</td>
<td>Benefit Advisory Service Workers- can help carers specifically .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessible Newham</td>
<td>N130: Advisors needed to ensure benefits not lost - address failing National Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disability</td>
<td>Health facilities can play a big part for VCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long term illness</td>
<td>GP patient involvement sureties to be more common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public realm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information in relation to the current condition of leisure and community facilities is available in Chapter 8 of the Baseline Report.
9.3 **COMMUNITY HALLS FUTURE NEEDS**

The Council aims to rationalise the existing stock of community facilities. This could include closures, refurbishment and new build. Where possible, multi-use facilities will be promoted. Demand for and development of new facilities will be influenced by the location of new homes.

9.4 **GETTING BACK INTO WORK**

Workplace is a recruitment service in Newham that is committed to helping employers find the right local people to work for them and to supporting local people who want those jobs. Workplace has two fixed sites in Stratford and Canning Town, and also conducts regular outreach at children’s centres, libraries, and community centres across the borough. Workplace East Ham is due to open in 2010.

9.5 **LIBRARIES / CUSTOMER ACCESS FACILITIES**

9.5.1 **FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

The future model of provision envisaged for Newham enables customers to access Council services through a variety of channels in order to maximise choice and delivery.

These channels include:

- Telephone Contact Centre – to offer a far wider range of services than are currently available in the Front Offices (FOs) including council tax and housing benefits, anti-social behaviour reporting and housing repair;
- Integrated Front Offices (FOs) – to be located at Stratford, Canning Town, East Ham and Manor Park to provide locally-based services for customers. Wherever possible, each will also contain a ‘library-plus’;
- Library Plus – to support FOs and be located at Beckton, Forest Gate, Green Street, Docklands, Plaistow and Custom House. They will provide traditional library services, as well as providing web access for handle simple enquiries and access to the contact centre for more complex matters; and,
- Partner Offices – to be co-located in facilities where appropriate. These will provide accommodation or access to partner services such as social support (through the Primary Care Trust), children’s support (schools) and adult education (Job Centre Plus);

The location of these key facilities has and will be based on where demand for them is greatest. There is intended to be seamless working between front office staff, support services (such as finance and HR) and specialist teams (such as street cleansing, adult social care, children’s services and libraries). Due to its multi-use nature, this level of provision exceeds standards set by the Libraries, Museums and Archives guidance.

All customer service properties will be reconfigured to improve the quality of premises and increase operational efficiency. It will establish combined facilities, which are proposed to be located in new buildings, and refurbish the remaining libraries to the same high standard as new-builds. This process is expected to deliver quick wins, such as the re-development of the East Ham Campus, which offers an excellent opportunity for the Council to showcase a new ‘integrated front office’. Furthermore, the relatively quick and simple refurbishment and re-branding of existing libraries and integrated service centres will have positive impacts on large numbers of people.
Other potential options include: i) re-locating all Contact Centre staff under one roof in Newham Dockside, which would provide an environment and location suitable for a telephone-based contact centre, ii) re-deploying buildings that are no longer required for customer-facing purposes in a way that represents best value for the Council, and/or iii) disposal of premises when market conditions permit.

9.5.2 COSTS

Costs related to annual and telephone-based staff costs will be reduced. However, there will be additional costs associated with the delivery of the programme as follows:

- Increase in management costs in front offices to reflect significant increases in work;
- Cost of redundancies;
- Additional ICT investment to include CRM, IT integration and web enhancement (£4.5m);
- Annual programme team costs of £1.3 million (to be finalised);
- Investment in property – £3m to refurbish and re-brand all existing libraries and LSCs; and
- Investment in property – up to £30 million on new builds at East Ham, Canning Town (Rathbone development), Stratford and Manor Park (unconfirmed at present).
10. Adult social care

10.1 Future Development

There has recently been a shift in the way in which adult social care should be approached and delivered. This is set out in the Government’s Putting People First document, which focuses on the concept of personalisation. The Commissioning Strategy Plan (NHS London, 2007) provides the future strategy for Newham to 2013. The impact of this new approach is that fewer people will be required to enter residential and nursing homes, however, more extra care facilities will be required.

An analysis of demand for future provision has been undertaken as part of "Forecasting the Demand and Costs for the Care of Older People" (LBN, 2007). It explains how changing demographics will increase demand for care up to 2018. Findings are based on forecast trends and population data from the GLA and ONS.

Up to 2018, there is forecast to be 13% growth in the older population (64 – 74 years). However, there will be greatest increase in the over 85 years age group which will grow by 9% up to 2012. This impacts of future needs as there will be significantly increased demand for services over and above population growth as a result of higher needs levels.

With regard to physical future development, the PCT proposes to create four poly-system areas. Each will cover approximately one quarter of the Borough in terms of population and deliver health services to that locality through a main hub (health centre) and spokes (smaller / specialist branch health facilities). Locations are given in the healthcare section above. Facilities will be co-located where practicable with customer access services and libraries.

The PCT comment that there are enough residential and nursing care homes, but there is need for more supportive living facilities and extra care housing.

Extra care housing will be rationalised to respond to needs and there are expected to be opportunities for refurbishment and/or conversion of existing care facilities into extra care housing or similar facilities.

Furthermore, LBN intends to pilot a new scheme relating to personal health budgets. Once an individual’s needs are determined they would have access to a budget to purchase treatments, to be delivered via the poly-systems.

In addition, there might also be future need for a Carers Centre, as no such facility is currently available in Newham. This issue has been raised by the Carers Strategy Group. However, an alternation option might be to develop and integrate a facility into the poly-systems.
10.1.1  **Costs**

The “Demand and Costs Report” forecasts future costs for the ten year period from 2007-08 to 2017-18. It states that up to 2018, LBN are likely to need to fund an additional £6m to £7m. These costs were forecast based on a financial model which takes account of the number of people receiving a service, different types of care and cost (based on 2007-08 budget for Older People). It should be noted that the model presents a simplified forecast and that demand for care services is highly complex and dynamic.

Capital costs will generally relate to the development of the hubs and spokes within poly-systems. However, it is not yet agreed as to how much of this development will be new build or refurbished/converted, as the PCT already owns a large estate and some premise will be multi-functional and accommodate a variety of services. The development of extra care housing tends to be predominately through the private sector.
11. Emergency services

11.1 Fire and Rescue

11.1.1 Assessing future needs and planning future provision

Future demand for fire services is not solely based on population or distance thresholds. Fire services use an Incident Risk Analysis Toolkit. The toolkit takes account of a wide range of data including past incidents, accessibility, population, new developments and socio-economic profiling to understand the types of people who are likely to be at higher risk.

There are currently no plans to build any new fire stations in Newham to provide extra capacity other than the committed rebuild of Plaistow fire station and three temporary stations within the Olympic Park.

11.1.2 Committed funding

In November 2008, CLG announced that £130m had been set aside for Fire and Rescue Service projects to build new stations and other facilities. Fire and Rescue Services have been bidding for a share of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits for long-term projects to modernise the country’s fire stations.

Plaistow station is identified as a PFI funded project, which involves the station being rebuilt although the same number of bays will be provided as before. Funding for 9 stations within the PFI amounts to £57.4 million covering 9 fire stations across London. In 2008, an outline planning application (07/02259/FUL) for the works was granted permission. The proposals include new community facilities to help deliver fire prevention, and in particular the Local Intervention Fire Education (LiFE) programme. Construction on site is likely to take place in 2012.

11.2 Police

11.2.1 Future development

The Metropolitan Police Authority (MPA) Estate Strategy and the Asset Management Plan for Newham is kept under review. The future of the police estate in Newham is yet to be formally finalised, and is subject to further dialogue between the MPA and the Council’s Planning team.

Whilst the existing estate performs a vital function, the future challenges the MPA are facing are changing and complex. These relate to population growth, demographics, development, service delivery and local and strategic needs. The MPA’s Estate Strategy is designed to respond to these changes. New sites and premises are required to adapt to these changes and the forecast future population growth to ensure that the MPA continue to provide an effective and locally focussed service.

Central to the future strategy is that no police buildings will be replaced until alternative and better-located facilities are up delivered and operational and without fully consulting the local community on the proposed changes.

The assessment of need for policing is based on a number of factors including population growth, nature of development (residential, retail and leisure in particular), geographic location, local demographics, accessibility and the prevailing economic conditions. Assessments of existing crime levels and existing provision is carried out on a case by case basis to calculate future requirements. Due to the range of factors, there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution and it is not possible to apply standard ratios to determine for crime rates from population growth.
An example of considerations required to assess growth points is shown at Barking Riverside which will provide 10,000 new homes. However two transport options are proposed. Under Option A, the Docklands light Railway will be extended and this is expected to result in a reasonably affluent community, with good access to the City and therefore relatively low policing levels. Alternatively under Option B, no extension of the DLR will take place and this would be expected to result in poor accessibility, and a lower income community and therefore higher levels of policing.

The aim to ensure that the future estate is fit for purpose and provides for the requirements of frontline policing. Five operational policing themes have been identified for Newham:

- Neighbourhood Police Bases;
- Front Counters;
- Office Accommodation;
- Patrol Bases; and
- Custody Centres.

In accordance with The Estate Strategy there is currently a Safer Neighbourhood Team for each ward in Newham. These are based in shared facilities, either in existing police buildings or shopping or residential areas, including community centres. The aim is that each team should be easily accessible to the residents of the ward. Additional Neighbourhood Police Bases may well be needed where new housing or retail development takes place, with small teams of police officers and Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) dedicated to the local area. Floorspace requirements range from approximately 95sqm to 220sqm, and can have public access where they are located together with front offices though this will increase the floorspace requirement.

The forward strategy for front counters has not been finalised, but it is likely that they will be required across the Borough, to provide better and more appropriate access to the police than has been the case in the past. However no existing front counter facility will be closed until alternative improved facilities have been opened and are operational.

Office Accommodation is required for other police functions in Newham, including command, management and support functions. These are currently located in Forest Gate, occupying space that could be better used for operational purposes. There could therefore be a need for office space. The space released from existing operational buildings could lead to more efficient team functions and Borough based policing.

Patrol Base – Newham is currently patrolled from Forest Gate. The use of a specialist policing building located in a town centre is unviable as it takes up space which could better contribute to community policing. The MPA’s preferred strategy is to provide a single patrol base for the Borough in a strategic location that is easily accessible with sufficient parking and garaging for operational vehicles. The provision of Patrol Bases supports the MPS’ modernisation programme, provides a better working environment, helps implement an improved 24 hour response and achieves MPA’s policy on leadership and supervision to brief and de brief 24 hour patrols at a single location. The MPA is currently looking for potential sites for a patrol base for Newham. Potential locations include warehouse units situated in backland locations, on industrial estates or business parks. Excellent public transport accessibility and good vehicular access 24/7 would be required. The floorspace requirement will be 3,000sqm, with a yard area. Sites which formerly provided a community use are also considered suitable locations for patrol base use. An alternative solution may be to extend existing police facilities where space restrictions allow. The MPA may also consider co-locating the Patrol Base with the Custody Centre.

Custody Centre – The MPA is considering providing specialised custody facilities throughout London. Custody centres will have between 20-40 cells in a single location, with related facilities such as interview rooms, consultation rooms and a search suite. Currently there are custody facilities at Forest Gate and Plaistow, which provide a total of 29 cells. These cells are in need of improvement and overall provision for Newham is
11. Emergency Services:

inadequate, and the existing arrangement can negatively impact on efficiency and effectiveness of the service. The MPS has also noted custody cells in high street police stations are not longer necessary. Locating these at a strategic point in Newham will led to significant cost savings, improve efficiency and enable more frontline policing.

11.3 AMBULANCE

In terms of future planned development, services are likely to move from Silvertown in 2011 to 2012. As part of this strategy the LAS is considering two options. The first option is to identify a similarly sized site, located closer to Stratford for replacement services. Alternatively, under the second option, a “super station” would be created. This would amalgamate the three existing stations into one single facility. This station would also be supported by a series of standby points, to be strategically located throughout the Borough.

At present, LAS is unable to estimate future capital costs in relation to new development. In terms of funding, LAS confirm the primary source will be from capital receipts from the sale of surplus ambulance stations.
12. Green Infrastructure

12.1 GREEN SPACE – PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS

In considering and understanding planned improvements to parks and open spaces in the future a number of initiatives have been examined.

Newham Parks and Open Spaces Development Plan 2009-2014 provides a framework for the improvement of our parks and open spaces to ensure that they better serve the needs of local communities. The plan allows the Council’s intentions for our parks and open spaces to be shared with both our communities and our partners.

The plan is intended to address the inequalities in access to quality parks and open spaces by investing in new and improved features and facilities. A lack of quantity provision can be mitigated in part by improvements to the range and quality of facilities on offer and the benefits of investment can be maximised through significantly increased usage and participation.

In Year One the Parks Development Plan will (subject to funding):

- Refurbish ten play areas;
- Install four trim trails;
- Develop two Sports Hubs;
- Deliver the Central Park Restoration Project;
- Deliver master plans in two parks;
- Improve buildings and toilets in selected parks; and,
- Create two ‘pocket parks;’

In relation to specific sites the future planned improvements to parks and other areas of open space in the London Borough of Newham are identified below.

This section does not relate to non-park green space e.g. allotments that are referred to in the schedules – they should also be included here.

12.1.1 BECKTON DISTRICT PARK SOUTH

Beckton District Park South is located to the south of the Borough at Stansfield Road, Beckton E16. This space operates as a public park/open space and consists of green open space with tree lined pathways, football fields, play area and a small pond. The park also has car park and community centre with changing rooms.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Play” Initiative, £1.25m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the completion of a play refurbishment programme in order to deliver “destination” play areas. These play improvements to Beckton District Park South are expected to come forward in Year 5 of the Plan.

As part of the Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sports & Activity Hubs” Initiative £900k is committed to this and four other parks in the district for the concentration and improvement of sports provision including groundworks, field drainage, and establishment of cricket at this park. These improvements to Beckton District Park South are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.
12.1.2 **Plaistow Park**

Plaistow Park is located in the centre of the Borough at Greengate Street, Plaistow, E13 0AS. The park consists of green open space, floral displays, Football pitches, Multi-use games area, Play area and Paddling pool.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Play Initiative”, £1.25m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the completion of a play refurbishment programme in order to deliver “destination” play areas. These play improvements to Plaistow Park are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Youth Zones” Initiative, £700k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three other parks in the district for the development of wheels parks and hang out zones to improve the 12+ offer at these parks. These play improvements to Plaistow Park are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These play improvements to Plaistow Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

12.1.3 **Plashet Park**

Plashet Park is located in the centre of the Borough at Plashet Grove, East Ham, London, E6. The park is a Medium-size park with cafe, tree-lined pathways, flower beds and children’s play area. Sports facilities at the park include bowling green, cricket nets, multi-use games area and tennis courts.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Play” Initiative, £1.25m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the completion of a play refurbishment programme in order to deliver “destination” play areas. These play improvements to Plashet Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Plashet Park alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 3 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £10k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and two additional venues for the establishment of mini-soccer league venues at these parks. The establishment of this venue at Plashet Park is expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These play improvements to Plashet Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Event Infrastructure” Initiative, £600k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three additional venues for improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at these key event venues. These improvements at Plashet Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.
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12.1.4 **STAR PARK**

Star Park is located to the west of the Borough at Star Lane, West Ham E16. The park consists of green open space and a football pitch.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Play” Initiative, £1.25m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the completion of a play refurbishment programme in order to deliver “destination” play areas. These play improvements to Star Park are expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Star Park alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 2 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity MUGAs” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the provision of MUGA’s at these sites. The provision of the MUGA at Star Park is expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.

12.1.5 **CANNING TOWN RECREATION GROUND**

Canning Town Recreation Ground is located in the south west of the Borough at Prince Regent Lane, Custom House, E16. It is a medium-size park with flower beds and children’s play area. Sports facilities include football pitch, tennis courts, and multi-use games area.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning” Initiative, £1.9m has been allocated for the delivery of existing masterplans at three sites. Canning Town Recreation ground is one of these parks identified and it is expected that the delivery of the masterplan will be in Year 1 of the plan.

As part of the Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sports & Activity Hubs” Initiative £900k is committed to this and four other parks in the district for the concentration and improvement of sports provision including groundworks, field drainage, and establishment of cricket at this park. These improvements to Canning Town Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Canning Town Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.1.6 **KEIR HARDIE RECREATION GROUND**

Keir Hardie Recreation Ground is located in the south west of the borough at Tarling Road, Custom House, E16. Facilities at the site include football pitch and changing rooms and a play area.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Initiative” £1.9m has been allocated for the delivery of existing masterplans at three sites. Keir Hardie Recreation Ground is one of these parks identified and it is expected that the delivery of the masterplan will be in Year 1 of the plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Keir Hardie Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.
12.1.7 MEMORIAL RECREATION GROUND

Memorial Recreation Ground is located in the west of the Borough at Memorial Avenue, Stratford, E15. Facilities include a basketball court, football pitch and changing rooms.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning” Initiative £1.9m has been allocated for the delivery of existing masterplans at three sites. Memorial Recreation Ground is one of these parks identified and it is expected that the delivery of the masterplan will be in Year 2 of the plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £900k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other venues for the establishment and concentration and improvement of sports provision at these parks. These improvements at Memorial Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Memorial Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Event Infrastructure” Initiative, £600k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three additional venues for improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at these key event venues. These improvements at Memorial Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

12.1.8 BRAMPTON PARK

Brampton Park is located in the centre of the Borough at Masterman Road, East Ham, E6. Facilities include basketball court, football pitch and changing rooms, play area, and paddling pool.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014), Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Brampton Park alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 3 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Brampton Park are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.1.9 GOOSELEY PLAYING FIELDS

Gooseley Playing Fields are located in the east of the Borough at St Alban’s Avenue, East Ham, E6. Facilities include football pitches and changing rooms, flower beds, Netball, a Play area and Tennis courts.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Gooseley Playing Fields alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 2 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £900k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other venues for the establishment and concentration and improvement of sports provision at these parks. These improvements at Gooseley Playing Fields are expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.
12.1.10 **Hermit Road Recreation Ground**

Hermit Road Recreation Ground is located in the west of the borough at Hermit Road, Plaistow, E13. Facilities include a Basketball court, tennis court, play area and flower beds.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Hermit Road Recreation Ground alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £900k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other venues for the establishment and concentration and improvement of sports provision at these parks. These improvements at Hermit Road Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity MUGAs” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the provision of MUGA’s at these sites. The provision of these MUGA’s at Hermit Road Recreation Ground are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

12.1.11 **Little Ilford Park**

Little Ilford Park is located in the north of the Borough at Church Road, Manor Park, E12. Facilities include football pitch and changing rooms, cricket pitches, multi use games court and flower beds. There is also a nature area, play area, trim trail and tennis court.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £900k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other venues for the establishment and concentration and improvement of sports provision at these parks. These improvements at Little Ilford Park are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Youth Zones” Initiative, £700k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this park and three other parks in the district for the development of wheels parks and hang out zones to improve the 12+ offer at these parks. These play improvements to Little Ilford Park are expected to come forward in Year 5 of the Plan.

12.1.12 **Central Park**

Central Park is located in the north east of the Borough at High Street, East Ham, E6. Facilities at the park include a bowling green, cafeteria, flower beds, ornamental pond, children’s play water feature, play area, tennis courts and a tree trail.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Youth Zones” Initiative, £700k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three other parks in the district for the development of wheels parks and hang out zones to improve the 12+ offer at these parks. These play improvements to Central Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Event Infrastructure” Initiative, £600k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three additional venues for improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at these key event venues. These improvements at Central Park are expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.
12.1.13 **New Beckton Park**

New Beckton Park is located in the south of the Borough at Savage Gardens, East Ham, E6. Facilities at the park include a bowling green, changing room, cricket pitch, football pitch, multi-use games court play area and tennis courts.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Sports Hubs” Initiative, £900k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other venues for the concentration and improvement of sports provision at these parks. These improvements at New Beckton Park are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Youth Zones” Initiative, £700k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three other parks in the district for the development of wheels parks and hang out zones to improve the 12+ offer at these parks. These play improvements to New Beckton Park are expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to New Beckton Park are expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.
12.1.14 **BECKTON DISTRICT PARK NORTH**

Beckton District Park North is located in the south of the Borough at Tollgate, Beckton, E6. Facilities at the park include a basketball court, cafeteria, cycle route, football pitch, fishing, lake, nature area, play area and a tree trail.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity MUGAs” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the provision of MUGA’s at these sites. The provision of these MUGA’s at Beckton District Park North are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

12.1.15 **CUNDY PARK**

Cundy Park is located in the west of the Borough at Victoria Dock Road, Canning Town, E16. It is a small grassy park with tree-lined walkways and a children’s play area. Facilities include a pond, nature area and play area.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity MUGAs” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the provision of MUGA’s at these sites. The provision of this MUGA at Cundy Park is expected to come forward in Year 5 of the Plan.

12.1.16 **KING GEORGE V PARK**

King George V Park is located in the south of the Borough at King George’s Avenue, Custom House, E16. Facilities include a city farm and flower beds.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity MUGAs” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and four other parks in the district for the provision of MUGA’s at these sites. The provision of this MUGA at King George V Park is expected to come forward in Year 2 of the Plan.

12.1.17 **BECKTON DISTRICT PARK**

Beckton District Park is located to the south of the Borough and covers an area to the east of Stansfield Road and north of Tollgate. Overall facilities at the park include a basketball court, cafeteria, cycle route, football pitch, fishing, lake, nature area, play area and a tree trail.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Beckton District Park are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Event Infrastructure” Initiative, £600k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and three additional venues for improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at these key event venues. These improvements at Beckton District Park are expected to come forward in Year 3 of the Plan.

12.1.18 **FOREST LANE PARK**

Forest Lane Park is located to the north of the Borough at Magpie Close, Forest Lane, Forest Gate, E7. Facilities at the park include a dipping pond, lake, picnic area, raised bed garden area, small orchid and woodland as well as a play area and wildflower meadow in spring/summer.
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Forest Lane Park are expected to come forward in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.1.19 PRIORY PARK

Priory Park is located to the north of the Borough at Grangewood Street, East Ham, E6. Facilities include a multi use games court and a play area.

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Sport & Activity Trails” Initiative, £500k is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity at the sites. These improvements to Priory Park are expected to come forward in Year 4 of the Plan.

12.2 ADDITIONAL PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

In addition to the parks outlined above there are a number of small amenity/open space areas for which planned improvements have been planned for. Existing facilities in these areas include areas of green open space, small sports courts and children’s play areas etc.

Planned improvements for these areas include:

12.2.1 GREENWAY

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) Master planning to identify development requirements will also take place at Greenway alongside another 4 sites. £10.5m is earmarked for this masterplanning exercise which will be completed in Year 3 of the Plan.

12.2.2 ABBEY LANE OPEN SPACE

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 2 of the Plan.

12.2.3 CHANDOS ROAD AMENITY AREA

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.2.4 HATHAWAY CRESCENT

As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 4 of the Plan.
12.2.5 **May Green**
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 5 of the Plan.

12.2.6 **Odessa Road Open Space**
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 3 of the Plan.

12.2.7 **Pier Road Open Space**
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 4 of the Plan.

12.2.8 **Sandal Street Amenity Area**
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.2.9 **Valetta Grove Open Space**
As part of Newham’s Parks & Open Spaces Development Plan (2009-2014) “Master planning Pocket Parks” Initiative, £2m is committed over the lifetime of the plan to this and a number of additional sites in the district to exploit the potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision. This is aiming to be undertaken in Year 1 of the Plan.

12.2.10 **Olympic Park – Legacy**
The physical legacy of the Games will be greatest in East London. Five major sports venues, the Olympic Village, and the International Broadcast Centre and Main Press Centre will be converted for legacy uses while the Olympic Park will be adapted for long-term use as a public park. Over time, it will be fringed by new mixed-use neighbourhoods offering homes, jobs, shops and cultural and leisure facilities for local people. The new energy generated by this transformation will help boost economic revival across East London.

The LDA, with its legacy partners, has now published for consultation the preferred legacy plans for the Olympic Park. These plans are called the Legacy Masterplanning Framework (LMF)

The Legacy Park is currently envisaged to contain 102 hectares of open space, and will include a wide range of large and small scale features and activities, ranging from visitor attractions to adventure play area and other smaller play areas.

The waterways will also be utilised by creation of a new marina and some 6,894 metres of improved waterways.
12.2.11 **CANNING TOWN AND CUSTOM HOUSE - SPD**

This Supplementary Planning Document, adopted in June 2008, identifies a number of open space improvements in the area:

**Custom House (Areas 5 & 18)**

Currently the area is a residential in nature to the north with a mixed use area to the south including a play area.

Proposals include the creation of a significant “central park” to the north of Activity Street. The predominant building use will be residential however there is scope to incorporate some commercial/community uses on the southern frontage facing the park. It is desirable that buildings overlooking the park should help contribute to the character of the park through diverse architectural style and materials.

**Keir Hardie Recreation Ground**

Keir Hardie Recreation Ground is also earmarked in the SPD for upgrading. The site is currently recognised as a major community open space located within the centre of the regeneration area. The SPD recognises that the park has received limited investment in recent years and would benefit from investment. A masterplan has been prepared to upgrade the recreation ground and its facilities and sets out a number of improvements including:

- a multi-use games area;
- improved play;
- exercise track;
- planting;
- new routes through the park and; and
- improvements to entrances and fences.

12.3 **MOVING FORWARD**

The Baseline Report explains the current condition of baseline information on open space in the Borough. This baseline is currently being updated and a site audit of all sites is being undertaken (completion data likely to be in June). Quantitative and qualitative and accessibility standards for open space provision will then be developed, and the identification of where deficiencies in provision exist.

On completion of this PPG17 open space study, analysis will be required to consider how the above planned improvements meet deficiencies identified and to consider how future needs can then be met.
13. Infrastructure Delivery Plan

13.1 Infrastructure Delivery Plan

The previous chapters of this report have covered the future provision planned by different infrastructure providers within the areas of physical, social and green infrastructure. It has also highlighted where future planned provision is funded and where not.

This delivery plan describes planned infrastructure provision for physical infrastructure, social infrastructure and green infrastructure combined, by major time period highlighting gaps in funding, where information is available.

The IDP is also displayed according to community forum areas. The community forum information follows the overall borough plans, starting on page 89. This information is also provided in the updateable Geographic Information System being provided to London Borough of Newham.

13.2 Delivery Plan

This chapter contains a draft delivery plan for infrastructure, set out in five year time periods. So it presents a time slice across each of the sector-based investment programmes. It provides a single place where the Borough Council and its partner agencies can identify – across the board – those items which require gap funding.

13.3 Short Term Projects (2010-15)

Many projects in the first five years of the delivery plan are already funded. Details and locations of each individual project (e.g. each school) are provided in the infrastructure schedules (see table 13.1 overleaf)
Table 13.1 Newham Infrastructure Delivery Plan: Projects 2010-15
### 13. Infrastructure Delivery Plan

#### Future Needs Report  29th June 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure sector</th>
<th>Project(s) -</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td>Roads in Olympic Park</td>
<td>Roads in Olympic Park</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ODA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee Line</td>
<td>Jubilee Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR Beckton Extension 3 car</td>
<td>DLR Beckton Extension 3 car</td>
<td>£10m platform extension</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Central Line Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Overground Upgrade</td>
<td>London Overground Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle superhighway 3</td>
<td>Cycle superhighway</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle superhighway 4</td>
<td>Cycle superhighway</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Education</td>
<td>Curwen Primary School</td>
<td>PCP Basic Need</td>
<td>£6,196,119</td>
<td>Primary Capital Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essex Primary School</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£5,708,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dersingham Infants</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£3,496,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheringham Juniors</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£4,232,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Helens</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicarage Primary</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avenue Primary</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brampton Primary</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£6,426,075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Ham C of E Primary</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£6,315,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for PCP Schools</td>
<td>PCP/Basic Need</td>
<td>£49,607,316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langdon Community Secondary School</td>
<td>New Build for additional primary school pupil place provision</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>Basic Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Ilford School</td>
<td>New build replacement of Community school for 1350 mainstream and 35 ASD students on existing site</td>
<td>£34,480,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure sector</td>
<td>Project(s) -</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>Stratford School</td>
<td>New build Foundation school, bringing together two existing sites onto single new site.</td>
<td>£29,380,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plashet School</td>
<td>Phased remodelling and refurbishment, with some new build.</td>
<td>£19,090,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tunmarsh KS3 PRU</td>
<td>New build replacement of PRU facilities for 66 students</td>
<td>£3,790,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John F Kennedy Special (PMLD)</td>
<td>Refurbishment /remodelling, with some elements of new build.</td>
<td>£6,400,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleanor Smith Special School</td>
<td>New build school for 55 SEBD students, bringing together two existing sites onto single new site.</td>
<td>£7,870,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saints Sixth Form</td>
<td>Refurbishment and some new build at current Stratford Annexe site to create new Joint Saints Sixth Form.</td>
<td>£12,260,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Angela’s School</td>
<td>Phased refurbishment of existing VA girls school for 900 students</td>
<td>£5,460,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Bonaventure’s</td>
<td>Phased refurbishment of existing VA boys school for 900 students.</td>
<td>£8,710,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Directions KS4 PRU</td>
<td>New build PRU facility for 144 students (FTE) on new site</td>
<td>£8,250,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 7FE School</td>
<td>Additional pupil place provision through new build 1050 place school.</td>
<td>£24,400,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Docks</td>
<td>BSF ICT funding agreed for existing PFI/BSF Wave 1 school.</td>
<td>£1,700,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingsford (existing PFI)</td>
<td>Provision of BSF ICT Managed Service at existing PFI school.</td>
<td>£2,120,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure sector</td>
<td>Project(s) -</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Higher Education</td>
<td>UEL Estate Strategy</td>
<td>UEL Estate Strategy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>UEL self funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>PCT hubs in community forum area</td>
<td>PCT hubs in community forum area</td>
<td>Estimated costs not currently available</td>
<td>Stratford hub is funded</td>
<td>Other hubs do not have committed funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Emergency Services</td>
<td>Plaistow Fire Station</td>
<td>Rebuild</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>National Fire Service PFI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Leisure</td>
<td>Aquatics Centre</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>£100,000,000</td>
<td>£5 million from ODA and LBN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>Canning Town and Green Street</td>
<td>New swimming Pool</td>
<td>£5,000,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refurbish and rebrand all libraries</td>
<td>Refurbish and rebrand all libraries</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>Proposal only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New build Libraries at East Ham, Canning Town, Stratford and Manor Park</td>
<td>New build Libraries at East Ham, Canning Town, Stratford and Manor Park</td>
<td>Up to £28,500,000</td>
<td>Proposal only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Event infrastructure</td>
<td>£600,000 across four sites for lifetime of Plan</td>
<td>LB Newham-funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure sector</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Newham Farm</td>
<td>Raise standards of allotments to Folkestone Road benchmarks</td>
<td>£275,000 for lifetime of Plan</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ham Creek Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridle path Allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary’s Allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Meads Allotments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reynolds Avenue Allotment; Leyes Road Allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fry House Tennant Allotment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve interpretation of nature and heritage at key sites</td>
<td>Improve interpretation of nature and heritage at key sites</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Sports and activity trails</td>
<td>£500,000 over lifetime of plan across ten sites</td>
<td>LB Newham-</td>
<td>funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brampton Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Lane Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keir Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaistow Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priory Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unknown funding not committed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure sector</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Abbey Lane Open Space; Hathaway Crescent Open Space; May Green; Odessa Road Open Space; Pier Road Open Space; Beckton District Park North (Year 3)</td>
<td>Masterplanning to exploit potential of key open spaces Pocket Parks</td>
<td>£2 million over lifetime of plan Unknown</td>
<td>LB Newham Funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beckton District Park South; Gooseley Playing Fields Little Ilford Park Memorial Recreation Ground New Beckton Park. Beckton District Park Central Park Memorial Recreation Ground Plashet Park.</td>
<td>Sports and activity MUGAS at</td>
<td>£500,000 for lifetime of plan across five sites</td>
<td>LB Newham-funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sports and Activity hubs at:</td>
<td>£900,000 to be split between 5 parks over the lifetime of the plan</td>
<td>LB Newham Funding not committed</td>
<td>LB Newham Funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Event infrastructure</td>
<td>£600,000 across four sites for lifetime of Plan</td>
<td>LB Newham-funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure sector</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Cundy Park (Year 5)</td>
<td>MUGA</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>LB Newham-funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermit Road Recreation Ground (Year 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King George V Park (Year 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Star Park (Year 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>Part of £5.8m central fund</td>
<td>Committed expenditure. LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keir Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valetta Grove Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground; Hermit Road Recreation Ground; Plashet Park</td>
<td>Establishment at Mini Soccer league venues</td>
<td>£10,000 split between three sites</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckton District park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver destination play areas at:</td>
<td>£1.25 million to be split between 4 parks over the lifetime of the plan</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13.4 Medium Term Projects (2015-20)

**Table 13.2: Newham Infrastructure Delivery Plan: Projects 2015-20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td>District Line capacity upgrade</td>
<td>District Line capacity upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crossrail*</td>
<td>Crossrail*</td>
<td>£17 billion*</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DLR Dagenham Dock Extension</td>
<td>DLR Dagenham Dock Extension</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallions Reach Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Gallions Reach Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratford International Station Interchange</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>£238 million</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Ham Station i</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>132kV powerlines replacement</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>132kv network between West Ham to Brunswick Wharf</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>132kV network laid from West Ham to Orchard Place</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee Line</td>
<td>Stratford to Canary Wharf</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overland Rail</td>
<td>Overland Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Risk - Olympic Online Wetland</td>
<td>Olympic Online Wetland</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure</td>
<td>Stratford (2)</td>
<td>PCT Hub but location is not yet decided</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>NHS Newham and others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Mill Meads Allotments</td>
<td>Raise standards to Folkestone Road standards</td>
<td>A share of £275,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>£10 million</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is a separate CIL for delivering Crossrail. So while included for reference purposes, this project should not be included in the schedule for the purposes of generating a Newham charging schedule for CIL.*
13.5  **PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE BY COMMUNITY FORUM AREA**

The following section displays planned infrastructure projects by Community Forum Area.

13.5.1  **PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE IN STRATFORD AND WEST HAM COMMUNITY FORUM AREA**

Table 13.3 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Stratford and West Ham Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.1. There are twenty one planned community infrastructure projects for Forest Gate Community Forum Area. Seven of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- New Library at Stratford;
- Olympic Aquatics Centre;
- Memorial Recreation Area: Delivery of Existing masterplans;
- Chandos Road Amenity Area: Delivery of Existing masterplans;
- Mill Meads Allotment;
- Greenway; and
- NHS Primary and community service at two locations

Table 13.3: Planned Infrastructure in Stratford and West Ham Community Forum Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure Transport</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Jubilee Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Electricity</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Overland Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>West Ham – Brunswick Wharf</td>
<td>Overhead 13kV powerlines replacement West Ham- Brunswick Wharf</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>EDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>West Ham-Brunswick Wharf</td>
<td>132kV network West Ham- Brunswick Wharf</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>EDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>West Ham Primary and Orchard Place</td>
<td>132kV network West Ham primary and Orchard Place</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>EDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Olympic Online Wetland</td>
<td>Online wetland between Delivery Zones 5</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure: Flood Risk</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Primary healthcare- Stratford City and two other locations</td>
<td>and 6, on the River Lea providing additional storage and conveyance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>West Ham C of E Primary School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment</td>
<td>£6,315,833</td>
<td>Primary capital Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>John F Kennedy Special (PMLD)</td>
<td>Refurbishment and Remodelling</td>
<td>£6.4 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Sarah Bonnell School</td>
<td>Wave 1: Refurbish and some new build</td>
<td>£12.6 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 (Wave 1)</td>
<td>Rokeby School</td>
<td>Wave 1 New FE building</td>
<td>£16.1 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 (Wave1)</td>
<td>Saints 6th Form</td>
<td>Wave 5: Refurbishment and some new build</td>
<td>£12.26 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Higher Education</td>
<td>Target date for completion is 2013</td>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td>Construction of a new library building on the Stratford campus</td>
<td>Information not yet available</td>
<td>UEL: self funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Higher Education</td>
<td>Target date for completion is 2013</td>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td>Stratford Island University Campus-provide academic and performing arts facility</td>
<td>Information not yet available</td>
<td>UEL: self funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Higher Education</td>
<td>Target date for completion is 2013</td>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td>Salway Road Site</td>
<td>Information not yet available</td>
<td>UEL: self funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community Facilities</td>
<td>2010-20104</td>
<td>Stratford Library</td>
<td>New Library at Stratford</td>
<td>A share of £28.5 million</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Leisure</td>
<td>20010-2014</td>
<td>Olympics Aquatic Centre - location to be decided</td>
<td>Olympic Aquatics Centre in Olympic Park - one of the Olympic 2012 venues</td>
<td>£100 million</td>
<td>LB Newham £5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Memorial Recreation Area</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>£1.9 million</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Chandos Road Amenity Area</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>MillMeads Allotments</td>
<td>Upgrade Mill Meads Allotments to same standards as Folkestone road</td>
<td>£275,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>£10.5 Million</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.2 **Planned Infrastructure in Forest Gate Community Forum Area**

Table 13.4 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Forest Gate Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.2. There are five planned community infrastructure projects for Forest Gate Community Forum Area. Four of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Green Street Polyclinic development;
- The Gate Library; and
- Odessa Road Open Space.

**Table 13.4: Planned Infrastructure in Forest Gate Community Forum Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Overland Rail</td>
<td>London Overground Upgrade</td>
<td>£326 million</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary care</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Green Street Polyclinic development</td>
<td>Recurrent and additional spend on primary and community services</td>
<td>Information not yet available</td>
<td>Information not yet available</td>
<td>NHS Newham and others. Business case will be applied to each development - funding not committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Forest Gate Community School</td>
<td>Wave 1: New build and remodelling</td>
<td>£9.8 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>The Gate Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment of Library</td>
<td>Share of £28.5 million</td>
<td>Funding not confirmed</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Odessa Road Open Space</td>
<td>Exploit potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision at 8 sites</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>Funding not confirmed</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.3 **Planned Infrastructure in Manor Park Community Forum Area**

Table 13.5 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Manor Park Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.4. There are fifteen planned community infrastructure projects for Manor Park Community Forum Area. Nine of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Little Ilford: Sports and Activity Youth Zones;
- Little Ilford: Sports and Activity Hubs;
- Plashet Park: Masterplanning;
- Plashet Park: Infrastructure to support physical activity;
- Plashet Park: Play;
- Plashet Park Event Infrastructure;
- Hathaway Crescent;
- Reynolds Avenue allotment; and
- Bridle Path Allotment.

Table 13.5 Planned Infrastructure in Manor Park Community Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>East London Transit (ELT) Phase 1b</td>
<td>Phase 1b</td>
<td>18.5m (for 1a &amp; 1b)</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Electricity</td>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>Wood Grange Park Substation</td>
<td>Replacement of 3kV cables and reinforcement</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Dersingham Infants School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment</td>
<td>£3,496,685</td>
<td>PCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Sheringham Juniors School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment</td>
<td>£4,232,850</td>
<td>PCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Avenue Primary School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td>PCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Little Ilford Community School</td>
<td>Wave 5: New build</td>
<td>£19,090,000</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure:</td>
<td>Unknown as proposal only</td>
<td>Manor Park Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>£3,000,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Proposal only. LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Funding proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>2009-2014. Year 4</td>
<td>Little Ilford Park</td>
<td>Sports and Activity Youth zones develop wheels parks, hang out zones to improve 12+ offer.</td>
<td>£700,000</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 5</td>
<td>Little Ilford park</td>
<td>Sports and Activity hubs. Concentration and improvement of sports provision.</td>
<td>Share of £900,000 between 5 sites</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td>Play facilities - Delivery “destination” play areas</td>
<td>£1.25 million between 5 sites</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td>Event Infrastructure:</td>
<td>£600,000 between 4 sites</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td>Sport and Activity Trails</td>
<td>£500,000 across Borough</td>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Plashet Park</td>
<td>Masterplanning to identify development requirements</td>
<td>£10.5 Million</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Hathaway Crescent</td>
<td>Key open spaces to supplement parks provision</td>
<td>Share of £275,000 across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Reynolds Avenue Allotment</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>Share of £275,000 across the Borough</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Bridle Path Allotment</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>Share of £275,000 across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.4 **PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE IN GREEN STREET COMMUNITY FORUM AREA**

Table 13.6 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Green Street Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.4. There are eight planned community infrastructure projects for Green Street Community Forum Area. Five of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Green Street Polyclinic Hubs;
- Green Street Library;
- Green Street Swimming pool;
- Priory parks: Sports and Activity Trails; and
- Fryhouse Allotment.

**Table 13.6: Planned Infrastructure in Green Street Community Forum Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Healthcare</td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Green Street PCT Hubs</td>
<td>Polyclinic development</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Business case will be applied to each development - funding not committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>St. Angela's School Phased Refurbishment</td>
<td>Wave 5: Phased Refurbishment</td>
<td>£5.46 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Infrastructure: Education</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
<th>St. Bonaventure’s 6th Form</th>
<th>Wave 5: Phased refurbishment of existing VA school for 900 students</th>
<th>£8.71 million</th>
<th>BSF</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Green Street Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>A share of £28 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Proposal – Not funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Green Street Leisure Centre</td>
<td>New Swimming Pool</td>
<td>£5 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Funding not committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Priory Park</td>
<td>Sports and Activity Trails- Provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity.</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Fryhouse Allotment</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.5 **Planned Infrastructure in East Ham Community Forum Area**

Table 13.7 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for East Ham Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.5. There are fifteen planned community infrastructure projects for East Ham Community Forum Area. Nine projects which do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Primary Healthcare- PCT Hub in East Ham;
- East Ham Library Refurbishment;
- Cross River Park;
- Central Park: Improve event Infrastructure;
- Greenway;
- Gooseley playing Fields: Masterplanning;
- Gooseley Playing Fields: Sports provision;
- Gooseley Allotments; and
- Central Park: 12 plus provision.

**Table 13.7: Planned Infrastructure in East Ham Community Forum Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Waste Water</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Thames Water Storage Tunnel</td>
<td>6.9km storage tunnel from Abbey Mills Pumping Station to Beckton</td>
<td>£417 million</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Beckton Sewage Treatment works</td>
<td>Expansion of Beckton Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td>Information not available due to commercial confidentiality</td>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>PCT-Location unknown</td>
<td>Recurrent and additional spend on primary and community services</td>
<td>£1.2 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>NHS Newham and others. Business case will be applied to each development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Vicarage Primary School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment of some Primary Schools</td>
<td>£5,965,543</td>
<td>Primary capital Programme</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Brampton Primary</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbishment of some Primary Schools.</td>
<td>£6,426,075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>Langdon School</td>
<td>Basic Need for Primary School Provision at Langdon School site</td>
<td>£5 million</td>
<td>Tbc (as outside PCP funding)</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Langdon School</td>
<td>Refurbish existing accommodation and explore whether any new build is required</td>
<td>£14.9 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Brampton Manor School</td>
<td>Wave 1: BSF programme</td>
<td>£6.7 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>Central Park</td>
<td>Improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at key event venues</td>
<td>£600,000 between four sites across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>Gooseley Playing Fields</td>
<td>Masterplanning to identify development requirements</td>
<td>£10.5 million across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>Gooseley Playing Fields</td>
<td>Sports and Activity Hubs</td>
<td>£900,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Gooseley Allotments</td>
<td>Raise Standards to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>£275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.6 **Planned Infrastructure in Plaistow Community Forum Area**

Table 13.8 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Plaistow Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.6. There are fifteen planned community infrastructure projects for Plaistow Community Forum Area. Eight of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Polyclinic development;
- Plaistow Library;
- May Green;
- St Mary’s Allotment;
- Plaistow Park: 12+ provision;
- Plaistow Park: Play;
- Valetta Green Open Space; and
- Greenway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>District Line Capacity Upgrade</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Polyclinic development:</td>
<td>Recurrent and additional spend on primary and community services</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Newham and others Business case will be applied to each development -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>BSF: Lister Community School</td>
<td>Wave 1: To construct a new FE mixed school on the existing main site</td>
<td>£29 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 13. Infrastructure Delivery Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>BSF: Eleanor Smith Special School</td>
<td>Wave 5: New build school, bringing together two existing sites onto a single new site</td>
<td>£7.87 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Education</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>BSF: Tunmarsh KS3 PRU</td>
<td>Wave 1: New build replacement of PRU facilities on existing site</td>
<td>£3.79 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Plaistow Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>A share of £3 million</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown as proposal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Emergency Services</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Plaistow Fire Station</td>
<td>Redevelopment of Plaistow Fire Station</td>
<td>A share of £57.4 million</td>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 5</td>
<td>May Green</td>
<td>Exploit potential of key open spaces to supplement parks provision</td>
<td>A share of £2 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>St Mary’s Allotments</td>
<td>Raise standards to Folkestone Road Benchmark</td>
<td>A share of £275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaistow Park</td>
<td>Develop wheels, hang out zones to improve the 12+ offer</td>
<td>£700,000 across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaistow Park</td>
<td>Delivery of destination play areas</td>
<td>A share of £1.25 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Plaistow Park</td>
<td>Provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity</td>
<td>A share of £500,000</td>
<td>PCT/LB Newham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>Valetta Green Open Space</td>
<td>Delivery of existing master plan</td>
<td>£5.8 million central fund</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>£10.5 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Funding not committed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.7 **Planned Infrastructure in Beckton Community Forum Area**

Table 13.9 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Beckton Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS Figure 13.7. There are twenty six community infrastructure projects for Beckton Community Forum Area, of which half of these are funded. However, there are sixteen projects which do not yet have funding committed. These are:

- Polyclinic development at Beckton community centre;
- Refurbishment of Beckton Globe Library;
- Newham City farm;
- Beckton District Park-South: Delivery of four destination Play areas;
- Beckton District Park-South Concentration and improvement of Sports provision;
- Beckton District Park-North; Provide MUGA;
- New Beckton Park: Provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity;
- New Beckton Park: Develop wheel parks and hang out zones to improve the 12+ offering;
- Beckton District Park: provide a range of infrastructure to support physical activity;
- Beckton District Park: Improved access, lighting, grass reinforcement and event infrastructure at key event venues;
- Greenway; and
- Cross River Park.
Table 13.9: Planned Infrastructure in Beckton Community Forum Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project (s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>DLR Beckton Extension</td>
<td>DLR Beckton Extension 3- car upgrade</td>
<td>£18.2m</td>
<td>TfL- committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Energy</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>London Thames Gateway Heat Network</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Some Funding from LDA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Gas</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Beckton Below 7Bar</td>
<td>Pressure Reduction Station rebuild</td>
<td>Part of £300m fund. Exact cost not available</td>
<td>National Grid committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009/10-</td>
<td>Beckton Above 7 Bar</td>
<td>Holder main support replacement</td>
<td>Part of £300m</td>
<td>National Grid committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Waste Water</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Beckton Sewage Treatment Works Expansion</td>
<td>Beckton Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td>Costs not available due to commercial confidentiality</td>
<td>Thames Water AMP5-Committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015-2020</td>
<td>Lee Tunnel</td>
<td>6.9km, &amp;m diameter storage tunnel from Abbey Mills Pumping Station to Beckton Sewage Treatment Works</td>
<td>£417m pot</td>
<td>Thames Water-Committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Beckton Polyclinic development</td>
<td>Beckton Polyclinic development</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Higher Education</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td>Construction of a new Sports and Leisure Building for Docklands campus</td>
<td>Exact figures not yet available</td>
<td>UEL self funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Beckton Globe Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>A share of £3 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>(2009-2014) Year 5</td>
<td>Beckton District Park-South:</td>
<td>Delivery of destination play areas</td>
<td>A share of £1.25 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2009-2014)</td>
<td>Newham City farm</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>A share of 275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2009-2014) Year 3</td>
<td>Beckton District Park-South</td>
<td>Improvement of Sports provision</td>
<td>£900,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2009-2014) Year 3</td>
<td>Beckton District Park-North</td>
<td>Provide MUGA</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td>Physical Infrastructure to support physical activity</td>
<td>£500,000 across four sites</td>
<td>PCT and LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td>Improve 12+ offering</td>
<td>£700,000 across Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 2</td>
<td>New Beckton Park</td>
<td>Sports and Activity Trails</td>
<td>£500,000 across Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 3</td>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Event Infrastructure</td>
<td>£600,000 across Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Beckton District Park</td>
<td>Sports and Activity Trails</td>
<td>£500,000 across Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>(2009-2014)</td>
<td>South Beckton Allotment:</td>
<td>Raise to Folkestone Road Benchmark</td>
<td>A share of £275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009-2014)</td>
<td>Cyprus Allotment:</td>
<td>Raise standards to Folkestone Road Benchmark</td>
<td>A share of £275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009-2014)</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Share of £10,500,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.8 **Planned Infrastructure in Canning Town and Custom House Community Forum Area**

Table 13.10 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Canning Town and Custom House Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.8. There are twenty-eight planned infrastructure improvements for Canning Town and Custom House Community Forum Area. Twenty-two of these projects do not yet have funding committed. These are:

1. Polyclinic development in Canning Town;
2. Canning Town Library refurbishment;
3. Custom House Library refurbishment;
4. Removal of Canning Town Roundabout;
5. Star Park: Existing Masterplans;
6. Star park: MUGAs;
7. Star park: Play Area;
8. Beckton District park South: Play area;
9. Beckton District Park South: MUGAS;
10. Beckton District park North: MUGAS;
11. King George V Park;
12. Connaught Allotments;
13. Leyes Road Allotment;
14. Greenway;
15. Canning Town Recreation ground: Masterplanning Parks;
16. Memorial Recreation Ground: Event Infrastructure;
17. Hermit Road Recreation Ground: Masterplanning;
18. Hermit Road Recreation Ground: Sports and Activity Hubs;
19. Canning Town Recreation Ground: Sport & Activity Trails;
20. Kier Hardie Recreation ground Deliver phase 1 of building repairs
21. Upgrade Kier Hardie Recreation Ground; and
22. Community Pool (25m)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Canning Town Polyclinic development</td>
<td>Polyclinic development</td>
<td>£9.2m approx 7</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Newham and others Business case will be applied to each development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure; Education</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>St. Helen’s Primary School</td>
<td>Rebuild and refurbish</td>
<td>£1.2 million</td>
<td>Primary Capital Programme</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Royal Docks Community School</td>
<td>Wave 1: Provision of a new PMLD unit</td>
<td>£1.7 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>Eastlea</td>
<td>Wave 1: Construction new build and major remodelling</td>
<td>£10 million</td>
<td>BSF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community facilities</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Canning Town Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>A share of £28 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Custom House Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>A share of £28 million</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>New Swimming Pool at Canning Town</td>
<td>New Swimming Pool at Canning Town</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Electricity</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>EDF Electricity</td>
<td>New - 3x 30 Mva 132/11kv substation at Excel Centre</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>EDF - committed funding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Removal of Canning town roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td>£18,000,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 This figure is based on the hub serving a catchment of 67,441 by 2026, and a build cost of £2,300 per sqm. Assumptions have been made in terms of delivery and funding mechanisms. If there are any changes the costs will differ from this figure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Star Park</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>A share of £10.5 million across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Beckton District Park South</td>
<td>Delivery of destination play areas</td>
<td>£1.25 million between 4 sites across Borough</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Star Park</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>A share of £10.5 million across the Borough</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Beckton District Park South</td>
<td>Delivery of destination play areas</td>
<td>£1.25 million between 4 sites across Borough</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Beckton District Park North</td>
<td>Delivery of destination play areas</td>
<td>£1.25 million between 4 sites across Borough</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>King George V</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>Share of £500,000</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Kier Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>Share of £1.9 million</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground:</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>£1.9 million split between 3 sites</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Memorial Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Event Infrastructure</td>
<td>A share of £600,000</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Hermit Road Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Master planning to identify development requirements</td>
<td>A share of £1.9 million</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Hermit Road Recreation Ground: Sports and Activity Hubs</td>
<td>Establishment of mini soccer league venues</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Canning Town Recreation Ground: Sport &amp; Activity Trails</td>
<td>Delivery of existing masterplans</td>
<td>A share of £500,000</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Project(s)</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Value</td>
<td>Existing Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposed Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Kier Hardie Recreation Ground:</td>
<td>Deliver phase 1 of building repair</td>
<td>A share of £5.8m Central Fund</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>Keir Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Upgrade Keir Hardie Recreation Ground</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Connaught Allotments</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>Share of £275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Leyes Road Allotment</td>
<td>Raise standards at all sites to Folkestone Road benchmark</td>
<td>Share of £275,000</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>Share of £10,500,000 across the Borough.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.5.9 **PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE IN ROYAL DOCKS COMMUNITY FORUM AREA**

Table 13.11 below depicts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Royal Docks Community Forum Area. The data shown in this table is also shown spatially in GIS figure 13.9. There are seven planned community infrastructure projects for Royal Docks Community Forum Area. The majority of these projects, with the exception of ELT (Phase 1b) do not have any committed funding. Projects which require funding are:

- Royal Docks: PCT Hub- Primary Care;
- Royal Docks: PCT Hub- Adult Care;
- North Woolwich Library refurbishment;
- Cross River Park; and
- Pier Road Open Space.

**Table 13.11: Planned Infrastructure in Royal Docks Community Forum Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Sector</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Project(s)</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Value</th>
<th>Existing Funding Source</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Electricity</td>
<td>2010-2015</td>
<td>Silver Town</td>
<td>Switchboard Asset Replacement and 66Kv transformer reinforcement</td>
<td>Information not currently available</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure: Transport</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>East London Transit (ELT)</td>
<td>Phase 1b</td>
<td>£18.5 million (split between Phase 1a and 1b)</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Primary Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Royal Docks PCT Hub</td>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>Information currently not available</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LB Newham. Business case will be applied to each development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Adult Care</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Royal Docks PCT Hub</td>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure: Community Facilities</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>North Woolwich Library</td>
<td>Refurbishment</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Cross River Park</td>
<td>Cross River Park</td>
<td>Proposal Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2014 Year 4</td>
<td>Pier Road Open Space</td>
<td>Masterplanning</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Funding: Capital Financing Strategy

14.1 Introduction

Local authorities have a requirement to invest in their communities and to develop the infrastructure to support them. This is not a responsibility that falls to the local authority in isolation. The development of localities requires investment from a range of sources including health, water and sewerage and national agencies. Where there is a substantial programme of development or regeneration there is a need for the investment strategies of the various agencies to be effectively coordinated through integrated infrastructure planning.

In Newham’s case a Community Infrastructure Study is being undertaken for the Council. The study should provide the basis for planning the development of the additional infrastructure that Newham will require over the planning period.

The adoption of the infrastructure plan should be a key document in the determination of the Council’s capital programme. However, it is not the only influencing factor. There will be other demands on the Council’s resources which will emanate from the Council’s corporate and service plans and the asset management strategy. It is essential that the Council gives careful consideration to its overall capital programme and the financing thereof.

14.2 An Introduction to the Capital Financing Strategy

14.2.1 Strategic Fit

The capital investment programme is part of the overall financial strategy in terms of the allocation of scarce Council resources. As such, it cannot be seen in isolation. Within the strategic hierarchy of the Council’s plans, it should be possible to follow a ‘golden thread’ linking the plans to the organisation’s overall strategic objectives. The thread would be discernable from the Community Strategy through the Medium Term Financial Plan, the Workforce Strategy, the Asset Management Plan, and the ICT Strategy to the individual departmental Service Plans.

It will be difficult for the Council to implement a Capital Financing Strategy to help finance its investment programme without recognising the direct impact on the Revenue Budget. This will involve modelling the options for financing the capital programme and the consequential effects that will have on the Revenue Budget. Revenue implications other than capital financing charges also need to be taken into account. Of course, some investments can generate a return in terms of reduced revenue expenditure or increased income. The obvious example of this is ‘Invest to Save’ projects, which should have medium to long term positive net financial effects. Additionally, capital expenditure that stimulates economic development can also have positive effects on the tax base, enabling them to be, at least in part, self financing.
It is also important to set out the relationship between the Capital Financing Strategy and the Treasury Management Strategy. The Capital Financing Strategy sets out in broad terms the sources of finance for the capital programme and its costs. The Treasury Management Strategy will set out the way in which the Council will fulfil its financing requirements in a more detailed manner and will reflect the overall cash requirements of the Council, not just those relating to capital spending. Borrowing decisions should not be driven alone by cash flow requirements.

14.2.2 **The Golden Rule and the Sustainable Investment Rule**

The Council should consider whether it wishes to adopt a long term strategic approach to the level of capital investment to ensure that the level of spending is (and remains) sustainable. By looking at a possible ten year strategy, the Council may be able to agree a balance between revenue and capital spending, taking into account the burden on local tax payers. This is a similar approach to capital investment as adopted (but not necessarily followed) by the UK Government. This is set out below and is instructive in the sense that it sets an approach to borrowing in the context of overall expenditure planning and resource allocation.

The Golden Rule states that, **over the economic cycle, the Government will borrow only to invest** and not to finance current spending.

The Sustainable Investment Rule states that **borrowing to finance investment will be set so as to ensure that net public debt, as a proportion of GDP, will be held over the economic cycle at a stable and prudent level**
14.2.3 CONSTRUCTING THE CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAMME

The construction of the capital programme in a structured way is a complex and often difficult task. It involves taking decisions on:

- The prioritisation of projects;
- The financing of individual projects;
- The overall financing of the total programme; and
- The revenue implications of both individual projects and the overall programme.

The above requires a considered and well administered approach. The overall financing of the capital programme is the province of the Director of Finance. It is likely that there will be an iterative approach that involves the construction of a draft capital programme and consideration of the overall financing of that programme and the revenue consequences of the projects. It is likely that consideration of the overall programme will require some schemes to be examined so as to achieve a programme that conforms with the Prudential Code.

14.2.4 THE PRUDENTIAL CODE AND MRP

The Prudential Code was introduced on 1st April 2004 across much of the UK. The intention was to reduce the requirement for permission to borrow from the Government. Instead, a regime of self-regulation was installed, essentially requiring Councils to review their overall financial standing to ensure that their capital spending plans were capable of being accommodated within their long term financial planning.

The Prudential Code requires that capital investment plans should be:

- Affordable;
- Prudent; and
- Sustainable

All borrowing should be supported by an options appraisal and Treasury management decisions should be taken in accordance with good practice. Essentially the prudential code requires a direct link to be established between the capital programme and its consequences and the Council’s Medium Term Financial Plan.

Local authorities are normally required each year to set aside some of their revenues as provision for debt. This is known as the Minimum Revenue Provision. This reflects the need to include the costs of repayment of debt in the sums levied on the Council Tax Payer.

14.2.5 INVEST TO SAVE

Invest to Save schemes must be subject to the same level of scrutiny as other schemes. However, they are likely to be measured more on financial return criteria than other more qualitative matters. It is essential that the financial business case is robustly challenged and that the Council is secure in achieving the forecast real savings from the schemes.
The criteria that the Council applies could take the following pattern:

Table 14.1: Invest to Save Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback Period</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 1 Year</td>
<td>Automatic approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 2 Years</td>
<td>Automatic approval subject to availability of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 3 Years</td>
<td>Consideration alongside other bids for Invest to Save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council may wish to make an annual allocation for Invest to Save schemes that is delegated to an Invest to Save Group to administer. However, schemes that cannot be accommodated but that have considerable benefits should be considered separately as bids for investment funding.

### 14.3 Capital Financing Options

#### 14.3.1 Overview

This section sets out the options for the financing of capital expenditure. The major sources of finance for capital expenditure are:

- Capital receipts;
- Borrowing;
- Leasing;
- Government Grants;
- Other Grants;
- Commuted sums (such as planning obligations);
- PFI/PPP and other commercial financing arrangements; and
- Revenue contributions

These resources should be applied only when all alternative sources of financing have been exhausted. There is a range of other sources of finance that have no or reduced costs for the Council such as grants or joint ventures. The approach should be firstly to attract finance that fulfils the Council’s requirements at minimal cost and only then to use Council financial resources to leverage external finance. The Council’s overall approach should be to borrow as a last resort rather than the automatic first port of call.

#### 14.3.2 Borrowing

The Council can borrow from a number of sources. Most commonly, the Authority will borrow from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) or through the financial markets. In Northern Ireland the PWLB loans are administered through the Government Loan Office.

#### 14.3.3 Public Works Loans Board (PWLB)

The UK Government raises money on the London money market for its own purposes through the issue of gilts. These are so-called because ‘gilt-edged’ loans are backed by Government and therefore very safe investments for both institutions and individual investors. Gilts have the highest possible credit rating in the market. They are generally issued via an auction and interest rates are lower than the general market rates because of the scale and security of gilts.

The Government allows local government access to this competitive mechanism for raising funds and does...
this through the PWLB. The PWLB issues loans with three maturity profiles:

- Maturity;
- Annuity; and
- Equal Instalments of Principal (EIP).

Loans can be advanced with either fixed or variable rates of interest. Maturities range from 1 year to 50 years for fixed rate loans or 10 years for variable loans.

14.3.4 **LOBOs**

A **Lenders Option Borrowers Option (LOBO)** is a market loan which has a fixed rate initial period and thereafter a potential variable rate and period to maturity. The loan rate is fixed during the initial predetermined period. After that period the lender has the option to change the rate of that loan, the borrower then has the option to accept the rate change or repay that loan. If the lender does not exercise the option to change the interest rate, then the borrower does not get an option to repay. So, from the borrower's viewpoint, the loan is essentially fixed unless an option is exercised by the lender.

The lender's decision to increase the interest rate on the Lenders Option Borrowers Option (LOBO) is not always interest rate driven. The lender will maintain a healthy margin between the hedging transaction it has undertaken with other financial institutions and the rate at which it has included in the actual LOBO loan. Only if this margin is under threat would the lender move to protect its common interest via requiring an increase in the loan rate during the LOBO period. Where the lender is involved in a string of hedging transactions which are all interrelated then the triggering of the LOBO rate change may be more influenced by other parties involved in the transaction.

The final maturity of LOBO loans range from around 40 years to 60 years. Currently the initial fixed period on offer varies from 1 year to 20 years. During the secondary LOBO period, when options can be exercised, the frequency at which the lender can change the rate of the loan in the variable period can be agreed and can vary from around 1 month to once every 10 years.

LOBOs can also be forward starting, i.e. a rate agreed at a specific date to draw down funds in the future. The significant benefit of this approach relates to securing certainty for the future affordability of capital programmes, without actually having to draw down cash if it is not currently required. In the current interest rate environment, by drawing down funds now with uncertain cash outflows, there would be a significant ‘cost of carry’, e.g. borrowing at 4% or more and investing the surplus cash at 0.5% until it is required. Of course in periods of higher interest rates, borrowing in advance of need could provide the Council with a useful turn on the temporary investment.

14.3.5 **The Current Market**

Interest rates are currently at their lowest levels for decades. The Bank Rate is at 0.5% and is not expected to fall any further. This means also that PWLB short dated rates are also at very low levels. At the time of writing PWLB interest rates vary from under 1% for one year and around 4.25% for long term money. The market for LOBOs has been difficult, with the market reluctant to lend. That is becoming easier and commercial money is more easily available. In terms of the context of borrowing decisions, rates are not expected to fall further (and there is little scope for this to happen). Most commentators expect that, once the recovery gathers momentum, rates will start to rise. Best advice, in many instances, is to cover the borrowing requirements (at least in part) sooner rather than later.
14.3.6 **CAPITAL RECEIPTS**

Where local authorities have capital assets that are surplus to operational requirements there is the potential for these to be sold and applied to finance capital expenditure. This is normally done as part of the authority’s Asset Management Planning. It is important that careful consideration as to what assets to sell is given so as to ensure that maximum value is achieved in the sale and other opportunities are not compromised.

In the current environment the sale of capital assets may be difficult and many authorities are taking a view that better value may be achieved in the future than now. Newham may be in a different situation as a London Borough and having regard to Olympic Games related development. In realising funds through the sale of capital assets, there is a sense in which the ‘family silver’ is being sold.

Opportunities should be taken, where possible, to reinvest in land for future operational and investment opportunities. The Council is uniquely placed to take a view on future development opportunities and to use its influence and financial resources to assemble sites and to bring opportunities to market. It has to be recognised that capital receipts are not “free”. They involve giving up Council assets though if they finance higher value assets the net position can be favourable. Indeed, that should be one of the measures of the worth of the investment being proposed. It also has to be recognised that the capital receipt may be derived from the disposal of a revenue generating asset. In such circumstances there is a direct revenue cost.

14.3.7 **LEASING**

Leasing is a long established form of capital finance in local government. It is essentially a form of finance whereby the local authority does not own the asset but leases it from a commercial finance organisation. There are a number of different forms of lease but the most commonly used in local government are operating leases. The most common form of these sees the lessor take the risk on the residual value of the asset at the end of the lease. This enables the asset to be on the lessor’s rather than the local authority’s balance sheet. This form of finance can often be cheaper than loan financing, though that is not always the case. It also enables the cost of the assets procured not to be set against either the capital programme or revenue accounts in the year of acquisition.

This form of leasing is most often applied to vehicles and plant, computer equipment and copiers. It normally involves little or no effect on the operation of the assets with the lessor’s requirements almost inevitably being in total accord with good practice use of the assets. It is often the case that the vendor of the equipment will offer lease finance. This is usually to be avoided as it is almost always considerably more expensive than arranging the finance separately through a finance house. Irrespective the decision as to whether to lease or not should be backed by a robust business case and should usually be a financing not an operational decision.

The application of operational leasing very effectively matches the revenue costs to the useful life of the asset. As such it is often a convenient and economical way of financing the provision of assets. Against that there are instances where the use of leasing can be more expensive over the life of the asset than borrowing.

14.3.8 **GOVERNMENT GRANTS**

Capital grants represent project specific funding for capital projects from Government or the EU. This is sometimes received from quasi-government sources or other national organisations. In developing capital proposals the Council will always seek to maximise such external contributions, subject to any related grant conditions not being inconsistent with the Council’s policy aims and targeted outcomes. Frequently such funding, which enhances the Council’s investment capacity, will also be linked to match funding arrangements.
Care needs to be taken to avoid a grant-driven approach where the existence of grant support ‘entices’ the local authority into projects that are not reflected in its key priorities. The grant may assist the Council to take on a project that it might not otherwise be able to do, but grants should not lead to projects being approved that would not otherwise be included in the capital programme.

Iconic capital schemes, even those with 100% grant aid, can become a revenue burden on the Council and it is important to take account of the whole life costs in making the decision whether or not to proceed with a specific project.

14.3.9 **PFI**

Where a sound business case can be made, a local Authority may be prepared to use Private Finance Initiative financing and other funding partnerships to create significant capital investment in property assets.

PFI has been used for across the UK for schools and hospital construction projects and a range of infrastructure work. PFI projects require Government approval and are assessed under the HM Treasury Green Book arrangements. Essentially, projects are financed by the private sector, usually through a single purpose financing vehicle. The public service organisation for which the project is procured thereby transfers risk from the public to the private sector, as an essential element of the project. The asset does not appear on the balance sheet of the public service organisation, and therefore the project does not contribute to the Government’s overall public sector borrowing requirement. Payment to the contractor is usually via an agreed income stream such as a rental, which allows the capital financing costs to be met together with a margin as profit for the developer/contractor.

Transfer of risk is a fundamental facet of PFI. However, the private sector element of the scheme is usually traded-on in the secondary financial markets once the scheme is completed. This solves the problem that the development company needs to recoup its investment before it can take on other projects because the income stream is insufficient to finance other large scale projects. Other financial institutions such as pension funds and insurance companies are keen to have secure future income streams and the PFI schemes find a ready market, once the agreement is in place and the construction phase is completed. This is called ‘securitisation’. The difficulty is that the private sector partner in the scheme is not then the originator and the transfer of risk is more tenuous. In the final analysis, a local authority needs to provide school places and a health authority needs to supply hospital facilities. That responsibility is not easily passed on, even though a PFI scheme, so the transfer of risk appears incomplete.

There are a number of concerns around PFI schemes in the current market:

- Risk is more difficult to manage and to transfer to the private sector if future projects require a higher level of public subsidy or guarantee;
- Prudential borrowing powers may be curtailed across the UK because of the overall deficit funding position;
- Establishing lines of credit are more difficult and need the active co-operation of the European Investment Bank, the Bank of England and the UKFI (The UK Financing Institute);
- The credit squeeze will have ongoing effects on procurement of schemes, refinancing provisions and capital maturities; and,
- A low-growth environment makes many PFI schemes harder to take to market. This is equally true of other financing schemes such as tax increment schemes.
14.3.10 **PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS**

Working with partners / matched funding allows the Council to work with partners in the development of the City and its services. Various mechanisms provide opportunities to enhance the Council’s investment potential with support and contributions from other third party and local strategic partners. These may range from commissioning / facilitating others to develop services in the City; funding for regeneration projects; and through match funding, or joint funding of developments.

Another source of funding capital expenditure is developer contributions representing contributions from developers towards the provision of public assets or facilities. Sometimes these are used to mitigate the impact of their development on communities and often referred to as planning obligations. These contributions are usually earmarked for specific purposes in planning agreements and often related to infrastructure projects. This has been a source of considerable finance for local authorities and other public agencies in England, Scotland and Wales but not as yet in Northern Ireland. The Council will become responsible for development control under RPI and may wish to address the issues associated with planning obligations.

14.3.11 **OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING: JESSICA**

This is an initiative by the European Union. A JESSICA scheme (Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas) is a new way of using existing money. Member states of the European Union can use some of their EU grant funding (Structural funds) to invest in sustainable developments in their own countries. The retained funds are repayable to the EU and can be recycled.

A JESSICA scheme needs the agreement of national government to divert such funds. It also needs an extensive partnership of public service organisations with a common purpose and an agreed programme of development. The emerging capital programme will give an opportunity to establish whether or not there are schemes which might comprise a coherent JESSICA bid. This would offer the opportunity to seek partners to develop a co-ordinated approach.

14.3.12 **REGIONAL INVESTMENT FUNDS (RIF)**

A Regional Investment Fund (RIF) allows a region to pump prime infrastructure schemes where the investment monies are unlikely to be available at a time to suit the scheme. The development of Regional Investment Funds has been in response to concerns about major developments, where the planning obligations contributions have not been available in time to finance infrastructure projects to support the development. The money is recovered once the scheme is completed successfully. A RIF can support public and private investment. Critically, a RIF requires the clear identification of future income streams to support repayment of the pump priming finance. A good governance arrangement, through some form of partnership, is needed and this may need to be supported by a range of single purpose investment vehicles for each major project. In England, the South West Regional Development Agency (RDA) has implemented such a scheme.

14.3.13 **ACCELERATED DEVELOPMENT ZONES (ADZ)**

An Accelerated Development Zone is a mechanism to pump prime development, particularly in run-down inner city areas. The initiative originated in the USA as ‘Tax Incremental Financing’ (TIF) but has been renamed ADZ in the UK. The initiative has had some success in the USA and elsewhere. Essentially, a local authority is permitted to trade future tax income to get development moving. So, the anticipated incremental increase in tax revenues arising from successful regeneration of a specific geographical area is used as security to raise debt to finance the initial growth expenditure. A number of bigger cities in the UK have expressed interest in such an initiative. Across the rest of the UK, an ADZ would require the Government to reassess the business rates distribution system. This is because business rates are collected...

by the local councils but paid over to the Government, which redistributes the tax receipts on the basis of population rather than the geographical location of the taxpayer.

The scheme would need to be aware of the risk of offering state aid through such a scheme to the private sector, in breach of EU rules, and would also need to be aware that the scheme may fetter a future Council by committing tax revenues to a specific purpose.

14.3.14 REVENUE CONTRIBUTIONS

Revenue Contributions to capital spending are an important element in financing capital programmes across the public sector. In commercial schemes, the Council can often improve its bargaining position by putting money and land into the scheme early in the process. This can cut the cost of carrying initial costs and attract other investors and developers through the clear commitment of the local council.

Many councils also try to restrict the growth of external debt, seeing it as a burden on future ratepayers, which should be avoided if possible. There are equity issues here, since current taxpayers are being asked to finance assets which will be in public ownership for many years to come.

14.3.15 ASSET BACKED VEHICLES

Council’s are increasingly being pressured to make better use of their asset base. Traditionally asset sales have been the default position for the public sector. There is now a greater focus on approaches which allow the Council’s to retain a long term economic interest in assets and benefit from long term increases in asset values, rather achieve immediate and lower disposal values in the current economic climate.

Property based joint ventures are a very common form of entity in the private sector and are becoming more popular in the public sector. The basic premise required for successful joint venture is having two or more partners who have different, but complimentary resources/skills that, when combined, can create increased value. For Council’s considering a property based joint venture they will need to have an attractive asset base that is free to be invested. The Council will look to the private sector to bring:

- Equity funding to match land value;
- Commercial development and operational expertise; and
- Knowledge of commercial debt markets.

Local Asset Backed Vehicles allow local authorities to lever longer term investment using their existing assets. This is not a new idea in financing terms, but it is a new application of the technique. The appetite in money markets for asset-backed vehicles is weak presently because the credit squeeze was caused mainly by trading in toxic asset-backed bundled investments. This has made the market much more cautious in trading in such instruments. However, over a long period, banks have generally been supportive of property as security for investment.

Partnership local asset-backed vehicles may be difficult to achieve as other public service organisations, such as in health, may not have the powers to undertake such investment activity.

There are three main forms of legal entity that the Council could consider if it were to choose to pursue a joint venture approach: Company Limited by Shares, Limited Liability Partnership and Limited Partnership. The Council could choose on the form of joint venture vehicle during the negotiation process with the private sector partner, although the Council should consider its own preferred position in advance. The key points to consider when comparing the vehicles are:
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- Taxation: Stamp Duty Land Tax (SDLT), VAT, Corporation Tax, and Capital Gains Tax;
- Control and legal responsibilities of Directors;
- Limits of Liability to third parties;
- Openness and attractiveness to future investor/developer partners, including long term institutional investors; and,
- Potential for exit and realisation of initial investment.

The Council will also need to consider whether it would wish to group the schemes together under a single ‘parent’ joint venture or form a separate joint venture for each development, illustrated by Figure 13.2 overleaf

**Figure 14.2: Comparison between Site specific Joint Venture and Group Joint Venture Schemes.**

Factors to consider when assessing which approach to adopt will include the compatibility of schemes to work with one partner, the type of partner the Council wants at the ‘group’ joint venture level and the timescales of the schemes.

14.4 **Business Rate Supplement**

In some countries there have been supplemental local taxes on businesses to provide the funds for infrastructure investment. The contributions are normally tax deductible, since they are a business expense. But the benefits are in local infrastructure development to produce a better business environment.

14.5 **Direct Local Government Investment**

Local Authorities can invest directly in a range of infrastructure projects. An obvious example is the provision of industrial and commercial estates, where the authority puts in the infrastructure and builds (some of) the buildings, taking a rental stream from the tenants. In a time of low interest rates, a council could provide such facilities relatively competitively and could expect to recover its costs whilst providing opportunities for local job creation.

Across the UK, where retail and commercial schemes have stalled in the recession, many authorities have examined options to become anchor tenants of new developments, developing a new civic centre and utilising the council’s covenant to provide the commercial security to allow the scheme to progress.
This is an example of where the local authority can use its buying power and its credit rating to underpin local investment. The major difficulty is that resources for internal local investment in services may have to be delayed to enable the Council to afford to fund the commercial developments. There is a point at which the local authority must focus on its primary functions, no matter how desirable the alternative uses for the resources.

14.6 RENTAL

There are assets that the Council may wish to acquire the use of but which it need not purchase. For instance buildings can be rented, vehicles can be contract hired (with or without maintenance) and even computers can be rented. It can be the case that this will work out cheaper and consume less capital resources than acquisition might do. Leasing and PFI are, to a large extent, variations of rental and used for these purposes but they are by no means the only means of renting the use of assets. Generally speaking, local authorities have preferred outright purchase to renting. This is based on the view that purchase is usually cheaper, particularly in the long run. Local authorities can be confident in taking the long term view, with the assurance that Councils are enduring institutions.

In recent years, the option to lease or rent assets has become a viable commercial option and the market has adapted to seek greater opportunities in the public sector. Low interest rates have made outright purchase even more attractive, but at the same time, the development equation has also changed, allowing developers to offer competitive rentals which need to be appraised along with other financing options. Local authorities have a substantial advantage in rental negotiations, frequently underused. This is because they have a strong covenant and an impeccable credit rating. Any developer or landlord obtains a clear commercial advantage if a local authority tenant is signed up for a significant period of time. This has the same effect as a first class retailer signing as an anchor tenant in a retail development. It helps to assure the success of the development by attracting other tenants. It also allows the developer or landlord the option to securitise the development at advantageous rates, since the authority’s covenant is attractive in the secondary market.

Local authorities frequently do not place sufficient value on the value of their covenant and credit rating, comparing the rental per square metre with commercial space available elsewhere in the local market. This difference can make a rental actually cheaper than outright purchase.

14.7 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Developer contributions are sought through the planning system with regard to new development. These contributions are intended to be made towards the costs, usually infrastructure, occasioned by new development. This can be sought either as financial or “in-kind” contributions and can be either through Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the 1991 Act) or for in-kind contributions as conditions to the Planning consent. These, are negotiated between local councils and developers as part of the process of granting planning permission.

Planning Obligations or developer contributions are popularly known as planning gain. The negotiations are founded on the principle that the developer should contribute towards the cost of the additional strain on public services (or pay for them completely). The notion is that, for larger developments in particular, the developer has some responsibility for the resulting increased demand for public services. So the costs of development (and the underlying value of the land) should be affected by these factors.

The government intends that a Community Infrastructure Levy be introduced that will replace large aspects of the current arrangements under Section 106. This levy is intended to finance the infrastructure occasioned by the planned housing growth in England and Wales. There are a number of key changes with the introduction of CIL. The biggest changes are that it:
• Removes the direct link between the development and the infrastructure it contributes towards funding; and,

• It will entail a standard charge for developments.

This proposal means that there needs to be infrastructure plans in place for areas targeted for significant housing growth so that there is a basis for calculating the charge. It is important that the Council ensures that the infrastructure delivery plan is fully informed by all of its needs going forward.

14.8 ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF CAPITAL FINANCING APPROACHES

The various methods of financing the capital programme have advantages and disadvantages. These do not play consistently in every scenario and different schemes and elements of capital expenditure are suited to different sources of finance. Nevertheless, in the table below we set out the advantages and disadvantages that apply to each source.
Table 14.2: Advantages and Disadvantages* from capital Financing Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borrowing From PWLB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally available at low interest rates</td>
<td>Not very flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long and short term fixed rates available</td>
<td>The full costs of finance fall to the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be repaid through annuity, equal instalments of principal or maturity arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily arranged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be repaid early although premiums maybe payable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector Borrowing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for a direct financing link to the capital project being financed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term finance – available up to 60 years or more</td>
<td>Interest rates will not normally come down and are likely to rise during the life of the loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible – provides a tool which can be used to hedge rates and manage interest rate risk</td>
<td>The full costs of finance fall to the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rates can be competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leasing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be cheaper than loan finance</td>
<td>Can only be used for a restricted range of capital assets (normally vehicles, plant and equipment such as computers and photocopiers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council is able to use and maintain the asset with little or no difference from if it owned it</td>
<td>Can sometimes be more expensive than loan finance (and supplier provided finance is almost always expensive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset not on the Council’s balance sheet</td>
<td>The arrangements can be restricting in order to comply with International Financial Reporting Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreads the cost of the asset over its operating life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PFI/PPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off balance sheet</td>
<td>Can be expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of risk to the private sector</td>
<td>Only viable for large projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of operating responsibility to the private sector</td>
<td>Complex arrangements often involving the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often the only available source of finance</td>
<td>Creates a long term liability albeit one that is not reflected on the balance sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI credits from government may be available</td>
<td>Reduced control of the asset which is never owned by the authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoids need to go to money markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No complex arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No debt or financing charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Backed Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leverage additional private sector equity funding to match land value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access debt finance off the public sector balance sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council can have an ongoing control and influence of the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be an incentive to undertake projects that are not the Council’s priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables capital projects that would otherwise not be funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing claims on the funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for and risk associated with disposal of the asset at the end of its operational life lies with the lessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links elements of capital finance to the delivery of infrastructure requirements associated with the housing growth agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grant Funding cont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer Contributions</th>
<th>May be an incentive to undertake projects that are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct cost</td>
<td>Not the Council’s priorities. Enables capital projects that would otherwise not be funded. May require match funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing claims on the funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advantages | Disadvantages

Responsibility for and risk associated with disposal | Can be received some time after the infrastructure needs to be delivered |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>of the asset at the end of its operational life lies with the lessor</th>
<th>be delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely to cover all of the investment that is occasioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links elements of capital finance to the delivery of infrastructure requirements associated with the housing growth agenda</td>
<td>Rates will often reflect the lessor’s ability to obtain better residual values for the assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be received some time after the infrastructure needs to be delivered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely to cover all of the investment that is occasioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above template is capable of and should be significantly extended to provide year by year estimates of funding requirements and costs. It will feed into the Council’s medium and long term financial strategies of which it will be a key component.

An example of the exemplar scheme funding can be found in Appendix A.
Governance Arrangements for Infrastructure Delivery Plan

This note contains three elements:

- Part A: The background to IDPs and how their governance
- Part B: Approaches being adopted by other local authorities
- Part C: Feedback on initial discussions within LB Newham

14.9 PART A: THE BACKGROUND TO IDPS AND THEIR GOVERNANCE

Overview

PPS 12 requires that the deliverability of the LDF, especially the Core Strategy, is set out (in effect) in a sound Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This comprises of an infrastructure delivery strategy that covers the years 1-15, and a projects schedule which has more certainty for years 1-5/6. In order to create a sound delivery plan and a realistic schedule, communication between local authorities and agencies responsible for infrastructure is key. This can be done through good governance arrangements achieved through working with other partners including the public sector under the auspices of the LSP. The requirements include all public sector programmes, including capital finance, land and buildings as well as service locations/co-locations.

In practice this might involve the establishment of 3 groups:

- Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) overview group;
- Infrastructure Provider’s Group; and,
- Major Landowner’s Group (as set out in PPS 12).

The establishment of such governance arrangements is likely to create a robust and on-going approach which can work with the delivery of the LDF over its 15 year life and beyond. It can also be more efficient and effective than single infrastructure studies which may quickly become outdated.

The changes to PPS12 as published in June 2008 make it clear that the LDF and development management processes need to identify and where possible to deliver economic, social and green infrastructure. This includes existing service deficits and new development which is set out to meet the longer term requirements of the area as envisioned in the Sustainable Community Strategy. This will also include housing growth targets as agreed in Newham’s LAA under Target 154.

PPS 12 also sets out further requirements of the LDF which are:

- Delivery of the LAA (all targets in addition to NI 154);
- A review of public sector service locations (to include the potential for co-location); and
- A review of public sector assets with a view to releasing and reuse.

The LDF, particularly in the Core Strategy and AAPs also needs to establish how the infrastructure requirements have been identified and what strategies are in place to ensure that all partners have been engaged in identifying needs and where appropriate are committed to delivery. The relevant parts of the LDF (DPDs) will need to identify infrastructure planning and delivery approaches for a 15 year period and this includes both an overall strategy and a schedule of infrastructure that has a good prospect of being delivered. This combined approach is now generally being referred to as an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

The LDF and the accompanying IDP now sits within new arrangements for local governance following statutory guidance for the operation of LSPs in July 2008. Amongst other things, the LSP is now required to have the role of...
the oversight and alignment of resources between public bodies at the local level, including capital and revenue expenditure. The LSP now also have responsibility for community consultation within the area.

The clarity of the LSP’s role now provides an operational framework within which infrastructure deficits and resources to meet them can be combined in a more formalised way. This is further supported by the Statutory Guidance’s statement that each LSP should have an Executive Board and that all thematic sub-groups should feed into it. As this Guidance was published in July 2008, most LSPs do not have this structure as yet but there is an expectation that LSPs will migrate to these governance arrangements in due course.

The LSP may take forward this role in a way that reflects local patterns of working and there is no statutory guidance as to how this could be done effectively. In ‘Planning Together’ (DCLG, 2009), which provides good practice advice on the ways in which LSPs and LDFs can implement these new relationships, there is a recommendation that the LSP creates a specific part of its structure to take responsibility and oversight for the IDP work. Increasingly this is now occurring and some examples of the ways in which different local authorities are approaching this are set out below. This approach also sits within the broad concept of Total Place and Total Capital which both strongly encourage a combined approach to the use of resources across local partnerships in order to better serve the community.

### 14.9.1 Why have governance arrangements?

There are a number of reasons for establishing governance arrangements for local infrastructure planning and delivery as they:

- Can help to engage with all partners and key stakeholders;
- Are recommended by Planning Together (April 2009);
- Can use the duty of cooperation between partners to encourage them to work together (2007 Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act);
- Can create clear focus and help maximise resource and public sector assets for existing and new development and community needs;
- Can create the reporting relationship without which there is no easy tie into the delivery of the SCS through LDF and LAA;
- Help to assess access to public sector services;
- Help to review potential for co-location;
- Support a sound Core Strategy and Area Action Plan; and
- Help to identify surplus land and buildings for other uses.

### 14.9.2 What might be included in the governance arrangements?

PPS 12 and subsequently the PINS Report on Lessons Learned from the examination of LDFs (September 2009) have identified some core components of the IDP approach which, if in place, will support the test of ‘deliverability’ as part of the soundness of the LDF:

- a sub-group of LSP or other similar LSP arrangements;
- a schedule of all existing capital commitments of public sector providers together with any from those of the private and voluntary/community sectors;
- identification of those with lead on capital and business planning in partner organisations;
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- identification of existing capital programmes, their review process and criteria for scheme assessment;
- an infrastructure providers group for the area that can meet regularly to discuss future service planning requirements, co-location, strategic sites or other aspects of improving service accessibility;
- major landowners forum;
- identification of public sector land and buildings on GIS base; and,
- identification of any service delivery changes that could benefit from co-location.

14.9.3 **What is the potential role and format for the LSP’s governance role?**

In Planning Together it suggests creating a sub group of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), infrastructure Group. Such a group can be made up from:

- the LSP Executive;
- An existing LSP group sub group;
- A group in its own right with key infrastructure deliverers and representatives of relevant theme groups; and
- It can in effect be two groups – a strategic group and an Infrastructure Provider Group.

14.9.4 **Potential role of a LSP strategic overview group**

An LSP overview group can have the following roles:

- to promote the economic, social and environmental well being of the area through the provision of public infrastructure which supports the vision for the area, its quality of life and enhances its potential for economic growth;
- to support the IDP process through cooperation;
- maintain an overview of IDP projects and their role in supporting the delivery of the SCS and LAA;
- give leadership to the review on the location of public sector services and use of assets;
- provide a combined evidence base for the IDP
- provide leadership to the Infrastructure Providers Group; and,
- Indicative terms of reference in Appendix 1.

14.9.5 **Potential Role of the Key Infrastructure Service Providers (KISP) Group**

A KISP group can have the following roles:

- to identify the social, economic and environmental infrastructure requirements for the local area based on the area’s future vision as set out in the SCS and to be delivered through the LAA, MAA and LDF;
- to identify the land and property assets available in the public sector’s ownership in the area under consideration;
- to take account of new ways of delivering services;
- to identify potential co-location opportunities;
- to identify likely infrastructure requirements and provision for areas of current deficiency and strategic sites;
- to identify a programme for infrastructure delivery which will include who is to provide, when it is to be delivered and the funding sources;
- to identify where more efficient use of assets could be promoted;
- to identify who will be responsible for the delivery of the infrastructure;
- to identify the resources required for infrastructure delivery and how they will be provided;
- to establish a project management group to be responsible for more direct delivery;
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- to advise the LSP, sub-regional partnership and LDA of infrastructure requirements and potential funding shortfalls to deliver the local vision;
- provide a readymade list of projects to meet deficits when ‘windfall’ or unexpected funding is made available e.g. DCSF’s play funding allocation;
- to develop joint bids for funding applications e.g. HCA’s Single Conversation, DCSF’s co-location fund; and,
- Indicative terms of reference in Appendix B.

14.9.6 HOW SHOULD INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS BE IDENTIFIED?

PPS 12 requires that infrastructure is identified in three categories, physical, green and social/ community.

Identifying the infrastructure requirements in any locality will need to be based on a number of evidence - based factors including:

- demographic evidence and projections;
- housing market assessment and how this is to be met;
- transport projections including reduction targets;
- meeting sub-regional and regional roles;
- changing service delivery approaches including transforming services; and,
- supporting the enhancement of local character and quality to improve economic viability and calm environments.

14.9.7 HOW ARE LOCAL AUTHORITIES APPROACHING THIS TASK IN A PRACTICAL WAY?

Local authorities are each taking their own route to establishing these governance arrangements. For some they are being incorporated into existing structures whereas for others they are being incorporated into full or partial reviews of LSPs. One approach that some have adopted has been to:

- put an initial report to the Executive Board outlining the role of the LDF as the delivery programme and plan for the SCS and LAA;
- At this meeting request that a workshop briefing session is held for LSP partners and internal service providers at operational and service delivery level. NB this might require business planning staff in the PCT and property/service colleagues in Police and Fire rather than ‘designing out crime’ teams;
- hold workshop and then seek agreement to establish a group and devise a tentative programme;
- report back to LSP Executive and keep informed on a regular basis;
- programme might need to be a mixture of issues over time including:
  - thematic reviews e.g. health provision across the area including expected service changes;
  - area based reviews of a market town or village where multiple agencies might own land and buildings; and
  - site reviews to consider the capacity and condition of existing facilities, school management planning e.g. shifting places between areas of surplus and areas of need

14.9.8 WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF PUBLISHING THE IDP?

Publishing the IDP will enable:
• the community to appreciate the current scale of investment in Newham;
• future investment based on existing investment;
• more discussion about co-location;
• leaders in Newham to provide forger guidance on investment approaches within the borough; and,
• support business cases for further projects

14.9.9 WHAT ABOUT INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS NOT YET FUNDED?

The LDF IDP can only include those projects with a good prospect of funding. However this will not be able to include those projects that are needed but not yet funded. It is recommended that a full list of all these projects be maintained within the SCS as part of its Action/Delivery Plan. This will enable the council and its partners to:

• identify project bids from funding sources when available, - sometimes unexpectedly or at end of year
• provide information to the private sector on what is required
• provide the bases of bids for Dingle Conversation and other similar funding streams
• be the list from which any developer’s contributions can be drawn
14.10  **PART B: APPROACHES BEING ADOPTED BY OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

Although IDPs are a relatively new approach there are already a number of examples emerging from local authorities on different ways of taking them forward. These are set out below and do not represent ‘best practice’ as yet but approaches to suit local circumstances.

14.10.1  **LB Lewisham**

The LB Lewisham has given the responsibility for the IDP to one of its LSP thematic groups, chaired by the Deputy Mayor. In October 2009, the IDP, including a covering report and schedule was put to this group following an earlier consideration of the approach to be followed. The report also demonstrated how the IDP is linking to Lewisham’s Total Place pilot. The approach to the IDP is also one of the fullest and has engaged a wide variety of service providers. The process is not completed but it demonstrates the ways in which the LSP can steer the process.

14.10.2  **LB Tower Hamlets**

LB Tower Hamlets has prepared an IDP to support its LDF and this has been published. As far as can be seen from the documents, the process has concentrated on the provision of infrastructure for new growth and does not fully address existing deficits. It also seems that discussions on infrastructure requirements have been undertaken on a bilateral basis and have not been conducted within any overview from the LSP. There may be further potential for these discussions in the future.

14.10.3  **LB Sutton**

LB Sutton has submitted their LDF Core Strategy which has been found sound. Its approach to infrastructure requirements is clearly set out in the Core Strategy and has been based on bi-lateral discussions. There seems to be little or no engagement from the LSP.

14.10.4  **LB Ealing**

LB Ealing is a PAS IDP pilot and is receiving consultant support as part of this process. There have been informal discussions with LSP partners and a formal request to establish governance arrangements is being considered at the LSP meeting in January.

14.10.5  **Bath and NE Somerset**

Bath and NE Somerset UA has requested its LSP to establish governance arrangements for the IDP that were approved in July. Under these, the LSP has responsibility for delivery through:

- Regular monitoring and update;
- Publicity re: progress;
- Maintaining shared access information;
- Establishing ongoing meetings of LSP sub group for capture and discussion of update information (six monthly);
- Chairing meetings, receive updates, give post meeting feedback and report up to LSP;
- Carrying out risk review at sub group meetings;
- Reviewing and update programme;
- Providing updated information for GIS;
- Reviewing delivery processes and make any recommendations for change; and
- Reporting on key performance indicators.
14.10.6 **Surrey County Council and District Councils**

Surrey County Council has no direct responsibilities for IDPs other than those associated with their Minerals and Waste LDF. However, the County Council has received funding from the SE RIEP in order to support capacity building in infrastructure planning across the County Council area. In year 1 of the project (2008-9), the County Council, engaged strategic infrastructure providers in:

- one to one dialogue;
- established the Surrey Infrastructure Forum which is for all stakeholders and has met twice in 2009; and
- established a Key Infrastructure Providers group that has met twice and has further meetings planned;

In year 2 of this project, the development of IDP support has been extended to all 11 Surrey district councils and this is now underway. Each district council is receiving support to achieve four milestones including:

- identifying current commitments (Dec. 2009);
- establishing governance arrangements (Feb 2010);
- establishing service standards (April 2010); and,
- identifying infrastructure deficiencies (June 2010)

In addition to this, this project is seeking to engage the major professional and service groups that need to be engaged in this process. The project board is chaired by one of the local authority chief executives who has the agreement of all the other chief executives that one of the outputs will be a briefing on IDPs for chief executives all over the country. Others are expected to follow if agreed by the project board in January.

14.10.7 **Derby City Council**

Derby City Council is working with two neighbouring authorities, South Derbyshire and Amber Valley, who together make up the Housing Market Area. Each authority is preparing an LDF within an aligned arrangement and as part of this are establishing governance and infrastructure provider arrangements within their local authorities. The authorities are receiving some facilitation support from PAS in this process. Derby City Council has held an LSP workshop of LSP partners including major infrastructure providers and are now engaged in discussions about the delivery of future governance arrangement that are likely to take Total Place considerations into account. Derby City Council is also a national pilot for the Delivering Efficient Corporate and Transactional Services (Decats), that has the objective of reconfiguring local services more efficiently and effectively and this work is being related to that as well.

14.10.8 **Gloucestershire CC and District Councils**

Gloucestershire CC has been undertaking work on a Strategic IDP (SIDP) which is working with the Gloucestershire wide partnership executive and with district councils in their production of their IDPs.

14.10.9 **Havant**

Havant is part of the PUSH MAA area and is also a growth area. As part of the LDF IDP, there has already been engagement of LSP partners in workshops, briefings and service planning. In addition, the authority, together with the County Council police, courts services and DWP have been working on co-location through a Public Service village through their LSP which has also received DCSF co-location funding.
14.10.10 YORRSHIRE AND HUMBESIDE LOCAL AUTHORITY ASSOCIATION AND LEADERS’ BOARD

The Y and H Leaders’ Board has established cross partner arrangements for determining key services and infrastructure investment needed in the region. This is also being supported through the creation of a regional infrastructure information hub. This is used by the MAAs and local authorities in the region to feeding their infrastructure investment requirements. This will provide the evidence base for the regional Leaders’ Board in the preparation of the Y and H Regional Implementation Plan as required through the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act s81. This will provide the underpinning to the regional bid for funding – both the overall share and specific projects and the programme for regional investment funding after 2011.

14.10.11 SOUTH EAST PARTNERSHIP BOARD

The SE Partnership (Leaders’) Board has commissioned an Infrastructure deficit study for the SE that inform the SE Regional Implementation Plan as required through the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act. They will then be using this as the basis of their bid for their regional share of national funding including both the overall amount and on specific projects.

14.10.12 IDP NATIONAL PILOTS

In addition to LB Ealing and Bath and NES (above) there are a number of national pilots to support the implementation of the Steps approach to IDPs (PAS, 2009). The authorities in the pilots are all at different stages in the process and include authorities that are also engaged in other national initiatives for more integrated working as follows:

- Durham (Total Place and Total Capital Pilots);
- Leeds (City Region Pilot and MAA);
- Sheffield (MAA);
- Bolton (City Region Pilot and MAA);
- Central Lincolnshire (enhanced two-tier working pilot);
- South Worcestershire (Total Place pilot);
- Portsmouth (MAA);
- Wealden (growth area);
- Adur and Worthing (growth and regeneration);
- South Somerset (growth area); and,
- Kent (Total Place pilot) and Tunbridge Wells;
- Other las with LSP engagement;

A number of LA’s are in discussion with their LSPs and are in the process of establishing formal arrangements. These include:

- Mansfield (where the Mayor is taking leadership of this initiative with LSP partners);
- Ashfield;
- Allerdale;
- Bassetlaw;
- NW Leicestershire; and,
- Bristol.
14.11 PART C FEEDBACK ON INITIAL DISCUSSIONS WITHIN LB NEWHAM

As part of this project and also with support from PAS, LB Newham officers and partners have received opportunities for briefings on the role on IDPs and the potential role of the LSP. These have been held in the period September-December 2009 and have included:

Briefings for planning officers and other senior council officers provided by PAS. The PAS session was for all service heads and was introduced by one of the Council’s (interim) Directors, who conveyed the importance of this work directly from the Mayor. Council Departments and services represented at these briefings have included:

- Regeneration;
- Central policy and partnerships;
- Highways and transport;
- Children’s services and play;
- Adult care services;
- Libraries;
- Schools;
- Briefings for partners and key infrastructure providers (provided by this project) have also been held twice and have included:
  - PCT;
  - UEL;
  - FE colleges;
  - Ambulance;
  - Utilities; and,
  - A briefing for portfolio holders was held in October 2009 (provided by PAS).

At each meeting, there was a presentation about the delivery role of the LDF and also the changing role of the LSP. The IDP process was linked with other key local initiatives including

- Total Place;
- CAA;
- LAA;
- MAA;
- JSNA;
- Area Based Budgeting; and
- Combined evidence and consultation requirements.

Each session also allowed opportunities for discussions and also to reflect on the specific requirements for people and communities in Newham. As briefing meetings, these sessions did not lead to any specific actions being agreed. However, at the third briefing session in December 2009, the participants strongly supported the development of a standing forum or group of infrastructure providers that could address issues together including:

- Meeting locality needs and deficits;
- Areas that require improved access;
- Areas of increased population;
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- Different service delivery models; and
- Co-location of services.

These briefing meetings have been well attended and received. Although some of the new ways of working are more integrated and delivery focused than has formerly been the case, officers and representatives have seen positive advantages for Newham. They have discussed how such approaches would enhance the likely success of their own cases for investment by working more closely together. In particular further integrated working opportunities were seen through current activities on:

- Commissioner Investment Asset Management strategies (CIAMS) currently being undertaken by the PCT;
- LIFTco projects;
- BSF projects;
- New energy networks;
- Transport schemes and investment including longer term plans;
- Play and green space;
- Schools and children’s services;
- Regeneration;
- Higher Education;
- Further Education
- Utilities;
- Ambulance
- Fire; and
- ODA PDT.

Other agencies not yet engaged who might be included in any future arrangement are:

- Metropolitan Police;
- RSLs;
- Care providers;
- LDA; and
- Voluntary and community sector.

LB Newham will need to consider how they wish to take forward this process in order to support their future integrated approach to infrastructure investment and planning. In order to support this, the Council may wish to consider the following options and decide which components would be useful. Those with a * are those identified as required or good practice form PPS 1 and/or PINS:

- LSP overview arrangements*;
- A key infrastructure service providers group;
- A major landowners group*;
- Establishing schedules of existing capital commitments*;
- An inventory of all public sector land and buildings;
- A review of localities with current or future deficiencies;
- A co-location project; and
- Identification of local needs to be incorporated into LIFTco and BSF projects; and,
• The creation of an SCS Action/Delivery Plan to include infrastructure investment required but not yet funded.
15. Conclusions and Way Forward

It is fundamental to our approach to infrastructure delivery planning that we consider not only the implications of additional growth, even in an area like Newham where this is very significant, but also the way in which services are delivered in future to the whole population. As a result a key part of our work is to enter into dialogue with service providers.

We have been successful in obtaining details of the way in which individual service providers are responding to the challenges posed by Newham’s growth and to the changing climate within which service delivery needs to take place, not only as a result of the drive for economy, but also due to the continually evolving understanding of the best way to meet residents’ needs.

As a result of our study we are aware of a number of ongoing reviews of service providers’ assets. In particular: The PCT is working on a hub-and-spoke polysystem
The Police are considering a wholesale review of its assets in Newham
The Council is looking at different approaches to client contact, and is also looking at how library provision might be altered in the borough.

Education assets have the potential to be transformed, especially through the Wave 5 Schools for the Future programme.

However these various activities are currently proceeding largely independently of each other and they could be transformed by those responsible for taking these strategies forward to move beyond sharing information, to a position where their property strategies are more closely aligned. This will involve more than simply consulting each other on the strategies, and thinking carefully about how key milestones can be aligned.

Our presentation of future community needs by Community Forum Area (Chapter 12) has the advantage of providing foci around which such alignment could commence. For example the key organisations could choose Canning Town or East Ham as one place to concentrate efforts.

TOTAL CAPITAL
We are conscious that the Total Place initiative set in motion by the Treasury is recommending that individual areas come up with proposals on how they might work more closely together across the local public sector. A particular value of this approach is in the area of asset management, where thinking how assets will be used across services can lead to a number of valuable results:

- Ensuring that public sector assets are put to greatest use;
- Assisting client access to services through collocation; and,
- Realising economies through disposal of unneeded assets to other uses.

We would also include in this list the benefits of being able to plan places, such as town and district centres, in such a way as to increase footfall and vitality.

The Treasury’s Total Capital programme has identified 11 pathfinders for 2010-11, where strategies for aligning investment and asset management in individual places will be developed. However the government is open to working with other areas which wish to develop similar strategies. We would recommend Newham considers how it
might take this thinking forward. The recommendations for governance of capital investment planning that we make in Chapter 14 would be a lynchpin of this process.

15.1 GAPS IN INFORMATION

Table 16.1 below summarises where there are gaps in information from the community infrastructure service providers.

Table 16:1 Summary of gaps in information and suggested action for LBN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Missing information</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Infrastructure</td>
<td>Emergency Services-Police</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police Authority are reviewing their Estates Strategy. Specific infrastructure requirements and costings for community infrastructure are not currently available</td>
<td>Contact MPA once Estates Strategy is finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services-Ambulance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact London Ambulance Service once costings are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of East London</td>
<td></td>
<td>UEL are reviewing their Estates Strategy. Specific infrastructure requirements and costings for community infrastructure are not currently available</td>
<td>UEL are keen to be involved and have suggested that LBN contacted the university, once the Estates Strategy has been finalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham University Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>No information was made available for the study</td>
<td>LBN to decide if they wish to contact to NUH,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Vic College</td>
<td></td>
<td>No information was made available for this study</td>
<td>LBN to decide if they wish to contact New Vic College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Newham- Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping information was not ready at the time of the study</td>
<td>Contact service provider once mapping is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Newham- Community Centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific costings for infrastructure are not currently available as Service provider previously indicated this is very sensitive information and previous report is out-of-date</td>
<td>Contact service provider once current costings are made available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Exemplar Scheme Financing:

The following section provides some examples of the format that could be applied to build up a capita programme “brochure”. We have used real schemes as included in the Capital Programme Database provided. However, we have added example information and analysis that is not intended to be a reflection of the true position.

London Borough of Newham Infrastructure Funding Brochure

Swimming Pool Programme

• Canning Town and Green Street

Scheme

Sport England standards require that six 25m community pools be provided in Newham based on population of 300,000. New facilities, including community pools (not necessarily 25m), might be proposed at Canning Town and Green Street.

COST

£5,000,000

IDENTIFIED CAPITAL FUNDING

Source | Amount
---|---
Council’s capital programme | £0
Gap | £5,000,000

REVENUE CONSEQUENCES OF ADDRESSING GAP (BORROWING)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Financing Costs (p.a.)</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Potential Revenue Consequences (MRP)</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POTENTIAL OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING

• Other Grants and Lottery Funding
• Capital receipts
• Leasing
• BSF and PFI Credits
• Private Sector Partner (e.g. Esporta)

RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>Significant amounts of grant is available from Sport England and Lottery. Bids could secure up to 50% of funding</td>
<td>Capital – £2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Receipts</td>
<td>Disposal of Atherton and Balaam Leisure facilities</td>
<td>Capital – £1,000,000 (predicted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing</td>
<td>Specific assets or equipment could be leased to reduce the overall capital cost of the programme.</td>
<td>Revenue – dependant on commercial arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSF Funding</td>
<td>A condition of funding could require that a co-located leisure and pool be located at a new BSF facility.</td>
<td>Capital - £5,000,000 Revenue – Unitary Charge (PFI credit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Partner</td>
<td>Concession and access can be gained through Private Sector Partners (e.g. Esporta, John Lloyd)</td>
<td>Revenue – Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A.1 WHAT IS PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE?

Infrastructure provides the backbone of social, economic and social facilities which support places, communities, businesses and people throughout the country. They are provided primarily but not exclusively by public resources and are delivered through a range of service providers again predominantly from the public sector.

The quality of public infrastructure has a major effect on the economic vitality of any locality and its potential well being. Some public infrastructure services such as schools or open spaces are delivered within spatial access standards whereas others are provided according to local priorities such as leisure centres and youth facilities.

Local authorities have always had a major role in the provision and operation of the local public infrastructure. In some cases this is through direct provision and on others it is through the use of its regulating or enabling roles such as the provision of new roads as part of planning consents. Some public services are provided at the local level but funded nationally, although generally with some local discretion over priorities. In particular these include health facilities, most rail services and Higher Education.

The emerging requirements of Government policy are drawing together the delivery of public services into a more integrated approach. Priorities are being set from a local evidence base and then implemented in an integrated way through a growing group of public services which are now focusing on localised delivery at community level.

These priorities are set out in the sustainable Community Strategy which is owned and led by the Local Strategic Partnership. They are delivered through the Local Area Agreement – the contract between local areas and central government – (which is supported through the provision of an increasingly joined up funding allocation) and the Local Development Framework which provides a delivery means through development for the next fifteen years. This process is also being mirrored at sub-regional level through Multi Area Agreements where there is a balance of interest towards the delivery of fixed public infrastructure including housing, transport, jobs and improved places, delivered by the planning system.

A.2 WHY IS INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION IMPORTANT?

In achieving their vision, it is recognised that local areas will need to enhance and in some cases reshape their places. New housing or economic growth will require associated infrastructure investment to ensure that benefits created are accompanied by facilities that will be used by those who need them.
The provision of infrastructure to support development has until now been achieved through public service capital programmes, (each being developed independently) and the negotiation of specific planning applications to achieve additional provision. This has been a mixed process with associated highways works frequently being a minimum requirement but other works being left to local agreements. In a number of localities, there have been financial requirements to support the provision of education and health facilities that has been used to add to the public funding which is made available to support new population growth. Other public infrastructure such as parks and leisure has more frequently been created through a mixed economy. Public realm and its maintenance is a general requirement achieved in association with most new development.

However, this process of generating infrastructure requirements has had some disadvantages. It is not as widely practised as may be expected with some communities losing out on developer contributions to a significant degree. Elsewhere, where impacts have been wider or cumulative it has been harder to find approaches to support infrastructure provision or investment.

A.3 WHY HAVE AN LSP INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP?

The new approaches to managing places in an integrated way leads to a more joined up approach to the delivery of public infrastructure in a more programmed way. In many local areas, it is the Local Strategic Partnership which has the leading role in identifying the vision for that locality. It also has a number of means to support the delivery of that vision including the Local Area Agreement and the Local Development Framework. (These relationships are set out in new guidance for LSPs published in November 2008).

*Planning Together* (CLG 2009) proposed that each local area should establish a single group where the delivery of public infrastructure can be delivered in a coordinated way. This will enable:

- More efficient use of public assets;
- Joint service planning;
- Remodelling service delivery points;
- Ensuring that public infrastructure accompanied new development in a coordinated way;
- Provides a means of identifying a local asset base through which additional resources for public infrastructure can be generated;
- What are the key objectives of the local infrastructure group?

- To promote the economic, social and environmental well being of the area through the provision of public infrastructure which supports the vision for the area, its quality of life and enhances its potential for economic growth;
- to identify the social, economic and environmental infrastructure requirements for the local area based on the area’s future vision as set out in the SCS and to be delivered through the LAA, MAA and LDF;
- to identify the land and property assets available in the public sector’s ownership in the area under consideration;
- to identify a programme for infrastructure delivery which will include who is to provide, when it is to be delivered and the funding sources;
- to identify where more efficient use of assets could be promoted;
- to identify who will be responsible for the delivery of the infrastructure;
- to identify the resources required for infrastructure delivery and how they will be provided;
- to establish a project management group to be responsible for more direct delivery; and
16. Conclusions and Way Forward

- to advise the LSP, sub-regional partnership and RDA (including the IRS process) of infrastructure requirements and potential funding shortfalls to deliver the local vision.

A.4 IDENTIFYING INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

Identifying the infrastructure requirements in any locality will need to be based on a number of factors including:
- demographic evidence and projections;
- housing market assessment and how this is to be met;
- transport projections including reduction targets;
- meeting sub-regional and regional roles;
- changing service delivery approaches including transforming services; and
- supporting the enhancement of local character and quality to improve economic viability and calm environments

Who should be involved?
- Local authority;
- PCT;
- Primary and secondary education;
- HE and FE;
- Highway Agency, TfL;
- Regeneration agencies;
- Lottery fund manager;
- Property managers for public services;
- Parks and open spaces;
- Sports and leisure services;
- Libraries;
- Housing/RSLs;
- Other members of the LSP;
- Community and voluntary bodies umbrella organisation;
- SCS team;
- LAA team; and
- Local authority finance team.

A.5 WHAT FUNDING COULD BE INCLUDED?

- Public body capital programmes;
- growth area programmes;
- s 106 agreements;
- s 278 infrastructure works;
- local transport plans;
- Highway Agency schemes;
- Congestion charges;
- Parking levies – fees and fines;
- Housing and Planning Delivery Grant;
• New Homes and Regeneration Agency;
• Building Schools for the Future;
• HE and FE capital programmes;
• RDA;
• ERDF;
• LAA;
• PCT capital programmes;
• Waste income;
• LEGI;
• Regional Funding Allocations;
• Other partnership funding;
• Local Asset backed funds (LABV);
• Jessica (EU funding approach for assets);
• Community infrastructure levy (CIL);
• Local Implementation Plan
• Environmental taxes including waste;
• Gershon and Transformational efficiency savings;
• Prudential borrowing;
• Land and buildings in the ownership of the LA and other local partners;
• Land and buildings in the ownership of other public and government agencies e.g. MOD, DWP, HMRC, DVLA, SHA, RailTrack, utilities;
• Devolved community assets;
• Income raised from more beneficial asset management;
• Tax or charges levied on land remaining underdeveloped;
• Interest on existing funds;
• Heritage lottery funds locally raised funding; and
• Land in private ownership.
• Undergrounding of Powerlines
• Newham Telecommunications Convergence Programme
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Indicative terms of reference

A.6 INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure provides the backbone of social, economic and social facilities which support places, communities, businesses and people. Infrastructure is provided primarily but not exclusively by public resources and delivered through a range of service providers again predominantly but not exclusively from the public sector.

The quality of public infrastructure has a major effect on the economic vitality of any locality and its potential well being. Public infrastructure services such as schools, leisure facilities or open spaces are delivered within access and population standards and whilst other services and facilities are provided to meet the specific needs of local groups or communities. In some cases, infrastructure is provided because it meets a more strategic role in the region or even has a national role.

The emerging practice of Government policy is to draw together the planning and delivery of infrastructure in a more integrated way. This is to maximise the benefit of investment where this is possible and to ensure that, where possible there are synergies between service providers which have a positive benefit for localities. Priorities for new infrastructure investment are set from a local evidence base which is made up form data collection, special studies and other available evidence as well as information gathered through community consultation. The preparation of the delivery plan and implementation programme for this investment is now developing through a growing group of public services which are now focusing on localised delivery at community level.

These priorities are set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy and led by the Local Strategic Partnership. They are delivered through the Local Area Agreement – the contract between local areas and central government and the Local Development Framework which provides a delivery means through development for the next fifteen years. The effectiveness of the whole process is assessed through Comprehensive Area Assessment.

To achieve its vision and also to ensure that any existing infrastructure deficits are addressed, this local authority is preparing its Local Development Framework to identify and address deficits in its current infrastructure capacity and those in the future.

The provision of infrastructure to support development has until now been achieved through public service capital programmes, each being developed independently, private and community/voluntary investment and the negotiation of specific planning applications to achieve additional provision. This has been a mixed process and one which has left many local councillors and other agencies feeling uncertain as to whether local needs are really being supported through appropriate and possibly additional infrastructure planning and delivery, not least where there changes in existing communities and/or new populations to be housed.

A.7 WHY HAVE A LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP?

The new approaches to managing places in an integrated way leads to a more joined up approach to the delivery of public infrastructure in a more programmed way and also creates a framework within which the private sector can work. Establishing a local infrastructure group can have the potential benefit of:

- Supporting the more efficient use of existing assets;
- Creating more joined up ways of public sector capital planning and investment;
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- Anticipate the use of public sector threshold funding for additional or changed populations;
- Supporting and developing joint or co-locations for services;
- Remodelling service delivery points;
- Ensuring that public infrastructure accompanied new development in a coordinated way;
- Provides a means of identifying the local asset base through which additional resources for public infrastructure can be generated;
- Identifying infrastructure requirements for which there is no present funding and which could be the subject of bids to the HCA or other public bodies;
- Provide the private sector with some confidence on the scale of public sector investment which continues to be made;
- Identify potential investment opportunities for the private sector;
- Support the development of sound LDFs;
- Where appropriate, enable the better targeting of any developers contributions

A.8 WHAT ARE THE KEY OBJECTIVES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROVIDERS ‘GROUP’?

The Infrastructure Providers’ Group provides a means of facilitating the planning and delivering strategic social, environmental and physical infrastructure within the area. It will invite into membership all the key infrastructure providers.

The key objectives of the group are:

To promote the economic, social and environmental well being of the area through the planning and delivery of physical, green and social infrastructure which supports the vision for the area, its quality of life and enhances its potential for economic growth.

To identify the social, economic and environmental infrastructure requirements for the local area based on the area’s future vision as set out in the SCS and to be delivered through the LAA, and LDF.
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