



Local Plan

**INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY
SCHEDULE
&
DRAFT REGULATION 123 LIST**

*Version to accompany Community Infrastructure
Levy Draft Charging Schedule
consultation 8 July to 19 August 2013*

May 2013

Contents

- 1 Introduction..... 4**
- 2 Scope of the infrastructure evidence base for CIL 4**
- 3 Methodology and stages 5**
- 4 Stakeholder consultation..... 6**
- 5 Detailed Infrastructure Delivery Schedule 7**
 - 5.1 Transport, including walking & cycling..... 7
 - 5.2 Education 12
 - 5.3 Community facilities and libraries 14
 - 5.4 Parks, open spaces and playgrounds 14
 - 5.5 Health..... 15
 - 5.6 Waste facilities..... 16
 - 5.7 Sport facilities 17
- 6 Aggregate funding gap 20**
- 7 Council Capital funding and funding sources..... 21**
- 8 Draft Regulation 123 list 23**
 - 8.1 What is the Regulation 123 list?..... 23
 - 8.2 How is the draft Regulation 123 list prepared? 24
 - 8.3 What does the draft Regulation 123 list include?..... 24
 - 8.4 Will all Borough CIL revenue be spent on projects in the Regulation 123 list? 24
 - 8.5 When and how can the draft Regulation 123 list be updated?..... 25
 - 8.6 The Council’s draft Regulation 123 list? 25
- CIL Draft Regulation 123 list..... 26**

Important Notice – Disclaimer:

The Council makes the following disclaimer with regard to the information contained within this Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and Regulation 123 List, without prejudice:

The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule has a base date of May2013. The findings presented in the following are a ‘snap-shot’ of information available at the time of its production. Infrastructure needs and demands can change significantly due to unexpected events. Funding levels vary with political exigencies and are in great flux at the moment. Therefore, this is a ‘living document’ and some of the information may be subject to change. It is the Council’s intention to regularly review and update the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.

The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule does not provide a definitive or exhaustive list of available funding sources and infrastructure costs. It has been prepared to support the development of a CIL Charging Schedule and focuses only on the infrastructure that might use CIL funding.

The draft Regulation 123 List contained within this document sets out infrastructure projects that the Council intends to fund in whole or in part from CIL. The list is neither definitive nor in order of priorities; more it is a list of infrastructure types/projects that CIL can fund, subject to Council priorities and the levels of available CIL funding.

The identification of infrastructure projects within this document does not imply the Council would necessarily grant planning permission for them; all projects will continue to be assessed against the local development plan and material planning considerations.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 In April 2012, the Council published its Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) ¹, which analysed and assessed the existing infrastructure provision, the shortfall and identified the existing and future needs and demands for the borough to support new development and a growing population in the borough. The IDP was supplemented in October 2012 with an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) ², the purpose of which was to confirm the aggregate funding gap to support the Council's preliminary draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, which was publicly consulted on from 17 December 2012 to 28 January 2013.
- 1.2 This document contains revisions and updates to the previous IDS, including the draft Regulation 123 List³. The draft Regulation 123 infrastructure list indicates which particular projects or types of infrastructure areas CIL revenues are intended to be spent on, with particular emphasis on the first five years after adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule. The Council's IDP (April 2012) includes a detailed analysis of existing infrastructure as well as an analysis of demand and need for future provision. Therefore, this document should be read in conjunction with the IDP.
- 1.3 The requirement for the draft Regulation 123 list is set out in the updated statutory CIL Guidance⁴, which now requires a draft list of projects or types of infrastructure that are to be funded in whole or in part by the levy. In addition, the updated Guidance also includes a requirement to set out known site-specific matters where Section 106 contribution may continue to be sought. In that regard, the Council has produced a draft Planning Obligations SPD⁵.
- 1.4 The level of CIL as set out in the Draft Charging Schedule⁶ is informed by a viability assessment and the IDP, updated IDS, including draft Regulation 123 list, which confirms the short-/medium-/long-term (from 2014 to 2029) infrastructure needs, aggregate funding gap and the areas/types of infrastructure that the Council intends to spend CIL revenues on. Together, they provide the basis for setting a well-balanced and reasonable charge for the draft CIL levy, which will be published and consulted on during the summer 2013.
- 1.5 Only following the required consultation and independent examination can a CIL be adopted. The final Regulation 123 list will be based on the one submitted to the examination.

2 Scope of the infrastructure evidence base for CIL

- 2.1 The updated statutory CIL Guidance sets out what infrastructure evidence is needed. It states that a charging authority needs to identify the total cost of infrastructure that it desires to fund in whole or in part from the levy. In order to do this, the charging authority must use the 'appropriate available evidence'⁷ to consider:

¹ http://www.richmond.gov.uk/infrastructure_delivery_plan.htm

² http://www.richmond.gov.uk/www.richmond.gov.uk/borough_cil.htm

³ Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011 and 2012)

⁴ DCLG, CIL Guidance <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-infrastructure-levy>

⁵ Draft Planning Obligations Strategy Supplementary Planning Document:
http://www.richmond.gov.uk/www.richmond.gov.uk/borough_cil.htm

⁶ Please see http://www.richmond.gov.uk/www.richmond.gov.uk/borough_cil.htm for further details on the Draft CIL Charging Schedule

⁷ DCLG, CIL Guidance, para 12 (7)

- what additional infrastructure is needed in its area to support the development and growth needs set out in the Local Plan and
 - what other funding sources are available (for example, core Government funding for infrastructure, which will continue following the introduction of a levy; anticipated section 106 agreements; and anticipated necessary highway improvement schemes funded by anyone other than the charging authority).
- 2.2 Statutory guidance then states that “a charging authority needs to identify the total cost of infrastructure that it desires to fund in whole or in part from CIL”.⁸ At CIL examination, a Charging Authority (CA) must demonstrate that a CIL is a necessity because there is not enough funding from all sources to pay for the infrastructure the area needs.
- 2.3 The purpose of CIL is to pay for “infrastructure to support the development of the area”⁹. In line with the Localism Act 2011 and the CIL Regulations, CIL must be applied by a charging authority only for the “the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure”. CIL can therefore be used to pick up the capital costs of providing infrastructure as well as any ‘ongoing’ costs of infrastructure required to support the development of the area.
- 2.4 Therefore, for the purposes of a CIL evidence base, this infrastructure delivery schedule concentrates only on matters that are likely to be funded wholly or partly through CIL, whereby this includes both new provision of infrastructure as well as ‘ongoing’ maintenance costs related to new and existing infrastructure, but only where this is required to support new development in the area.
- 2.5 Whilst the infrastructure schedule includes various known small-scale projects, some categories of infrastructure are outside the scope of this study, because there is no realistic intention to spend CIL on them. These include for example utilities such as gas, electricity, telecommunication as well as privately owned infrastructure, such as dentists, pharmacies, optometrists, shopping facilities, pubs, petrol stations and post offices. Whilst generally quasi-private infrastructure, such as care homes, have been excluded, rail infrastructure capital improvements have been included in the infrastructure schedule, because these are considered to be of important to the development of the area.

3 Methodology and stages

- 3.1 The main tasks in the production of this updated Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and draft Regulation 123 list were.
- Using the IDP and IDS as the baseline, analyse specific infrastructure projects, where a need/future demand has been identified;
 - Identify and update any costs of new required infrastructure/facilities, and sources of funding;
 - Confirm the funding gap for each project listed in the schedule;
 - Establish whether the project will be needed in the short-/medium-/long-term, and whether it will need to be delivered in phases;
 - Identify and engage with the delivery partners to ensure the information presented is as up to date as possible;
 - Where applicable, identify and include updates to the location of new infrastructure;

⁸ DCLG, CIL Guidance, para 12 (7)

⁹ Section 205(2) of The Planning Act 2008

- Update the aggregate funding gap in line with the review set out above for infrastructure delivery and mechanisms that can bridge the funding gap – this will inform the setting of the Borough CIL.

4 Stakeholder consultation

- 4.1 Whilst there is no statutory requirement to consult stakeholders during the infrastructure planning process, to ensure it correctly reflects the project costs, funding etc, consultation has been carried out with identified stakeholders, i.e. the infrastructure / service providers in the borough. Meetings, dialogue and continuous engagement has taken place throughout the infrastructure planning process, and also in developing the draft Regulation 123 list.
- 4.2 During the consultation and engagement process, it became apparent that most service providers do not plan beyond three years, and therefore estimates and assumptions have to be made in terms of what infrastructure may be required in 10-15 years' time. Therefore, it is difficult to predict the infrastructure requirements as a result of growth; the consulted stakeholders and service providers are by no means bound by this study.
- 4.3 It is the intention to keep the infrastructure evidence base updated in light of continuous dialogue with service providers and to reflect the most up to date information available (see section 10 of the IDP for further monitoring and review details).

5 Detailed Infrastructure Delivery Schedule

The following section sets out the infrastructure delivery schedule, which is categorised by type, detailing what infrastructure will be required, by when, how much it is anticipated to cost, sources of funding, location where applicable and delivery partners. The schedule is presented in tabular format to enable regular monitoring and review by the Council and its partners. It should be read in conjunction with the infrastructure assessment of the Council's IDP.

This section is sub-divided into infrastructure categories as follows, whereby this is in no order of priority or relevance:

- Transport, including walking & cycling
- Education
- Community facilities and libraries
- Parks, open spaces, playgrounds, recreation
- Health
- Waste facilities
- Sport facilities

5.1 Transport, including walking & cycling

The provision of transport infrastructure as well as in particular the maintenance and upgrade of existing infrastructure to serve existing and future users has been identified to be a major cost to the Council. An increasing population will put an increased demand and pressure on the borough's existing transport infrastructure, as will increasing visitors to new commercial development. New developments could lead to sizable impacts on some of the borough's already congested road systems (note in this context the Council's policy to provide a minimum of car parking spaces for certain new development schemes). While Section 106 obligations will remain in place beyond April 2014 to mitigate any specific impacts from a development site, such as an access road for an individual development, this infrastructure schedule identifies some significant projects and costs in relation to reducing reliance on cars, improving travel choice and sustainable modes of transport. This includes improvements to the public transport network, such as rail infrastructure and in particular upgrade and improvement of rail stations (which have also been identified in the Council's local development plan), better provision for pedestrians and cyclists, including the Twickenham town centre highway schemes to support new development in the town. Airtrack Lite is considered to be of particular importance to this borough, with the aim of providing direct train service from the borough to Heathrow; this project is currently subject to feasibility work, and although this infrastructure schedule does not put any costs or a funding gap against this project, it is understood that works could include further improvements and upgrades to signalling, platforms, rail stations etc.

Table 1 below sets out an estimate of infrastructure needs, where applicable projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap for the provision of transport infrastructure in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029. Note that the list excludes schemes identified in the Richmond Local Implementation Plan 2 (LIP2) where LIP funding has already been agreed with the Mayor (i.e. projects that are solely funded by LIP); it however includes those schemes where an amount of Section 106 funding is anticipated. LIP projects that do not involve the provision of infrastructure, such as road maintenance and measures to increase road safety are excluded.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Rail transport network – new signalling scheme	Develop a new signalling scheme to reduce the level crossing downtime (currently over 59%) at Mortlake, Barnes and North Sheen stations; this will support public transport and growth as well as the redevelopment of the Stag Brewery site	Long-term	Aspiration	£10,000,000 - £20,000,000	£10,000,000 - £20,000,000 (for all partners)	DfT, Network Rail, SW Trains, LIP, Network Rail, Council resources (Local Authority contributions will be expected for any downtime improvement schemes)	DfT, LBRuT, Network Rail, SW Trains
Mortlake rail station and surrounds – improvements and refurbishment	Comprehensive redevelopment of Mortlake rail station and surrounds, including improvements to access and to link with the bus stops/bus station and Stag Brewery site redevelopment	Long-term	Development Brief, UDP / Site Allocations Proposal site	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail, private developers	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail, private developers
Fulwell rail station – improvements and refurbishment	Upgrade of Fulwell rail station and resurface access road	Long-term	UDP / Site Allocations Proposal site	Nominal £1,000,000	Nominal £1,000,000	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail
Whitton rail station – improvements and refurbishment	Whitton rail station refurbishment, upgrade and interchange improvements, including station forecourt, cycling provision, new retail units, canopy above platforms, lift etc.	Short-term	SW Trains Programme, UDP / Site Allocations Proposal site	£800,000	£700,000	£100,000 from Council resources and South West Trains; LIP	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
North Sheen rail station – refurbishment	North Sheen rail station – general refurbishment	Medium-term	Proposed	Nominal £500,000	Nominal £500,000	Network Rail, LIP, Council resources	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail
Strawberry Hill rail station – upgrade	Upgrade of Strawberry Hill rail station	Long-term	Proposed	Nominal £500,000	Nominal £500,000	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail	LBRuT, Network Rail, SW Trains
Hampton Wick rail station – upgrade	Upgrade of Hampton Wick rail station	Long-term	Proposed	Nominal £500,000	Nominal £500,000	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail
Barnes rail station – refurbishment	Barnes rail station upgrade and refurbishment	Medium-term	Proposed, Network Rail Programme	£500,000	£500,000	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail, SW Trains	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail
Richmond rail station – redevelopment	Redevelopment (including over-track development) and interchange improvements of Richmond rail station	Long-term	As part of development of station site, UDP / Site Allocations Proposal site, Site brief	Dependent upon development viability	Unknown	LIP, Council resources, Network Rail, private developers	LBRuT, TfL, Network Rail, private developers
Rail access to Heathrow	Direct train service from London Waterloo to Heathrow (local requirements and works needed in this borough are still unknown, but it could involve further improvements and upgrades to signalling, platforms, stations etc)	Long-term	Proposed (feasibility work has started)	Cost in LBRuT unknown as yet	Unknown as yet	Network Rail, SW Trains, BAA , London Boroughs, TfL, County Councils	Network Rail and SW Trains
Bridge or subway/tunnel under A316	Build a subway/tunnel under the A316 linking Harlequins car park to RFU West car park	Long-term	TfL study on A316 corridor	£1,000,000 plus estimated	£1,000,000 estimated	TfL, RFU LIP, Council resources	LBRuT, TfL

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Twickenham town centre – Street scene and highways (Phase 2) – Water Lane / Embankment	Scheme for Water Lane, Embankment upstream of Water Lane and Wharf Lane – repaving, environmental improvements NB: Phase 1 (pavement widening, re-paving etc) will be implemented from the financial year 2013/14 onwards, for which the total funding of £8,000,000 was secured.	Short-term (2015-2017)	Principles are in Twickenham AAP, scheme not yet designed	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	Council resources, LIP, private/developers	LBRuT, TfL
Thames River Wall, Twickenham embankment	Refurbishment of river wall, which will support the development areas and proposals in Twickenham, as set out in the Twickenham AAP	Short-term (2014-2019)	Structural requirement, to support the proposals in the Twickenham AAP	Unknown - nominal £400,000	Unknown - nominal £400,000	Council resources, LIP	LBRuT
Twickenham embankment – river transport and landing stage	Twickenham embankment – provision of passenger boat landing facilities in the area upstream of Water Lane – this includes moorings and changes to railings	Long-term (2024-2029)	Principles are in Twickenham AAP; UDP / Site Allocations Proposal site	£1,000,000 - £5,000,000	£1,000,000 - £5,000,000	Council resources, private developers	LBRuT
Foot-/cycle bridge between Ham and Twickenham, including town centre enhancements for cycling	Develop a foot-/cycle bridge at Eel Pie to connect Ham and Twickenham, which is to include town centre enhancements for cycling, including the linking of towpaths and cycle routes	Medium-term	Identified in Core Strategy, Site Allocations Proposal site	£10,000,000 estimated	£2,000,000 estimated	Will be subject to TfL bid; Council resources	LBRuT, TfL

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Footbridge between Kew and Brentford	Develop a public footbridge from Ferry Quays, Brentford to the towpath adjoining Kew Gardens	Long-term	Potential option identified in Thames Landscape Strategy (other option would be a ferry service)	£2,000,000 - £4,000,000 estimated	£2,000,000 - £4,000,000 estimated (it can be assumed that LB Hounslow would pay for half)	Unknown	LBRuT, TfL, LB Hounslow
London Cycle Network and Borough Cycle Network	Complete network of cycle routes across the borough with associated infrastructure/signage	Long-term	LIP Programme	£2,000,000 - £3,000,000	£1,000,000	LIP, Council resources	LBRuT, TfL
Cycling on Towpath	Convert towpaths to shared use	Long-term	LIP programme	£1,000,000 - £2,000,000	£1,000,000	TfL, LIP, Council resources	TfL, Environment Agency, Port of London Authority, LBRuT
River Crane corridor network improvements, including route linking Twickenham station to Richmond College	Improving the walking/cycling network along the River Crane Corridor, improvements to open area, acquiring land to provide "missing link" to path	Medium-/Long-term	Whole area subject to Crane Valley Guidelines, principles also in Twickenham AAP; FORCE plans to open up area as part of a wider park	£1,000,000 estimated	£1,000,000 estimated	Council resources, TfL	LBRuT, TfL, Environment Agency, landowners
TOTAL				£34,200,000 - £50,200,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£25,100,000 - £41,100,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 1: Strategic transport infrastructure requirements in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.2 Education

Additional residential units in the borough, coupled with an increase in population, will put significant demand and pressure on the borough's existing schools and education infrastructure. The future needs and costs, including the funding gap where known, has been determined in conjunction with the Council's education department. It has been established that there will be particularly a medium-/long-term need for additional primary school capacity in certain parts of the borough, with the possibility of requiring a new school site, on top of expansion of existing primary school sites. **There are currently uncertainties in the provision of primary schools due to the possibility and unknowns in relation to future free schools.** Significant costs have also been established in relation to secondary school provision, special needs education as well as further and adult education and early years provision, whereby their funding sources and funding gap are currently unknown; therefore, as part of this infrastructure schedule, no costs have been allocated against future CIL funding, although this does not preclude any spending on it in the future.

Table 2 below sets out an estimate of infrastructure needs, where applicable projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap for the provision of educational infrastructure in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Primary schools – borough-wide	Provision of additional capacity by another four or five forms of entry within the borough, possibility of need for new primary school(s), including for possible free schools	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	Based on current estimates (May 2013); Investigation, once outcome of future free school bids known and in response to rising birth rate	£12,000,000	£12,000,000	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources. Availability of Council owned land uncertain. There could be opportunity for new primary school in relation to Stag Brewery redevelopment	LBRuT
Secondary schools – borough-wide	Provision of additional capacity, including the creation of a new secondary school at Richmond upon Thames College site	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	Investigation, once outcome of future free school bids known and in response to rising birth rate	£25,000,000	Unknown	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources. Availability of Council owned land uncertain	LBRuT

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Special Needs Education – Clarendon School, Hampton	Clarendon School – re-provide at Richmond upon Thames College site	Medium-term (2019-2029)	Identified as Phase 2 of Developing our special school provision	£9,000,000	Unknown	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources. Possibility of capital receipt if redevelopment allows	LBRuT
Special Needs Education – Strathmore School, Petersham	Strathmore School – relocate and improve	Short-term (2013-2015 and 2013-2017)	Consultation stage	£6,400,000	Unknown	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources. Possibility of capital receipt if redevelopment allows	LBRuT
Special Needs Education – borough-wide	Post-16 provision for SEN – additional capacity or assistance to colleges	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	Investigation	Unknown	Unknown	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources	LBRuT
Richmond upon Thames College, Twickenham	Redevelopment of college (potential site for secondary school, see also above)	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	Proposed	Unknown	Unknown	Partial funding through the possibility of enabling development. Secondary school funding as above.	LBRuT, RuTC
Nurseries and early years – borough-wide	Provision of additional capacity (to be identified) in new units or by the conversion of PVI (private, voluntary and independent) nurseries into community nurseries, alongside existing school provision	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	Investigation	Unknown	Unknown	Council Capital Programme unknown for medium-/long-term sources	LBRuT, Private providers
TOTAL				£52,400,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£12,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 2: Education infrastructure requirements in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.3 Community facilities and libraries

There is a general move to encourage provision of community facilities through flexible, multi-purpose centres, where there can be co-location and dual use of similar facilities and activities for community use. Additional needs for community facilities have been established in the infrastructure schedule and are anticipated to be as a result of population growth, demand for use and changes in the way people use space. Whilst some future investment will be required to deal with existing deficiencies in provision, new development coupled with an increase in population, will put increasing pressure on existing facilities, thus requiring improvements or redevelopment of existing and possible co-location with other public services.

Table 3 below sets out an estimate of infrastructure needs, projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap for the provision of community facilities in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Co-location of community facilities (library, youth) in Whitton	Improvements to Whitton library – community centre to include youth provision	Short-term (2014-2019)	Uplift Programme Cabinet 18 June 2012	£3,000,000	£3,000,000	Council resources	LBRuT
Co-location of library with other facilities – Kew	Potential for co-location with other public services in Kew	Short-term (2014-2019)	At concept stage	£1,000,000	£1,000,000	Council resources	LBRuT
Redevelopment of community facilities in Ham	Redevelopment of current community facilities, including youth centre	Short-term (2014-2019)	Uplift programme Cabinet 18 June 2012	Unknown	Unknown	Council resources, RHP, enabling development	LBRuT, RHP
TOTAL				£4,000,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£4,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 3: Community facilities requirements in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.4 Parks, open spaces and playgrounds

The borough's parks and open spaces are well used and regarded by residents and visitors alike for informal recreation. Demand is more likely to increase than decrease, from local residents and from visitors from inner London boroughs, particularly as London's population grows. There

are generally very few areas of open space deficiency in the borough. Promotion of the area for tourism and walking is likely to increase demand for walkers and pedestrians in general; therefore, access to and improvements to the towpath are considered to be of importance in this borough, where walking is the most popular leisure activity. In addition, there is a need for new provision of adventure play and other outdoor facilities within existing parks.

Table 4 below sets out an estimate of strategic parks and open spaces projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Improvements to the Thames Towpath – River Thames	Towpath improvements including furniture, surfacing, trees, one park project	Short-term (2014-2019)	Project part of the 5-year capital funded Parks Investment Programme (2012-17)	£3,000,000	£2,500,000	£500,000 match funding; Yr 1 - £25,000; Yr 2 - £25,000; Yr 3 - £450,000 Other funding sources: HLF, PLA, EA, WLRG, TLS etc.	LBRuT
New provision within existing parks – borough-wide	New provision of BMX, outdoor gym, water play, adventure play, forest school etc.	Short-/Medium-term (2014-2024)	Investigation / Initial feasibility work to confirm projects	Unknown, depends on initial feasibility work	Unknown	Council resources	LBRuT
TOTAL				£3,000,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£2,500,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 4: Strategic open space and play schemes for delivery in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.5 Health

Maintaining existing facilities, increasing flexibility and choice to patients are significant challenges for the health sector. New development will create an additional demand for health services that may not have been anticipated. The future costs for providing additional capacity to support new housing development has been determined in conjunction with the local NHS by using the HUDU model. In addition, during the consultation period a specific requirement for health care provision in Kew has also been established.

Table 5 below sets out an estimate of infrastructure needs, where applicable projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap for the provision of health services in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time /	Project status and	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------	---------------------	-------------	-----------------	-------------------

		phasing	commitment				
Health care (including Hospitals and GPs) – borough-wide	Provide additional capacity to support new housing development and population (projects not yet identified). Costs identified using the HUDU model, which uses the numbers of proposed housing units, resulting population and calculates health care floorspace required, and costs, both capital and revenue, before mainstream NHS funding catches up.	Short- /Medium- / long-term (2014-2029)	N/A	Acute: £1,103,105 Mental healthcare: £166,870 Intermediate care: £185,090 Primary healthcare: £889,580 Total: £2,344,645	£2,344,645	Richmond CCG and NHS England, Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare, South West London and St George's NHS Mental Health Trust, Council resources	Richmond CCG and NHS England, Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare, South West London and St George's NHS Mental Health Trust
Health care (GPs) – Kew	Site(s) for practice relocation – from unsuitable, cramped accommodation into purpose built estate, fully DDA compliant and "future proofed" for the purpose of Care Quality Commission (CQC) registration – for improved / extended service delivery and enhanced capacity.	Short- /Medium- / long-term (2014-2029)	Priority identified by Clinical Commissioning Group	Unknown	Unknown	Richmond CCG and NHS England, Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare, South West London and St George's NHS Mental Health Trust, Council resources	Richmond CCG and NHS England, Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare
TOTAL				£2,344,645	£2,344,645		

Table 5: Health requirements for delivery in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.6 Waste facilities

This Council is preparing a joint Waste Development Plan Document (WLWP) with the west London Boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon and Hounslow. The WLWP will provide a planning framework for the management of all waste produced in the six boroughs over the next 15 years. A significant amount of waste generated in this borough and in London overall is transferred outside of London for treatment or disposal in landfill. This will be a significant issue and major problem in the future as the surrounding counties currently accepting London's waste may no longer do so in the future.

New development in the borough will put additional pressure and demand on the borough's existing waste facilities and arrangements for disposing of waste. As London moves towards waste self-sufficiency by 2031 (as set out in the London Plan), new sites for waste facilities may also be required in this borough, or as a minimum the Council will need to contribute financially to the provision of waste disposal, management and waste treatment facilities outside of the borough. To date, the Twickenham Depot facility has been identified as an existing waste site that is considered to have potential for some reconfiguration and redevelopment. An additional waste facility has also been identified for upgrade in the medium-/long-term, but it is likely that additional investments are required in the long-term.

Table 6 below sets out an estimate of currently identified infrastructure projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap for the provision of waste facilities in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Waste facilities – Twickenham	Twickenham Depot (i.e. Council depot/storage and waste management facility) improvements, including possible development of a sorting facility	Short-term (2014-2019)	At concept stage	£5,000,000 - £10,000,000 estimated for sorting facility	Unknown until commercial options considered	Likely to be co-funded with a private sector operator; In the long term, there may be a possible intensification of enabling uses on part of the entire site;	WLWA, LBRuT, private providers
Waste facilities – Townmead Road	Townmead Road – upgrade of recycling facilities	Medium-/long-term (2019-2029)	At concept stage	£2,000,000 or more estimated depending on whether the existing site can be utilised	At least £2,000,000	Council resources and WLWA Capital with potential for a private sector partner	WLWA, LBRuT
TOTAL				£7,000,000 - £12,000,000	£2,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 6: Waste facility requirements in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

5.7 Sport facilities

Demand for the borough's sport facilities is likely to increase in the future as a result of new residential developments, increase in population and increased demand for sport activities.

Table 7 below sets out an estimate of projects, related costs, funding sources and a funding gap in the provision of sport facilities in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames between 2014 and 2029. Whilst the projects listed below are for new infrastructure elements that support to some extent new development in the respective areas, no significant amount of costs has been allocated against future CIL funding, whereby this does not preclude any spending on it in the future.

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Grey Court School, Ham / Petersham	Grey Court School – development of new community sports centre to include indoor/outdoor and wet/dry facilities	Short-term (2014-2019)	Draft plans produced and planning advice being sought	£4,000,000 plus	Unknown	Council resources, third party funding	LBRUT, School
Richmond upon Thames College, Twickenham	Sports hall as part of the redevelopment of the college for a secondary school	Short-term (2014-2019)	At concept stage	£2,000,000 estimated	Unknown	Council resources, third party funding	LBRuT
Pools on the Park, Richmond	Pools on the Park – retractable roof for outdoor pool	2016/17	At concept stage. Can only proceed once Council lease from Crown finalised	£800,000 estimated	Unknown	Council resources, third party funding	LBRUT, Commercial partner
Pools on the Park, Richmond	Pools on the Park – extension to fitness suite	2016/17	At concept stage; can only proceed once Council lease from Crown finalised	£500,000 estimated	Unknown	Council resources, third party funding	LBRUT, Commercial partner
Orleans Park Sports Centre, Twickenham	Orleans Park Sports Centre – extension to provide fitness suite	2015/16	At concept stage	£400,000 estimated	Unknown	Council resources	LBRUT, Orleans Park School
Shene Sport & Fitness Centre, East Sheen	Shene Sport & Fitness Centre – extension to fitness suite	2014/15	At concept stage	£300,000 estimated	£300,000	Council resources	LBRUT, Richmond Park Academy
Hampton Sport & Fitness Centre, Hampton	Upgrading of artificial turf pitch	Short-term (2014-2019)	At concept stage	£285,000 estimated	£285,000	Council resources	LBRUT, Hampton Academy
Whitton Sport & Fitness Centre, Whitton	Upgrading of artificial turf pitch	Short-/medium term (2019-2020)	At concept stage	£250,000 estimated	£250,000	Council resources	LBRUT, Twickenham Academy

Infrastructure type / project	Project details, including location	Delivery time / phasing	Project status and commitment	Total capital costs	Funding Gap	Funding sources	Delivery Partners
Shene Sport & Fitness Centre, East Sheen	Upgrading of artificial turf pitch	Short-term (2016-17)	At concept stage	£250,000 estimated	£250,000	Council resources	LBRUT, Richmond Park Academy
TOTAL				£8,785,000	£1.085,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)		

Table 7: Sport and recreation schemes for delivery in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (as of May 2013)

6 Aggregate funding gap

- 6.1 In light of the above assessment, to date, the funding gap is considered to be as a minimum in the range of approximately £49 million to £65 million (this excludes any unknown gaps). Note that wherever possible, the service providers' own estimates of costs of infrastructure requirements have been used, and that these are based at current real prices, excluding inflation.
- 6.2 However, it can be assumed that the funding gap easily exceeds £65 million because a number of existing funding sources/streams are under pressure in the current economic climate. In addition, the Council Capital Programme is to date unknown for the medium-/long-term period. There are also several infrastructure categories, such as education, where it is currently difficult to estimate the future costs of providing essential infrastructure elements, such as new schools, as these are dependent on factors such as availability of land (including Council owned land). It should be noted that land costs are not included in the calculations of the costs and the funding gap, because it is difficult to make generic assumptions on land costs where this has not been identified yet and in some instances existing land and buildings may be utilised or services may be co-located.
- 6.3 In addition, the total capital costs and therefore also the funding gap are unknown for certain infrastructure projects, particularly for those in the medium-/long-term range. This is because to date it is only known that there will be a future requirement for these infrastructure elements, but detailed feasibility studies, consideration of commercial options or other factors will still need to be considered; these will ultimately determine the details of the projects, including capital costs and funding gap.

6.4 The funding gap identified as at May 2013 consists of:

Infrastructure	Total capital costs	Funding Gap
Transport	£34,200,000 - £50,200,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£25,100,000 - £41,100,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
Education	£52,400,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£12,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
Community facilities	£4,000,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£4,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
Parks, open spaces, playgrounds	£3,000,000 (excl. any unknown costs)	£2,500,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
Health	£2,344,645	£2,344,645
Waste facilities	£7,000,000 - £12,000,000	£2,000,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
Sport facilities	£8,785,000	£1,085,000 (excl. any unknown gaps)
TOTAL	£111,729,645 - £132,729,645 (excl. any unknown costs)	£49,029,645 - £65,029,645 (excl. any unknown gaps)

Table 8: Identified infrastructure costs and funding gap (as of May 2013)

6.5 The costs and funding sources in this report are likely to change during the plan period and as of the anticipated adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule in April 2014 (i.e. 15 years from 2014 to 2029), depending on the exact timeframes in which individual elements are delivered.

6.6 Any costs that are identified in this report are based on the best available information at the time of publication, and may be subject to change at a later stage.

7 Council Capital funding and funding sources

The main potential public funding sources for infrastructure include:

- a) **Council's Capital Programme¹⁰** – The total budgeted spend on the capital programme for 2011/12 to 2016/17 is £210.0m. Councils are expected to manage their finances in a sustainable, affordable and prudent manner. The Council remains committed to investing in the essential infrastructure that underpins high quality services, hence continued expansion of the capital programme particularly for schools, sixth forms, highways, pavements and parks. However, the affordability of this expansion has been helped by the identification of one-off capital and revenue resources but the programme still relies having on the Council increasing its borrowing. Reserves are expected to fall overall. The Council's budget has to achieve a balance between the Council Tax increase not adding a further financial burden on household budgets, maintaining service standards whilst addressing the serious, long term reductions in public finances that are expected. There remains uncertainty about future funding, with a review for affordability on an annual basis.

¹⁰ http://www.richmond.gov.uk/treasury_management

- b) **Homes & Communities Agency (HCA)**¹¹ – provide funding to assist with delivery of affordable housing, although funding levels have been reduced in recent years and for the current 2011-15 Affordable Homes Programme.
- c) **Transport for London (TfL)**¹² – works in partnership with the London boroughs, providing funding for a range of transport projects. The majority of TfL funding is allocated to boroughs in the form Local Implementation Plan funding settlement. TfL funding for the Council has been made available in the past to spend on local transport improvements, such as on road renewal schemes, school travel plans, improved town centres, road safety projects and schemes to reduce pollution through increased walking and cycling.
- d) **Section 106 contributions**¹³ – Until now, Local Authorities have been able to agree new essential infrastructure through S106 agreements or planning obligations, either as monetary or “in kind” contributions from developers, negotiated as part of the planning approval process. The Council’s adopted Planning Obligations Strategy sets out how the Council currently calculates developer contributions for various types of community infrastructure. From 6 April 2014¹⁴, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be the only mechanism for collecting funds to support new infrastructure where these funds are pooled. Therefore, in the future, Section 106 receipts will be limited to site-specific development impacts and to support the provision of affordable housing; it could also be used for “strategic” infrastructure if it is infrastructure required for the development of a large site or a small group of up to five sites, subject to the three tests set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). Section 106 receipts will however not be used for any projects or items listed in the draft Regulation 123 list. As set out in the three years LBRuT’s Authority’s Monitoring Reports¹⁵ of 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10, Richmond Council agreed monetary Section 106 amounting to £4,996,150 in total. Of the total amount, £981,259 was for educational contributions, £2,061,800 for transport and £453,681 for public realm/open space. The 2010/11 AMR reports for the first year on monies received rather than monies expected – the total amount received was £1,321,356.10, of which £545,630.74 was for education, £377,723.67 for transport, £373,938.96 for public realm, £8,243.93 for health, £5,000.00 for affordable housing and £10,818.80 for monitoring.
- e) **New Homes Bonus (NHB)**¹⁶ – introduced by Government in 2011, match funds the additional council tax raised for new homes, with an additional amount for affordable homes, for the following six years. The Council will receive an additional £925k in New Homes Bonus Grant in 2013/14, bringing the total amount received to just under £2.1m. Funding is expected to support homelessness costs and the cost of supporting the Council’s capital programme. Whilst significant future funding could be brought in through NHB, this is not ring-fenced for infrastructure delivery and can therefore go to other local authority priorities to compensate for funding lost through other sources. Given that NHB replaces a large amount of mainstream funding to local authorities and there will be flexibility on how to spend this grant – no assumption has been made that

¹¹ <http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/ourwork/our-funding>

¹² <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/>

¹³ LBRuT Planning Obligations Strategy:

http://www.richmond.gov.uk/section_106_planning_obligations

¹⁴ The Government is currently consulting on amendments to the regulations to delay this date by one year; further information can be found on: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/community-infrastructure-levy-further-reforms>

¹⁵ LBRuT, Authority Monitoring Report:

http://www.richmond.gov.uk/ldf_udp_annual_monitoring_report.htm

¹⁶ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingsupply/newhomesbonus/>

NHB will be spent on infrastructure projects, as outlined in this infrastructure delivery schedule, to support growth in this borough.

- f) **Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF)**¹⁷ – provides funding for a wide range of heritage projects. It is the largest dedicated funder of the UK's heritage, with around £375million a year to invest in new projects. HLF funding has been granted to various projects within the borough of Richmond upon Thames.

Other potential sources of funding include: Big Lottery Fund, Sport England, Arts Council England, Community Fund etc.

This IDS is written in a time of diminishing public funding in the context of continued economic uncertainty. Various strategies and plans have each identified their own funding sources or potential gaps, and while other public bodies should have their own Government funding streams they may also be suffering cutbacks and uncertainty.

The public sector could undertake to make periodic payments using revenues raised from its own activities, but this is unlikely to raise significant amounts of money each year to finance infrastructure projects. In the current economic climate the likelihood of upfront grant or loan payments from the public sector is also very small, although it may re-emerge slowly in the future over the life time of this Plan.

Other available sources of funding for projects have also been reviewed:

- g) **Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)** – a flexible funding mechanism to improve and manage a clearly defined commercial area, based on the principle of an additional levy on all defined ratepayers following a majority vote. A BID for Twickenham is under consideration. However with no BIDs currently established in this borough and an assumption has been made that no such money will be going to infrastructure projects in this Plan's period.
- h) **Tax Increment Financing (TIF)** – allows local authorities to borrow against predicted growth in their locally raised business rates, which can be used to fund key infrastructure and other capital projects. This requires major schemes to be viable and it is not considered there is likely to be such a scheme to justify taking it forward.
- i) **Local Asset Backed Vehicles (LABV)** – require significant amounts of land in public ownership to be worthwhile. No assumption has been made that any separate finance is available through a LABV in this study.
- j) **Private Finance Initiative (PFI)**: this is very unlikely to make a contribution to financing new infrastructure because given the current economic climate, it is unlikely that public bodies will be willing to enter into these long term commitments.

8 Draft Regulation 123 list

8.1 What is the Regulation 123 list?

After 6 April 2014, or upon implementation of the Council's CIL Charging Schedule (whichever is the earliest), all infrastructure not included within the Council's published

¹⁷ <http://www.hlf.org.uk/Pages/Home.aspx>

Regulation 123¹⁸ list cannot be funded through CIL contributions, and can only be funded via Section 106 agreements, which will be subject to rigorous application of the statutory tests for obligations. Section 8.4 below sets out that this restriction does not apply to the spending of the “neighbourhood funding” percentage of CIL revenues on behalf of a neighbourhood community.

8.2 How is the draft Regulation 123 list prepared?

The Regulation 123 list is not subject to the same procedural requirements that have been set out for the CIL Charging Schedule. The Regulations only require that the 123 list is published, without the need for consultation or formal procedures.

The Council has decided to publish the draft Regulation 123 list for comments alongside the Draft CIL Charging Schedule, although it must be stressed that comments on the Regulation 123 list will not form part of the Charging Schedule consultation. However, the Council will take into account any comments received on the draft Regulation 123 list prior to this being submitted for the examination of the CIL Charging Schedule.

8.3 What does the draft Regulation 123 list include?

The Regulation 123 list sets out the infrastructure that will be eligible to be funded through CIL. In line with the Regulation, the infrastructure can be generic types of infrastructure (such as provision of additional primary school capacity) or more project/item specific (such as a landing stage at Twickenham embankment). The draft Regulation 123 list, as presented in the table below, derives entirely from the infrastructure requirements set out in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS).

The draft Regulation 123 list should be read in conjunction with the Council’s proposed draft Planning Obligations Strategy SPD, which sets out those known, site-specific matters where Section 106 contributions are likely to be the funding mechanism.

The principal purpose of the draft Regulation 123 list and the draft Planning Obligations Strategy is to provide transparency on what the Council intends to fund in whole or part through CIL and those known matters where Section 106 contributions will continue to be sought.

8.4 Will all Borough CIL revenue be spent on projects in the Regulation 123 list?

The Localism Act 2011 introduced provisions to require charging authorities to allocate a “meaningful proportion” of the funds that they raise through CIL in the area where development takes place. In April 2013, the Government made regulations¹⁹ to clarify that the “meaningful proportion” of CIL receipts will be either 15% or 25% of the CIL, depending on whether a formal neighbourhood plan is in place²⁰. This percentage is now referred to as “neighbourhood funding”.

For areas that have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, a 25% (uncapped) share of the CIL revenue from development in their area will be spent by the local authority in consultation with the neighbourhood forum. Where there is no formal neighbourhood plan, 15% of the CIL

¹⁸ Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011 and 2012)

¹⁹ The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013

²⁰ Regulation 59 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013

revenue from development in their area will be spent in consultation with the community, but this will be capped at £100 per council tax dwelling²¹.

In addition, it should be noted that the “neighbourhood funding” percentage of CIL is not subject to the same spending restrictions and limitations as the Regulation 123 list. The amended CIL Regulations²² changed the definition of “relevant infrastructure” in relation to the “neighbourhood funding” percentage, which must be applied only for the “the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area”.

Therefore, the (draft) Regulation 123 list does not apply to or regulate the spending and application of the “neighbourhood funding” percentage of CIL (i.e. 15 or 25%) that the Council is required to spend on behalf of neighbourhood communities. It does also not affect or limit the use of planning obligations.

8.5 When and how can the draft Regulation 123 list be updated?

The CIL guidance²³ requires that a draft Regulation 123 list is made available at the examination of the CIL charging schedule. The final Regulation 123 list will “be based on the draft list that the charging authority prepared for the examination of their draft charging schedule”. Therefore, the final list will be based on the one submitted to examination. The Regulation 123 list is finalised as part of the CIL adoption process. Any changes thereafter must be subject to local consultation.

8.6 The Council’s draft Regulation 123 list?

The infrastructure listed below will be eligible to be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The draft Regulation 123 list, as set out below, defines which projects and/or types/sections of infrastructure the Council intends to fund through CIL revenues (it does not set out any projects that the Council will be required to spend the “meaningful proportion” of CIL on behalf of neighbourhood communities). It will take effect upon implementation of the Council’s CIL Charging Schedule, anticipated in April 2014.

The list is not definitive and in no order of priorities as no formal decisions have yet been taken to confirm how CIL funds will be allocated amongst the listed infrastructure projects. More it is a list of infrastructure projects that CIL can fund, subject to Council priorities and the levels of available CIL funding.

Ultimately, it will be necessary to prioritise both within theme areas (e.g. strategic transport) and also between theme areas (e.g. education or strategic open space). These decisions will rest with elected representatives and senior officers, in order to allow different areas and interests to express their different priorities. Factors such as whether an infrastructure element is essential or even required by legal statute or regulation if a development was to go ahead would then be taken into account.

The table below sets out infrastructure projects and/or types of infrastructure that the Council intends to fund in whole or in part from CIL revenue:

²¹ In line with new Regulation 59 of the CIL Regulations (as amended in 2013), in this borough, where there are no parish or town councils, the “neighbourhood funding” percentage of the CIL revenue will be spent by the charging authority (see Regulation 59F).

²² Regulation 59, Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013

²³ DCLG, CIL Guidance, para 86

CIL Draft Regulation 123 list²⁴

Infrastructure types and/or projects that will, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL:

Strategic transport:

- New rail transport signalling scheme to reduce level crossing downtime
- Improvements, upgrades and refurbishments of Mortlake, Fulwell, Whitton, North Sheen, Strawberry Hill, Hampton Wick and Barnes rail station
- Redevelopment of Richmond rail station
- Rail access to Heathrow
- Bridge or subway/tunnel under A316
- Twickenham town centre scheme (Phase 2)
- Thames River wall at Twickenham embankment
- River transport and landing stage at Twickenham embankment
- Foot-/cycle bridge between Ham and Twickenham, including town centre enhancements for cycling
- Public footbridge between Kew and Brentford
- Complete London and Borough Cycle Network with associated infrastructure/signage
- Convert Thames towpath to shared use
- River Crane corridor network improvements

Education facilities (not including land)

- Provision of additional primary school capacity, probably within Twickenham, Teddington, Richmond, East Sheen and Barnes, plus possible need for new primary school(s) / free schools
- Provision of additional secondary school capacity within the borough, including creation of a new secondary school through the redevelopment of Richmond upon Thames College site.
- Re-provision of Clarendon School Special Needs Education at Richmond upon Thames College site
- Relocate and improve Strathmore School Special Needs Education
- Additional capacity or assistance to colleges for post-16 Special Needs Education provision
- Provision of additional capacity in new units or by conversion of private, voluntary and independent nurseries into community nurseries

Community facilities:

- Co-location of community facilities in Whitton
- Co-location of library with other facilities in Kew
- Redevelopment of community facilities in Ham

²⁴ Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011 and 2012)

<p>Strategic parks and open spaces projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to the River Thames Towpath • New provision of play and adventure facilities within existing parks
<p>Waste facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements and/or development of Twickenham Depot sorting facility • Upgrade of recycling facilities at Townmead Road
<p>Sports and leisure provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grey Court School community sports centre • Richmond upon Thames College sports hall • Pools on the Park retractable roof for outdoor pool and extension of fitness suite • Extension of fitness suites at Orleans Park Sport Centre and Shene Sport & Fitness Centre • Upgrading of artificial turf pitches at Hampton Sport & Fitness Centre, Whitton Sport & Fitness Centre and Shene Sport & Fitness Centre

Table 9: CIL Draft Regulation 123 list (as of May 2013)

Note: Planning obligations will still be required in accordance with Regulation 122 and 123 (Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011 and 2012)) for obligations relating to infrastructure not listed above.