

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/W/21/3270663

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 12 August 2021

Planning Inspector: Harold Stephens BA MPhil Dip TP MRTPI FRSA

Appellants: A. C. Lloyd (Homes) Ltd

Land south of Chesterton Gardens, Leamington Spa

The development proposed is an outline planning application for a residential development of up to 200 dwellings with associated access, landscaping and public open space (all matters reserved apart from access).

Application: W/20/0617 – Warwick District Council

53. *The s106 Agreement is between (1) AC Lloyd Homes Limited (2) Ann Richardson, Janet Stallard & Robert McGregor (3) Warwick District Council and (4) Warwickshire County Council. The proposed planning obligations within the s106 Agreement are as follows...*
- *Police Contribution: £33,645 towards the recruitment and equipping of police staff, the provision of police vehicles and the provision of police office accommodation...*
54. *The tables in section 6 of the CIL Compliance Statement explain how the above planning obligations comply with the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 2010 (as amended) and paragraph 57 of the NPPF.*
56. *In my view, all of the obligations in the s106 Agreement are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, they all meet the tests within Regulation 122 (2) of the CIL Regulations and should be taken into account in the decision. The development makes adequate provision for any additional infrastructure and services that are necessary, including affordable housing, arising from the development.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/W/20/3251042

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 09 November 2020

Planning Inspector: JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Appellants: North Warwickshire & South Leicestershire College

North Warwickshire & South Leicestershire College, Hinckley Road, Nuneaton, CV11 6LS

The development proposed is the development of up to 195 dwellings together with the provision of a 3G sports pitch, associated public open space, and other green infrastructure, and landscaping.

Application: 036050 – Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council

40. *I have considered the legal agreement against advice in the Framework and the tests in Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as well as the requirements of the development plan.*
41. *In the light of Borough Plan Policies H1, H2, HS1 and HS5, and having regard to the evidence before me, I have no grounds to find the intended affordable housing, and contributions to education, healthcare, primary care and policing would not be necessary, related to the development or proportionate. Using the agreement to secure the provision and management of the sustainable drainage scheme and the public open space is also appropriate.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/20/3251121

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 14 October 2020

Planning Inspector: David Prentis BA BPI MRTPI

Appellants: HB (South Caldecotte) Ltd

Land at Brickhill Street, South Caldecotte, Milton Keynes, MK17 9FE

The development proposed is the development of the site for employment uses, comprising of warehousing and distribution (Class B8) floorspace (including mezzanine floors) with ancillary Class E office space, a small standalone office (Class E) and small café (Class E) to serve the development; car and HGV parking areas, with earthworks, drainage and attenuation features and other associated infrastructure, a new primary access of Brickhill Street, alterations to Brickhill Street and provision of Grid Road reserve to Brickhill Street.

Application: 19/01818/OUT – Milton Keynes Council

13. *A draft s106 Agreement was discussed at the inquiry. As changes were made to the draft at a late stage, I allowed some time after the Inquiry for it to be signed. The signed version subsequently received was consistent with the final draft. The Agreement would provide for...*
- *schedule 7 – a public art strategy; an emergency services contributions; a public art contribution and a community facilities contributions...*
41. *The Council submitted a statement of compliance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL Regulations) which set out the justification for the above obligations, including identification of relevant policies in Plan:MK (the adopted Local Plan). With the exception of the matters referred to below, the need for these obligations was agreed between the Council and the appellant and was not disputed by any other party. I see no reason to differ and have taken the obligations into account accordingly.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/W/20/3251042

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 09 November 2020

Planning Inspector: JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Appellants: North Warwickshire & South Leicestershire College

North Warwickshire & South Leicestershire College, Hinckley Road, Nuneaton, CV11 6LS

The development proposed is the development of up to 195 dwellings together with the provision of a 3G sports pitch, associated public open space, and other green infrastructure, and landscaping.

Application: 036050 – Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council

40. *I have considered the legal agreement against advice in the Framework and the tests in Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as well as the requirements of the development plan.*
41. *In the light of Borough Plan Policies H1, H2, HS1 and HS5, and having regard to the evidence before me, I have no grounds to find the intended affordable housing, and contributions to education, healthcare, primary care and policing would not be necessary, related to the development or proportionate. Using the agreement to secure the provision and management of the sustainable drainage scheme and the public open space is also appropriate.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/19/3234056

Appeal Decision: Dismissed – 30 April 2020

Planning Inspector: S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Appellants: Summix IFW Developments Ltd

Land East of Islington Farm, Tamworth Road, Wood End, Warwickshire

The development proposed is residential development (Class C3) with associated access, landscaping, open space and drainage infrastructure, with all matters reserved save access.

Application: PAP/2018/0762 – North Warwickshire Borough Council

3. *A signed and dated S106 agreement was produced at the hearing. This includes an obligation to provide up to 50% affordable housing. It also requires the developer to make financial contributions towards the provision of sustainable travel packs, improvements to public rights of way and a bus stop, police services, youth provision, off-site leisure and healthcare. I shall return to this matter below.*
37. *I have considered the S106 Agreement in line with Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 56 of the Framework. These state that planning obligations must only be sought where they are necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*
39. *Detailed correspondence outlining the requirements from the increased population for healthcare and policing was submitted by the relevant bodies in relation to the original application...*
42. *I conclude that the terms of the S106 agreement meet the tests set out above and thus I will take them all into account as material considerations. Nevertheless, all obligations other than that relating to affordable housing provide mitigation for the impacts of development, rather than any specific benefits.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/18/3196890

Appeal Decision: Dismissed – 01 April 2019

Planning Inspector: Brendan Lyons BArch MA MRTPI IHBC

Appellants: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Land to the south of Tamworth Road and to the west of the M42, Tamworth, B78 1HU

The development proposed is described as residential development of up to 150 dwellings, open space, landscaping, drainage features and associated infrastructure, with full approval of the principal means of access and all other matters reserved.

Application: PAP/2017/0602 – North Warwickshire Borough Council

46. *I also accept that the other obligations of that UU, involving financial contributions to mitigate impacts on hospital, healthcare and police services would be policy and legally compliant.*
48. *I conclude that with the exception of the proposed biodiversity offsetting obligation, the proposal would provide adequate justified mitigation for the effects of development on local infrastructure.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/17/3187601

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 28 September 2018

Planning Inspector: Matthew C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

Appellants: Mulgrave Properties LLP

Land west of Church Lane and south of Horsemere Green Lane, Climping, West Sussex, BN17 5RY

The development is described on the application form as “outline application for the erection of up to 300 dwellings and ancillary development comprising open space, a building within use class D1 of up to 875 sqm (net), a building for A1 use having a floor area of up to 530 sqm (net), together with open space and ancillary work, including car parking and drainage arrangements, with appearance, landscaping, layout and scale wholly reserved for subsequent approval; the access detail, showing the points of access to the development, and indicated on Bellamy Roberts drawings numbered 4724/004 and 4724/005 are access proposals to be determined at this stage of the application; for the avoidance of doubt all other detail within the site is to be determined as a reserved matter at a later stage.”

Application: CM/1/17/OUT – Arun District Council

28. *A planning obligation was completed on 3 September 2018. The obligation secures the provision of affordable housing at a rate of 30%. It also secures the following for the Council: an NHS contribution; a police contribution; sports facilities contributions (including towards sports pitches, sports hall and swimming pool). It also secures a community building and the provision of public open space (including play areas), and a travel welcome pack to occupiers of the dwellings on first occupation (to include a cycle voucher or bus travel season ticket). In terms of provisions in favour of WSCC, the obligation safeguards land for future highway works, as well as contributions to highway improvement works. It also secures the provision of fire hydrants, and suitable access for fire brigade vehicles and equipment, contributions to fire and rescue services, library facilities, and education (primary, secondary and sixth form).*
29. *I have no reason to believe that the formulae and charges used by the Council and WSCC to calculate the various contributions are other than soundly based. Both the Council and WSCC have produced Compliance Statements which demonstrate how the obligations meet various Council policies and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. The development would enlarge the local population with a consequent effect on local services and facilities. I am satisfied that the provisions of the obligation are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, that they directly relate in scale and kind to the development, thereby meeting the relevant tests in the Revised Framework and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/V/17/3171287

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed – 29 March 2018

Planning Inspector: Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Appellants: Dunsfold Airport Limited (DAL) and Rutland (DAL) Limited

Dunsfold Park, Stovolds Hill, Cranleigh, Surrey, GU6 8TB

The development proposed is a hybrid planning application; part Outline proposal for a new settlement with a residential development comprising 1800 units (Use Class C3), plus 7500sqm care accommodation (Use Class C2), a local centre to comprise retail, financial and professional, cafes/restaurant/takeaway and/or public house up to a total of 2150sqm (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5); new business uses including offices, and research and development industry (Use Class B1a and B1b) up to a maximum of 3700sqm; storage and distribution (Use Class B8) up to a maximum of 11000sqm; a further 9966sqm of flexible commercial space (B1(b), B1(c), B2 and/or B8); non-residential institutions including health centre, relocation of existing Jigsaw School into new premises and provision of new community centre (Use Class D1) up to a maximum of 9750sqm; a two form entry primary school; open space including water bodies, outdoor sports, recreational facilities, canal basin and nature conservation areas; public transport routes, footpaths and cycleways; landscaping; the removal of three runways; all related infrastructure including roads, car and cycle parking, energy plant and associated equipment, water supply, telecommunications, drainage systems and waste water treatment facilities; and part Full application for the demolition of 8029sqm of existing buildings and the retention of 36692sqm of existing buildings, for their future use for a specified purpose as defined by the Use Classes as specified in the schedule of buildings and their use; and the temporary use of Building 132 for a construction headquarters.

Application: W/2015/2395 - Waverley Borough Council

33. *Having had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR308-316, the planning obligation dated 1 August 2017, paragraphs 203-205 of the Framework, the Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusion for the reasons given in IR317 that the obligation complies with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests at paragraph 204 of the Framework.*
263. *The development would place undue pressure on existing infrastructure. This includes schools, health facilities and sewerage. The Fire Service has been known to 'run out' of appliances and there are plans to close existing stations. In addition the service has lost many firefighter posts since 2010. Waverley is one of the worst areas for ambulance services and beds in hospitals are scarce. This proposal would also add to the burden upon the police.*
312. *A number of contributions are included in the Obligation. These are for such matters as the Cranleigh Leisure Centre replacement, provision for Surrey premises on site, and police equipment, as well as contributions to the improvements in public rights of way nearby, education facilities, and transport improvements. Given the increase in local population which would result from this development all of these facilities and services would be put under increased pressure and would need to provide extra and improved services. The development is*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

directly related to them, and the contributions are reasonable in scale and kind and where necessary would provide mitigation for the impacts of the development. There are no contributions which would fall foul of pooling restrictions and they therefore meet the tests of the CIL Regulations.

317. *Taken overall I am satisfied that the S106 Agreement meets the tests of the CIL Regulations and PPG and can be taken into account in determining this application.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/W/17/3173741

Appeal Decision: Dismissed – 14 March 2018

Planning Inspector: Matthew C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

Appellant: Gladman Developments Limited

Land off The Lakes Road, Bewdley, Worcestershire, DY12 2BP

The development is described as “outline planning permission for up to 195 residential dwellings (including up to 30% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space, and children’s play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access point from The Lakes Road and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of the main site access off The Lakes Road”

Application: 16/0550/OUTL – Wyre Forest District Council

63. *I have no reason to believe that the formulae and charges used by the Council to calculate the various contributions are other than soundly based. In this regard, the Council has produced a detailed Compliance Statement which demonstrates how the obligations meet the relevant tests in the Framework and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations... It also explains the necessity for the police contribution and how monies would be spent...*
64. *The development would enlarge the local population with a consequent effect on local services and facilities. I am satisfied that the provisions of both the obligations... are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, that they directly relate to the development, and fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development, thereby meeting the relevant tests in the Framework and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations... Overall, I am satisfied that the planning obligations... accord with the Framework and relevant regulations, and I have taken them into account in my deliberations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/17/3172731

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 20 December 2017

Planning Inspector: Karen L Baker DipTP MA DipMP MRTPI

Appellant: Gladman Developments Limited

White Post Road, Banbury (Grid Ref. Easting: 445726 and Grid Ref. Northing: 238365)

The development proposed is ‘up to 280 residential dwellings (including up to 30% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children’s play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access point from White Post Road and associated ancillary works.’

Application: 15/01326/OUT – Cherwell District Council

54. *Policing: Thames Valley Police is seeking a financial contribution, based on a formulaic approach, towards the provision of additional resources to mitigate the impact of the proposed development. The Unilateral Undertaking includes a financial contribution of £40,303 towards the infrastructure of Thames Valley Police, including ANPR cameras, new premises, patrol vehicles and staff set up costs. Given the scale and nature of the proposed development, I am satisfied that the increase in population would lead to an increase in demand on police resources. As such, I am satisfied that this obligation would pass the statutory tests.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/16/3163551

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 28 November 2017

Planning Inspector: P W Clark MA MRTPI MCMII

Appellant: Albion Land Ltd

Land off Howes Lane and Middleton Stoney Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire

The development proposed is the erection of up to 53,000sq.m of floor space to be for B1, B2 and B8 (use classes) employment provision within two employment zones covering an area of 9.45ha; parking and service areas to serve the employment zones; a new access off the Middleton Stoney Road (B4030); temporary access of Howes Lane pending the delivery of the realigned Howes Lane; 4.5ha of residential land; internal roads, paths and cycleways; landscaping including strategic green infrastructure (GI); provisions of sustainable urban systems (SUDS) incorporating landscaped areas with balancing ponds and swales; associated utilities and infrastructure.

Application: 14/01675/OUT – Cherwell District Council

9. *The proposal is accompanied by a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking. In addition to the usual procedural, administrative and interpretative matters, the Unilateral Undertaking provides for...*
- *A Police contribution of £151.30 per dwelling up to a maximum of £22,693.96 paid in two instalments towards the increase in capital costs of providing neighbourhood policing...*
38. *...The appellant believes that a test of these obligations against the CIL regulations would reduce the burden. To put this concern into context, the total financial contributions for a typical 3-bedroomed house may be summed as follows...*
- *Police £151.30*
44. *Thames Valley Police has assessed that the development of the North-West Bicester eco-town, of which the development is part will generate: (i) a requirement for 15 new members of staff to police the additional population generated by the development; (ii) to be accommodated by an extension to and adaption of the existing Bicester Police Station; (iii) a control room/police network database at their Kidlington district headquarters; (iv) 4.5 additional patrol vehicles, 4.5 PCSO vehicles and 6 bicycles; (v) two additional Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras; (iv) mobile IT kit for each police officer; and (vii) an increase in radio coverage.*
45. *Proposals are included in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Each element would be delivered in phases. The first phase of additional personnel would be delivered by the 2000th dwelling (probably around the year 2028 according to the trajectory described in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan), the second phase by the 3,500th dwelling (circa 2033) and the third phase by the 5,500th (out of 6,000) dwellings (circa 2043).*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

46. *I am not convinced that the revenue costs of paying the salaries of the additional staff required is a cost attributable to the development, since the residents of the development will be paying in the usual way towards the funding of police salaries. To make a contribution through a planning obligation charged to the capital costs of buying their homes would be paying twice over and is not necessary. To that extent I do not regard the obligation contained in Schedule 2 of the Unilateral Undertaking as complying with the CIL Regulations. But the other elements represent capital costs which can be said to be attributable to the development.*
47. *The accommodation would be provided towards the end of the eco-town's build-out period (design work on Bicester Police Station to commence by the 4,900th dwelling, circa 2039). The building work would be started by the time of the 5,260th dwelling (circa 2042) and be completed by the time of the 5,500th dwelling (circa 2043).*
48. *The first phase of the control room would be rolled out by the 2,500th dwelling (circa 2029), the second phase circa 2043 by the time of the 5,500th dwelling. Phase 1 of the vehicle fleet would be delivered by the time of the 2,000th dwelling (circa 2028), the second phase by about the 3,500th dwelling (circa 2033) and the final phase by the 5,500th dwelling (circa 2043).*
49. *The two ANPR cameras would be installed by the time of the 2,000th dwelling (circa 2028). Phase 1 of the mobile IT equipment roll-out would be completed at the same time, Phase 2 by the 3,500th dwelling (circa 2033) and Phase 3 by the 5,500th dwelling (circa 2043). Phase 1 of the increased radio coverage would be completed by the 2,500th dwelling (circa 2029) and the second phase by the time of the 5,500th dwelling (circa 2043).*
50. *Because the obligation contained in Schedule 2 of the Unilateral Undertaking includes a payback requirement if the contribution is not spent or committed with 15 years of the final payment of the contribution (probably circa 2035), it is likely that the obligation would in fact only contribute to the ANPR cameras, the first phase of the control room, the first two phases of the IT equipment roll-out and the first phase of the increased radio coverage. In so far as that would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and is directly related to the development, I accept that the obligation contained in Schedule 2 of the Unilateral Undertaking complies with the CIL regulations and I have taken it into account in making my decision.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/V/16/3143095

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 13 July 2017

Planning Inspector: S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

Appellants: Fontwell Estates Limited & Global Technology Racing

Land east of Fontwell Avenue, Fontwell, West Sussex, BN18 0SB

The development proposed is up to 400 new dwellings, up to 500sq.m of non-residential floor space (A1, A2, A3, D1 and/or D2), 5,000sq.m of light industrial floorspace (B1 (b)/(c) and associated works including access, an internal road network, highway works, landscaping, selected tree removal, informal and formal open space and play areas, pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure, utilities, drainage infrastructure, car and cycle parking and waste storage.

Application: WA/22/15/OUT – Arun District Council

42. *Having had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR10.8-10.15 and IR11.61, the planning obligation dated 2 December 2016, paragraphs 203-205 of the Framework, the Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusion for the reasons given in IR11.61 that all the obligations, bar the NHS contribution which has not been substantiated and fails the CIL tests, comply with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests at paragraph 204 of the Framework and is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development, and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*
43. *The Secretary of State has taken into account the number of planning obligations which have been entered into on or after 6 April 2010 which provide for the funding or provision of a project or type of infrastructure for which an obligation has been proposed in relation to the application (IR10.8-10.15 and IR11.61). The Secretary of State concludes that the obligations are compliant with Regulations 123(3), as amended.*
- 1.4 *The local planning authority (lpa) considered the application on the 25 November 2015 and resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement (CD 24). The applicants submit an engrossed S106 Agreement dealing with the provision of financial contributions relating to education; libraries; the fire service; highways and transport; police infrastructure; primary healthcare facilities; leisure facilities and the provision of affordable housing and public open space (CD 37). The applicants, the lpa and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) submitted notes on CIL R122 compliance (CDs 49, 55 & 52).*
- 9.23 *...Other responses included... Sussex Police – sought financial contribution towards the provision, maintenance and operation of Police infrastructure.*
- 10.15 *The payment of:*
- *£70,000 towards the provision of mobile IT kit, speed awareness kits and towards the re-provision of Littlehampton Police Station. CD 55 Appendix A1.7 provides a detailed*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

justification by Sussex Police for the principal of the contribution. Whilst the Sussex Police request was originally for £109,714 the sum subsequently agreed is £70,000 (LPA 3);

11.61 All the obligations, bar the NHS contribution which has not been substantiated and fails the CIL tests, are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Accordingly, the S106 Agreement is consistent with the guidance at Framework paragraph 204 and Regulations 122/123 of the CIL Regulations and where appropriate, I have attached weight to it in coming to my conclusion.

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/E3715/W/16/3147448

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 10 July 2017

Planning Inspector: Martin Whitehead LLB BSc(Hons) CEng MICE

Appellants: David Wilson Homes (East Midlands) and Gallagher Estates Ltd

Land at Ashlawn Road West, Rugby, Warwickshire, CV22 5RZ

The development proposed is the demolition of existing buildings, erection of up to 860 dwellings, land for potential primary school, two vehicular accesses from Ashlawn Road and the provision of a bus link control feature to Norton Leys, open space, green infrastructure, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including sustainable urban drainage works.

Application: R13/2102 - Rugby Borough Council

30. *Having had regard to the Inspector's analysis at IR158-166, the planning obligation dated 17 February 2017, paragraphs 203-205 of the Framework, the Guidance and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusion for the reasons given in IR166 that the obligation complies with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests at paragraph 204 of the Framework and is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development, and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*
156. *Warwickshire Police (WP) requested a sum of £185,278 towards police infrastructure that would mitigate the impact of the proposed development. This contribution has not been disputed and should be secured in a S106 planning obligation. It reflects the precise need that would arise from the development of up to 860 new homes on the appeal site based on WP's experience policing development in the area. The contribution would be used to mitigate the impact on infrastructure where there is no spare capacity and would accord with Core Strategy Policy CS10. Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy includes police as one of the critical infrastructure requirements to ensure delivery and mitigation, which are expected to be included in a S106 Agreement.*
157. *WP objects to the development proceeding without the necessary contributions as the resulting development could not be adequately policed, contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS13 and policies within the Framework. There is extensive evidence in WP's written representations which cover how the contribution request was calculated and compliance with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) Regulation 122 and 123(3). Each element of the contribution would be spent on an individual 'project' to meet the needs of the development alone, without the need for any pooling of contributions.*
160. *The Council, WCC and WP have provided documents to demonstrate CIL compliance. I have not received any evidence to demonstrate that the planning obligations would contravene any of the above Regulations.*
165. *...The obligations to secure a Police contribution would ensure that the money would be spent on police equipment, premises and vehicles that would be necessary to police the new development.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

166. *Based on the above, I have found that the planning obligations in the S106 Agreement meet the tests in CIL Regulation 122 and 123(3) and paragraph 204 of the Framework. I have therefore taken them into account in my conclusions and recommendations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/16/3144445

Appeal Decision: Dismissed - 21 March 2017

Planning Inspector: David M H Rose BA (Hons) MRTPI

Appellant: Redrow Homes Limited

Land east of Kestrel Close/Beechfields Way, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8QE

The development proposed is an outline application to include access for residential development for up to 170 dwellings with open space following demolition of 14 and 15 Kestrel Close, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8QE

Application: TWC/2015/1003 - Telford & Wrekin Council

157. *The planning obligation concluded after the close of the inquiry provides for... a contribution towards police premises, recruiting and equipping new officers and staff to serve the development and vehicles.*
163. *The current development plan is silent on police contributions although it is matter addressed in the emerging Telford and Wrekin Local Plan and the related Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The premises contribution is not controversial.*
164. *The legitimacy of contributions towards training new officers and the provision of equipment and vehicles is less clear cut in so far as it would, in effect, amount to a tariff payment with no exclusivity for the proposed development. Nonetheless, the sums sought are fully quantified against the policing requirement, which existing resources cannot meet, for the proposed development.*
165. *There is no doubt that the proposed development would generate a need for policing and that need would require additional resources which have been calculated on a pro-rata dwelling basis. The Framework identifies a need for safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. In addition, an extensive array of appeal decisions supports the principle of police contributions. Overall, the balance of the evidence before me points to the obligation (based on the underlying pro-rata calculation) being necessary and proportionate mitigation for the development.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/15/3004910

Appeal Decision: Dismissed - 04 May 2016

Planning Inspector: Siân Worden BA DipLH MCD MRTPI

Appellant: Jelson

Land off Sherborne Road, Burbage, Leicestershire, LE10 2BE

The development proposed is residential development and associated infrastructure (73 dwellings).

Application: 14/00475/OUT - Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

44. *Leicestershire Police (LP) has demonstrated adequately that the sums requested would be spent on a variety of essential equipment and services, the need for which would arise directly from the new households occupying the proposed development. It would be necessary, therefore, in order to provide on-site and off-site infrastructure and facilities to serve the development commensurate with its scale and nature consistent with LP Policy IMP1. The planning contribution would also enable the proposed development to comply with the Framework's core planning principle of supporting local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing and delivering sufficient community facilities and services to meet local needs.*
45. *In respect of compliance with CIL Regulation 123(3) the proposed spending has been apportioned to individual projects and procurement, such as property adaptation and a contribution towards a vehicle, in order to ensure no need for the pooling of contributions. In addition a clause of the undertaking which, in requiring written confirmation prior to payment that it would only be spent where there were no more than four other contributions, would provide a legal mechanism for ensuring full compliance with Reg. 123(3).*
46. *Evidence was submitted in the form of two maps with types of criminal incidents plotted on them. The first of these shows that there were several burglaries and thefts in the housing area adjacent to the appeal site during the year up to July 2014. The second map covers a larger area, this time in Blaby, and indicates a steady rate of incidents, mainly forms of stealing, in all types of residential area. I have no reason to believe that levels of crime differ significantly between Hinckley/Burbage and Blaby.*
47. *I consider this to be a no less realistic and robust method of demonstrating the criminal incidents likely to arise in a specific area than the analysis of population data which is normally used to calculate the future demand for school places. The evidence gives credence to the additional calls and demands on the police service predicted by LP.*
51. *My overall conclusion on planning contributions is that those requested by LP and by LCC for the civic amenity site would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and would meet the other tests set out in the Framework. In those respects the submitted planning obligation carries significant weight. The contribution sought for Burbage library would not.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/V/14/2229497

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed – 31 March 2016

Planning Inspector: Mrs KA Ellison BA, MPhil, MRTPI

Appellants: ERLP and the Merchant Venturers

Land at 'Perrybrook' to the north of Brockworth and south of the A417, Brockworth, Gloucestershire

The development proposed is a mixed use development of up to 1,500 dwellings including extra care housing, community facilities including A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 local retail shops, B1/B8 employment uses, D1 health facilities and formal/informal public open space.

Application: 12/01256/OUT – Tewkesbury Borough Council

23. *The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's assessment of the two planning obligations at IR14.12-14.21. He is satisfied that the requirements of the completed, signed and dated Section 106 agreements referred to at IR14.12 are in accordance with paragraph 204 of the Framework and the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended.*

14.21 *The Statement of Common Ground in respect of planning obligations sets out details of any relevant planning obligations made since 2010 and confirms that none of the obligations exceed the pooling restrictions in Regulation 123(3) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended). The obligations also accord with Regulation 122 in that they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to it and are fair and reasonable in scale and kind.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/A/14/2228806

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 15 February 2016

Planning Inspector: John Braithwaite BSc(Arch) BArch(Hons) RIBA MRTPI

Appellant: Money Hill Consortium

Money Hill, Land North of Wood Street, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicestershire

The development proposed is 605 residential dwellings including a 60 unit extra care centre (C2), a new primary school (D1), a new health centre (D1), a new nursery school (D1), a new community hall (D1), new neighbourhood retail use (A1), new public open space and vehicular access from the A511 and Woodcock Way.

Application: 13/00335/OUTM - North West Leicestershire District Council

17. *The Secretary of State has also considered the executed and signed Unilateral Undertaking; the Inspector's comments on this at IR61-63; paragraphs 203 and 205 of the Framework, and the Guidance. He considers that that the provisions offered by the Unilateral Undertaking would accord with the tests set out at paragraph 204 of the Framework and agrees with the Inspector that they would also comply with Regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations.*

63. *The contribution of £219,029 towards Police infrastructure is not related to requirements of development plan policies. The figure has been arrived at following a close and careful analysis of the current levels of policing demand and deployment in Ashby. The proposed development, in terms of population increase, would have a quantifiable and demonstrable effect on the ability of the Police to carry out their statutory duties in the town. LP has not sought any contribution to some aspects of policing, such as firearms and forensics, but only for those aspects where there is no additional capacity. The contribution is thus fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and is directly related to that development. The contribution is necessary because the new housing that would be created would place a demonstrable additional demand on Police resources in Ashby. The financial contribution to Police operations thus satisfies Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and a provision of the Undertaking would ensure that the contribution also satisfies Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/W/15/3007980

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 08 February 2016

Planning Inspector: C Thorby MRTPI IHBC

Appellant: Rosconn Group

Land rear of 62 Iveshead Road, Shepshed, LE12 9ER

The development proposed is the erection of up to 77 dwellings following demolition of 62 Iveshead Road (access only to be determined)

Application: P/14/0777/2 - Charnwood Borough Council

19. *Planning obligation. The necessity for contributions towards affordable housing, on site open space, policing, healthcare, travel plan, transport, education and civic amenity have been justified by comprehensive evidence from the local and County Council, and the Police Authority. There is no dispute that the provisions of the legal agreement would meet the Council's policy requirements, the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the CIL Regulations 122 and 123 relating to pooled contributions. I am satisfied that this is the case and am taking them into account.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/A/14/2221613

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 14 January 2016

Planning Inspector: Jennifer A Vyse DipTP DipPBM MRTPI

Appellant: Barwood Strategic Land II LLP

Land at The Asps, bound by Europa Way (A452) to the east and Banbury Road (A425) to the west

The development proposed is described on the application form as residential development (use class C3) for up to 900 dwellings, a primary school (use class D1), a local centre (use classes A1 to A5) and D1) and a Park and Ride facility for up to 500 spaces (sui generis) with access from Europa Way and Banbury Road, areas of public open space, landscaping enhancements and archaeological mitigation.

Application: W/14/0300 - Warwick District Council

32. *The Secretary of State has had regard to the matters raised by the Inspector at IR13.1 – 13.5 and agrees with the Inspector’s reasoning and conclusions on the two Unilateral Undertakings at IR14.137-14.161. In making his decision on this case, the Secretary of State has taken into account the provisions in the Unilateral Undertakings that do accord with Paragraph 204 of the Framework and do meet the tests in the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended.*

Condition 7 - An area of land measuring no less than 0.5 hectare shall be reserved for a local centre. This area of land should broadly be in the location identified on drawing No EDP 1871/116C. Any reserved matters proposal for development on this land must provide a mix of A1 and A2 and A3 and A4 and D1 floorspace, and a police post and associated off-street servicing and parking facilities, all of which shall be delivered in accordance with the phasing plan.

11.5 *Warwickshire Police and West Mercia Police: They requested a S106 contribution to provide police infrastructure necessary to enable the direct delivery of policing services to the site. No objections were received from either the Council or the appellant and so it was assumed that HE request met the relevant statutory tests. It was a surprise, therefore, to see on the Statement of CIL compliance, that the request was considered not to be compliant, notwithstanding that the Obligation did include the requested provision. The correspondence sets out why, in their view, the contribution is CIL compliant and is supported by four Appendices.*

13.18 *Police: the obligation secures the provision of a building for use as a police office, of at least 200 square metres gross internal floor area (together with service connections and external parking) to be located within the local centre that forms part of the development scheme. In addition, a contribution of £187,991 is secured, payable to the Council to fund the provision, fitting out and equipping of the police office.*

14.154 *Police: As set out in the CIL Compliance Schedule, the appellant is not satisfied that the arrangement is CIL compliant, with the Council being of the view that insufficient evidence*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

was available to come to an informed view on the matter. However, no evidence was before the Inquiry to support those concerns.

- 14.155 *Having had sight of the Schedule, Warwickshire Police and West Mercia Police submitted further correspondence on the matter, dated 10 April 2015. They demonstrate that the arrangement has been arrived at after careful analysis of the current and planned levels of policing in the area. With reference to existing local deployment reflecting actual policing demands and local crime patterns, it is confirmed that five additional staff would be required to serve the development proposed. Policing of the area is delivered currently from three separate premises (in Warwick, Leamington and Leek Wooton) all of which are already maintained to capacity. I am in no doubt therefore, that a new police office would need to be provided on the site, and fitted out, in order to accommodate the additional staff. I consider the arrangement to be necessary to make the development acceptable, it is directly related to the development proposed and to mitigating the impacts that it would generate, and it is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The arrangement therefore meets the relevant tests. Moreover, as a discrete project to which no more than five developments would contribute, I have no reason to suppose, on the basis of the information before me, that there would be any conflict with CIL Regulation 123.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/A/14/2229398

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 14 January 2016

Planning Inspector: Robert Mellor BSc DipTRP DipDesBEnv DMS MRICS MRTPI

Appellant: Gallagher Estates Ltd

Land South of Gallows Hill / West of Europa Way, Heathcote, Warwick

The development proposed is a residential development up to a maximum of 450 dwellings; provision of two points of access (one from Europa Way and one from Gallows Hill); comprehensive green infrastructure and open spaces including potential children's play space; potential footpaths and cycleways; foul and surface water drainage infrastructure and ground modelling.

Application: W/14/0681 - Warwick District Council

33. *Having examined the completed and signed S106 Planning Agreement and considered the commentary and views at IR349 - 356 and the Inspector's assessment at IR462 - 467, the Secretary of State concludes that the obligations in the Agreement accord with Paragraph 204 of the Framework and meet the tests in the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended.*
353. *The Council has submitted a summary table of S106 contributions (Document AD13) to demonstrate that the Regulation 123 limit of a maximum of 5 contributions to infrastructure would not be exceeded. The Council has also submitted a CIL Regulations Compliance Statement (Document AD14) which sets out the justification for each obligation, matters of agreement and matters of dispute. Appendix D explains that the monitoring fee is necessary as the large scale housing site with multiple contributions requires additional monitoring work. It sets out how the sum has been calculated including the activities to be carried out and the hourly rate of the officer.*
354. *Mr T Jones represents Warks and West Mercia Police Authority. He appeared at the Inquiry in a round table session to further provide evidence in support of the need for the financial contribution for police services that is included in the submitted S106 planning obligation agreement. There is supporting written evidence at OIP7, OIP22, and OIP23. The contribution is sought to support police services for the local area to accommodate the rising need generated by this new development. Appeal decisions by the Secretary of State have been submitted in support of such contributions APP/X2410/A/12/2173673 (Document OIP22) and APP/X2410/A/13/2196928/APP/X2410/A/13/ 2196929 (Document OIP23). In each case the Secretary of State agreed with the Inspector that the contributions were compliant with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. The Inspector's Report for the first case noted that contributions had previously been supported in some appeals and not in others.*
462. *The S106 planning obligation agreement between the LPA and the Appellant and landowners covers all the matters referred to as reasons for refusal [349-352]]. However the Appellant has queried whether all of the obligations satisfy the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Obligation Agreement itself provides that if the 'Planning Inspector or Secretary of State in the Decision Letter' concludes that any of the planning*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

obligations or the monitoring fee or any part of the obligation are incompatible with Regulations 122 or 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) then that shall cease to have effect. In particular the Appellant queries the legality of the monitoring fee and the contributions to police and health services. The LPA has provided a CIL compliance statement [353].

464. *The contributions for police services are similar to those which the Secretary of State has previously endorsed as compliant with Regulation 122 [354]. I consider that the CIL compliance statement shows that they are also compliant with Regulation 123 [353].*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/W/15/3005052

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 05 January 2016

Planning Inspector: Harold Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

Appellant: Gladman Developments Ltd

Land South of Greenhill Road, Coalville, Leicestershire

The development proposed is described as development of up to 180 dwellings, including a retail unit, access and associated infrastructure (outline-all matters reserved apart from part access).

Application: 14/00614/OUTM - North West Leicestershire District Council

69. *The contribution to Leicestershire Police (LP) has been justified following a close and careful analysis of the current levels of policing demand and deployment in the beat area. The financial contribution would be spent on start-up equipment, vehicles, additional radio call capacity, PND additions, additional call handling, ANPR, Mobile CCTV, additional premises and hub equipment. No part of the LP contribution provides for funding towards any infrastructure project that would offend the restriction on pooling. In my view, the LP contribution is fully compliant with Regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/A/14/2222595

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 02 June 2015

Planning Inspector: P W Clark MA MRTPI MCMII

Appellant: RJ & S Styles

Land North of Littleworth Road, Benson

The development proposed is described as (1) the erection of 125 dwellings with associated access, open space and landscaping and (2) 41 retirement flats and 11 retirement bungalows with associated parking and car share facilities.

Application: P14/S0673/FUL - South Oxfordshire District Council

51. *The necessity, relevance and proportionality of these and the other elements of the planning agreement are set out in three documents submitted to the Inquiry. They (include)... a letter from Simon Dackombe Strategic Planner, Thames Valley Police. With one exception they provide convincing (and undisputed) evidence that the obligations comply with regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.*

52. *The exception is that part of the contribution sought for policing which relates to the training of officers and staff. Whereas all the other specified items of expenditure relate to capital items which would ensure for the benefit of the development, staff training would provide qualifications to the staff concerned and would benefit them but these would be lost if they were to leave the employ of the police and so are not an item related to the development. I therefore take no account of this particular item in coming to a decision on the appeal. This does not, however, invalidate the signed agreement.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/A/14/2222210

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 26 May 2015

Planning Inspector: Christopher J Anstey BA (Hons) DipTP DipLA MRTPI

Appellant: Hanover Developments Ltd

Greetham Garden Centre, Oakham Road, Greetham, Oakham LE15 7NN

The development proposed is the redevelopment of the former Greetham Garden Centre for residential development for up to 35 dwellings, and provision of access.

Application: 2013/0956/OUT - Rutland County Council

- Refusal Reason 2 related to the failure in the appeal application to make any commitment to developer contributions. As part of the appeal submissions two unilateral undertakings have been submitted. I consider that these two undertakings are compliant with paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. In arriving at this view I have taken account of the replies from the Council and the Police Authority to the Planning Inspectorate's letter of 5 May 2015 relating to 'pooled' contributions. The first unilateral undertaking, dated 22 January 2015, makes provision for various contributions towards health services, indoor activity services, libraries, museums, outdoor sports, open space, children's services and policing. As the contribution to policing is in line with the amount per dwelling specified in the adopted Developer Contributions Calculation increasing this amount would not be justified. The second unilateral undertaking, dated 12 March 2015, will ensure that at reserved matters stage a Section 106 agreement is drawn up to secure 35% affordable housing. Consequently I believe that Refusal Reason 2 has now been addressed.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/A/14/2227672

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 19 May 2015

Planning Inspector: Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MCIEH DMS

Appellant: Larkfleet Homes

Land to the rear of North Brook Close, Greetham, Rutland LE15 7SD

The development proposed is construction of 19 residential dwellings, including garages and associated infrastructure.

Application: 2013/1042/FUL - Rutland County Council

16. *The proposed development would increase demands on the Market Overton Doctor's Practice. The building is not large enough to cater for the additional patients that it has been calculated would live in the area as a result of planned new housing development including the appeal site. Similarly, the police service delivers its service locally from premises at Oakham. This facility is at capacity and the new development would generate a need for additional space, equipment, information handling and communications. A financial contribution is therefore necessary to mitigate the effect of the development by expanding the Doctor's Surgery and police service provision.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/L2440/A/14/2216085

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 10 February 2015

Planning Inspector: Geoffrey Hill BSc DipTP MRTPI

Appellant: Bloor Homes Ltd

Land at Cottage Farm, Glen Road, Oadby, Leicestershire LE2 4RL

The development proposed is development of land for up to 150 dwellings (Use Class C3) and associated infrastructure, including pedestrian and vehicular access, open space and structural landscaping.

Application: 13/00478/OUT - Oadby & Wigston Borough Council

82. *A completed planning obligation, in the form of an agreement made under Section 106 of the Town and Country, was submitted at the inquiry (Document OW15). I have considered the submitted planning obligation against the tests set out at paragraph 204 of NPPF.*
83. *In general terms, the agreement establishes a commitment to provide 30% affordable dwellings, support for sustainable transport, the provision of open space for public use, and financial contributions for education, the county council library service and police infrastructure. The terms of the offered agreement were discussed, and whether the contributions put forward were directly related to the development being proposed. Nothing was said at the inquiry to indicate that what is being offered is unreasonable, disproportionate, or likely to be covered by other sources of financial support or revenue.*
84. *I am satisfied that, in the light of the matters discussed at the inquiry, and taking into account the written submissions relating particularly to the police contribution (document LP1), all the offered contributions and undertakings are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/A/14/2222358

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 23 January 2015

Planning Inspector: P W Clark MA MRTPI MCMl

Appellant: Gladman Developments Ltd

Tickow Lane, Shepshed, Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE12 9LY

The development proposed is 180 dwellings.

Application: P/13/1751/2 - Charnwood Borough Council

15. *The planning obligation makes provision for a financial contribution to policing costs in the form of whichever of three alternatives (if any) is determined to meet the tests for planning obligations set out in regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. A further provision of the obligation allows for the exclusion of any component of the obligation if this Decision concludes that it does not meet those same tests.*
16. *From the many other planning appeals which were presented to me, I draw the following precepts. Policing is a statutory service which is funded at public expense but so too are many other services which are the subject of planning obligations to offset the impact of a development upon those services; that consideration alone does not cause a planning obligation to fail the CIL tests.*
17. *It is commonly accepted that the day to day running costs of a servicing a development would be covered by revenues to the service provider, such as Council Tax. On the other hand, capital expenditure arising directly from the needs of a development might not be provided in time or at all within the priorities of a public service provider and, if not provided, the development would have an unacceptable impact. If the investment would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, then it would satisfy one of the CIL tests. In this case, the evidence which the police provided concerning their capital financing made clear the difficulties they would face in funding capital expenditure and the consequential unacceptable impact in the form of a dilution of their services over a more extensive area.*
18. *Applying this precept to the itemised entries in option (c) of the "Police Contribution" as defined in the obligation, I do not find anything other than the references to training in item (i) which would not fall within a reasonable definition of capital expenditure. Training however, is not a necessary adjunct to the creation of new posts; they could (and some would say should) be filled with already qualified and trained personnel. Moreover, whereas the other items would be retained by the police force in the event of a recruit leaving the service, any training would not. I doubt even the most creative accountant could convincingly define that as capital expenditure.*
19. *Although it is correct to say that the spatial impact of a development upon policing cannot be precisely quantified because nothing can be known for certain in advance about the crime rates likely to occur, the same is true of impacts on other services; impacts on traffic generation can only be estimates based on measurements of similar development elsewhere; likewise, impacts*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

on the provision of schools can only be based on estimates of the child population likely to arise derived from analyses of similar developments elsewhere. Yet such estimates are commonly accepted and, in the current case, those put forward by the police were not discredited. Nor were alternative ways of apportionment suggested. For these reasons I have no difficulty with the basis on which the police have estimated the impact on their services likely to arise from this proposed development. I am satisfied that the outcome is fairly and reasonably related in scale to the development.

20. *It is fair to say that the police have gone into far greater detail in analysing the impact of the development on their capital expenditure than is normal amongst service providers. In consequence, the closer scrutiny which that invites may make it appear that it should not be “necessary” for such petty amounts to be recouped from a developer through a planning obligation and that the small adverse impacts upon police capital expenditure should be tolerated in light of the wider benefits of the development as a whole.*
21. *But each is a building block to a larger sum and there are parallels with the way some other services calculate the impacts of developments on their services, as set out in the Council’s S106 Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. In addition, I recall paragraph 61 of Mr Foskett’s judgement which was brought to my attention; although the sums at stake for the police contributions will be small in comparison to the huge sums that will be required to complete the development, the sums are large from the point of view of the police. Therefore, I do not doubt their necessity.*
22. *I conclude that the provisions made in option (c) of the “Police Contribution” entry of the obligation, adjusted to remove the second sentence of paragraph (i) would comply with the CIL regulations. With that obligation in place, the development would have an acceptable effect on policing, in compliance with section (xviii) of Local Plan policy ST/1 which requires developments to provide for public services and with policy ST/3 which requires development to provide for infrastructure if lacking.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2430/A/14/2224790

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 06 January 2015

Planning Inspector: Thomas Shields MA DipURP MRTPI

Appellant: Davidsons Developments Limited

Land to the east of Nottingham Road, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire

The development proposed is residential development for up to 85 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access and areas of open space.

Application: 14/00078/OUT - Melton Borough Council

28. *In the completed Agreement there are covenants relating to affordable housing, police service requirements, open space and maintenance, bus stop and bus shelter provision, bus travel, a travel plan co-ordinator and travel packs, off-site traffic signal works, civic amenity, leisure facilities, library facilities, Melton Country Park facilities, and training opportunities. Support for infrastructure requirements is provided in saved LP Policy OS3 and within the County Council's SPG11. In addition, at the Hearing Mr Tyrer, the County Council's Developer Contributions Officer, and Mr Lambert, the Growth and Design Officer for Leicestershire Police, provided detailed information and justification of the infrastructure requirements and how financial contributions would be spent.*

30. *I am satisfied that the proposed planning obligations are necessary, directly related, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/M2460/A/14/2213689

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 04 December 2014

Planning Inspector: Richard Clegg BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

Appellant: Mr J Kent

Land rear of 44-78 Ashby Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 1SL

The development proposed is described as 'residential development'.

Application: 2013/0862/04 - Leicestershire County Council

39. *A police contribution of £13,756 is included in the planning obligation. Detailed evidence in support of this level of contribution has been submitted by the Police and Crime Commissioner. It is clear that the increase in the local population from up to 60 dwellings on the appeal site would place additional demands on the police. Contributions are not sought across the board. The representations identify those areas where there is spare capacity and they have not been taken into account in calculating the overall level of contribution. A need has been identified in the following areas: start-up equipment, vehicles, radio call capacity, database capacity, call-handling, automatic number plate recognition cameras, mobile CCTV, premises, and hub equipment. Details are provided of the purpose to which the funding would be put, and, in the case of each area where a need has been identified, the level of contribution has been calculated in relation to the size of the appeal proposal, even if this means that some expenditure is required from the police budget. The policing contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and it also complies with the other statutory tests.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/A/13/2208318

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 18 November 2014

Planning Inspector: David Cullingford BA MPhil MRTPI

Appellant: Rainier Properties Limited

Land surrounding Sketchley House, Watling Street, Burbage, Leicestershire

The development proposed is described as an outline application for the 'demolition of Nos.11 and 13 Welbeck Avenue to create vehicular and pedestrian access and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 135 dwellings, public and private open space together with landscaping and associated infrastructure (all matters reserved except for the point of access).'

Application: 13/00529/OUT - Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

22 *The Secretary of State has considered the terms of the planning obligation submitted at the inquiry and considered by the Inspector at IR11.54-11.57; and he agrees with him at IR11.57 that these contributions meet the Framework test and comply with CIL regulations.*

8.1 *Policing is a service that is always available and responds to demand on an 'equal access' basis; the level and efficiency of that response depends on the facilities available. Calls and deployments are monitored and give an indication of the level of services delivered to the 45,400 households in the Borough or the 6393 houses in Burbage. In 2011 there were 83,315 calls from the Borough, 9,386 of which required emergency attendance and 5,314 entailing some 'follow up'. In Burbage there were 11,664 calls, 314 emergencies and 744 attendances; last year there were 419 recorded incidents. Those incidents largely entail burglary, car related crime and theft and there are geographical concentrations at the commercial units around Hinckley Island and the town centre. Some 372 incidents of anti-social behaviour are recorded in Burbage and regular patrolling and local community contact maintained by the Neighbourhood Policing team, located at Hinckley Local Policing Unit.*

8.2 *The integrated nature of policing means that many different operational units are involved in responding to recorded incidents. Staff at the Local Police Unit, the hub at Braunston, the Basic Command Unit at Loughborough, the Force HQ at Enderby, tactical support, road safety, communications and regional crime can all be involved. Some 270 staff are employed to deliver policing in the Borough and about 80% of their time is devoted to such activities. The minimum number of staff is deployed to meet existing levels of demand, which means that there is little additional capacity to extend staffing to cover additional development. The aim is to deploy additional staffing and additional infrastructure to cover the demand from new development at the same level as the policing delivered to existing households. Hence, additional development would generate a requirement for additional staff and additional personal equipment (workstations, radios, protective clothing, uniforms and bespoke training), police vehicles of varying types and functions, radio cover (additional base stations and investment in hardware, signal strengthening and re direction), national database availability and interrogation, control room telephony, CCTV technologies, mobile units, 'beat drop in hubs', premises and the like. Yet, the prognosis is that 'It is sensible to assume that most of the capital requirements incurred by*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

growth will not be covered by existing mainstream central and local funding'. Hence, the necessity to seek developer contributions to ensure that existing levels of service can be maintained as growth continues.

- 8.3 *The proposed development is expected to increase the overnight population of this settlement by at least 307 people and a net addition of 133 new houses must bring additional policing demands. Extrapolating from existing empirical data indicates that the scheme would generate annual additions of some 239 calls and responses, 28 emergency events, 16 non-emergency events, 9 additional recorded crimes and 8 recorded anti-social behaviour incidents. In turn those events would require additional vehicle use, more radio calls, greater use of the PND systems to process and store crime records and intelligence, further deployment of mobile CCTV technologies and additional access for beat staff in a local Hub, not to mention consequences for support and HQ staff.*
- 8.4 *The Framework supports the provision of the facilities and services needed in a community. This is one of the 'core principles' and SPDs are indicated to be an appropriate means to assist applicants in understanding the obligations that proposals might generate. The Framework advocates the creation of healthy and inclusive environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life. Policy IMP1 of the Local Plan reflects that advice and provides an over-arching justification for the contributions sought. And, the Leicestershire County Council Statement of Requirements sets out the provisions that should be made towards the need for additional policing that might be due to new development.*
- 8.5 *The contribution requested amounts to £44,711 to mitigate the additional impacts estimated to accrue directly from the proposed development. These contributions are required to upgrade the capacity of existing infrastructure, which would not otherwise be sufficient to meet the likely demand from the scheme. It is anticipated that staff salaries and day to day routine additional costs would be met by rate revenues. A programme to procure the additional facilities required would be agreed as a clause in a legal agreement. The contributions sought would be directly related in scale and kind to the development, so that the completion of some infrastructures would require funding from elsewhere. But, the contribution would be used wholly to meet the direct impacts of this development and wholly in delivering the policing to it. On the basis of advice, the level of contributions sought are not based on a formula but derived solely from the direct impact of the scheme on policing. This has elicited support at appeal. A detailed explanation of the methods used to calculate each element of the total contribution is offered together with the justification for it derived from the advice in the Framework. It is shown that the contributions sought are directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the scheme and necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. There would thus be CIL compliant.*
- 11.57 *The Contributions towards... additional policing... are directly related to the development, proportionate to the scheme and necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms. Hence, I consider that the contributions sought can be considered to be CIL compliant.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/A/14/2217536

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 21 August 2014

Planning Inspector: Jane Miles BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Appellant: Ullesthorpe Court Hotel and Golf Club Ltd

Land off Fairway Meadows, Ullesthorpe, Leicestershire

The development proposed is new housing development on Land off Fairways Meadows, Ullethorpe.

Application: 13/01228/OUT - Harborough District Council

31. *Returning to the unilateral undertaking, I have already mentioned obligations relating to measures to promote more sustainable modes of transport, which are necessary to make the development acceptable. The undertaking also includes provision for contributions towards library facilities and police services and, given the justifications provided, I find that these are also necessary to make the development acceptable.*
32. *Taking account also of the information provided to explain how the various contributions are calculated and how they would be used, I find that all the obligations would be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind. The tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and in the Framework are therefore satisfied and thus I have had regard to all the obligations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Refs: APP/K2420/A/13/2202658 and APP/K2420/A/13/2210904

Appeal Decision: Appeal A Dismissed and Appeal B Allowed - 18 August 2014

Planning Inspector: Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI

Appellant: Alexander Bruce Estates Ltd

Land off (to the south of) Spinney Drive and land off (to the east of) Brookside, Barlestone, Leicestershire

Appeal A - The development proposed is the erection of 49 new dwellings, landscaped public open space and creation of a formal wetland habitat with boardwalk access.

Application: 12/01029/FUL – Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

Appeal B – The development proposed is erection of 49 dwellings with landscaped open space.

Application: 13/00735/FUL - Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

34. *The contribution to Leicestershire Police has been justified based on crime statistics within the area and demands that would arise from the development. It would fund equipment and infrastructure to support additional personnel within the beat area, not the staffing itself. In terms of civic amenity contributions, the nearest household waste and recycling disposal site is at Barwell. Figures were provided indicating that the site is at or above capacity at peak periods such as Bank Holiday weekends. The contributions would assist in the acquisition of an additional storage container to cater for the waste from this and other new housing developments in the area.*
35. *The Council considers that the police and civic amenity contributions do not meet the tests within Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations (CIL) but does not provide much evidence to support its position. In contrast Leicestershire Police and the County Council have provided significant justification for the contributions, including reference to a number of recent appeal decisions where such contributions have been supported by Inspectors and the Secretary of State.*
36. *The contributions would accord with Policies IMP1, REC2 and REC3 of the LP and the Council's Play and Open Space Guide SPD. In addition the contributions to the County Council are supported by the Statement of Requirements for Developer Contributions in Leicestershire.*
37. *The obligations within the S106 agreements are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, they meet the tests within CIL Regulation 122 and should be taken into account in the decision. I consider that the conditions set out in Paragraph 2.9 of the agreement are satisfied and that the obligations should become effective.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Refs: APP/H1840/A/13/2199085 and APP/H1840/A/13/2199426

Secretary of State Decision: Appeals A and B Allowed - 02 July 2014

Planning Inspector: Harold Stephens BA MPhil Dip TP MRTPI FRSA

Appellants: Barberry Droitwich Ltd (Appeal A) and Persimmon Homes Limited & Prowting Projects Ltd (Appeal B)

Site at Land at Pulley Lane, Newland Road and Primsland Way, Droitwich Spa

Appeal A - The development proposed is an outline planning application for the development of land for up to 500 dwellings (Class C3); up to 200 unit care facility (Class C2); provision of mixed use local centre to include shop (Class A1); financial & professional services (Class A2); restaurants & café (Class A3); drinking establishment (Class A4); hot food takeaway (Class A5); offices (Class B1a) and police post; indoor bowls facility; means of access and estate roads; public open space; landscaping and infrastructure.

Application: W/11/01073/OU – Wychavon District Council

Site at Land North of Pulley Lane and Newland Land, Newland, Droitwich Spa

Appeal B - The development proposed is an outline application for the construction of a maximum of 265 dwellings with associated car parking, access, infrastructure provision and open space.

Application: W/12/02336/OU - Wychavon District Council

19 *The Secretary of State has also considered the S106 Planning Agreement in respect of Appeal A submitted by the main parties at the inquiry (IR8.88) and, like the Inspector, he is satisfied that the provisions can be considered to be compliant with CIL Regulation 122 and paragraph 204 of the Framework and that full weight in support of the appeal proposal can therefore be given to the obligations.*

1.15 *With regard to **Appeal A** the planning application was submitted in outline form with all matters reserved except for access. A schedule of the application documents and plans on which the SoS is requested to determine the proposal is at BDL 13. The reader should note that the most helpful plan in this schedule is the Indicative Masterplan. The proposed development is described as including the following components...*

- *A police post*

6.25 *...With other development already underway there is over a 12% increase in the town's population which amounts to a massive effect on local services such as doctors, dentists, schools and the police...*

8.88 *A S106 obligation (BDL5) was submitted at the inquiry and is agreed by the main parties... From all the evidence that is before me I consider that the provisions of the S106 Agreement complies*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

with paragraph 204 of the NPPF and meets the 3 tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. I accord the S106 Agreement significant weight and I have had regard to it as a material consideration in my conclusions...

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/A/12/2183653

Secretary of State Decision: Dismissed - 17 April 2014

Planning Inspector: Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

Appellant: Mr IP Crane

Land South Of Hallbrook Primary School, Crowfoot Way, Broughton Astley, Leicestershire

The proposal is a development of 111 dwellings including a new community hall, sports pitches and associated parking, open space, access and landscaping.

Application: 12/00494/OUT - Harborough District Council

22. *The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's assessment of the Section 106 agreement dated 23 May 2013 at IR62-76. He agrees that all of the contributions would be necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and would accord with the CIL Regulations 2010 and the tests in paragraph 204 of the Framework (IR77).*
70. *The contribution towards policing has been requested by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire [PCCL/ML/1]. The proposal would increase the workload of the Leicestershire Constabulary in terms of additional calls, non-emergency follow ups and additional vehicle miles amongst other things. The contribution would enable the force to respond to this increased workload. It would therefore accord with CS Policy CS12 and the Local Infrastructure Schedule in the CS [HDC13].*
77. *All of the above contributions would therefore be necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms and be directly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind. They would therefore also accord with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Refs: APP/X2410/A/13/2196928 and APP/X2410/A/13/2196929

Secretary of State Decision: Appeals A and B Allowed - 08 April 2014

Planning Inspector: Harold Stevens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

Appellant: William Davis Ltd

Land off Mountsorrel Lane, Rothley, Leicestershire, LE7 7PS

Appeal A: construction of a maximum of 250 dwellings, replacement primary school, change of use from dwelling to medical facility, change of use from agricultural land to domestic curtilages, green infrastructure, potential garden extensions, construction of a relief road, and demolition of barns in accordance with application ref: P/12/2005/2, dated 20 September 2012; and

Application: P/12/2005/2 – Charnwood Borough Council

Appeal B: an area of public open space including water balancing ponds and green infrastructure in accordance with application ref: P/12/2456/2 dated 21 November 2012.

Application: P/12/2456/2 - Charnwood Borough Council

- 16 *The Secretary of State has also considered the Planning Obligations as described by the Inspector at IR8.42-8.47. He agrees with the Inspector (IR8.42) that all the provisions included in the executed Section 106 Agreement dated 13 December 2013 are necessary and comply with the Framework and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. He also agrees with the Inspector (IR8.43-8.46) that the completed s106 Unilateral Undertaking, dated 13 December 2013, between the Appellant, the Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire (APP10) meets the tests of Regulation 122 and the Framework and should be regarded as a material consideration.*
- 5.1 *The sum of £106,978 is sought by The Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire (LP) towards Police infrastructure that would mitigate the impact of the proposed development. That figure has been arrived at following a close and careful analysis of the current levels of policing demand and deployment in Charnwood, so that the impact of the development could be properly assessed and a contribution sought that accurately reflects the precise need that would arise from the development of 250 new homes on the appeal site. LP3 page 17 contains an itemised breakdown of the anticipated expenditure on Police services/items dedicated towards the appeal development.*
- 5.2 *It is noted that the Landowner in this matter does not accept that any part of the Police Contribution meets the CIL tests as recited in the Unilateral Undertaking at clause 1.2.10. However, there appears to be no criticism by the Appellant of the approach taken by LP to the contribution requested, and no evidence has been produced to undermine the conclusions LP arrive at as to the nature and level of contribution required to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on LP resources.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

- 5.3 *The sum requested equates to approximately £427.91 per dwelling. That sum can only be arrived at by working backwards - it is not a roof tax applied to all proposed residential developments in the force area because that would not reflect the individual circumstances and needs of each development. For example, in the Land south of Moira Road appeal APP/G2435/A/13/2192131, the contribution per dwelling amounted to approximately £300 whereas in the Land at Melton Road appeal APP/X2410/A/12/2173673, the contribution worked out to be £590.85 per dwelling. In both instances, the requests were found to be CIL compliant.*
- 5.4 *Mr Lambert explains through the documentation submitted in respect of the initial application and for this appeal why the Police seek contributions, including the planning policy justification at both national and district level, and the difficulties associated with funding new infrastructure items in response to growth in residential development which places additional demand on police resources. The Inspector considering the Land at Melton Road Appeal at paragraph 291 accepted that "the introduction of additional population and property to an area must have an impact on policing, in the same way as it must on education and library services for example," and went on to conclude:*
- "Moreover, it also seems to me that the twelfth core planning principle of the Framework, that planning should... "take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs", can only be served if policing is adequate to the additional burdens imposed on it in the same way as any other local public service. The logic of this is inescapable. Section 8 of the Framework concerns the promotion of healthy communities and planning decisions, according to paragraph 69, should aim to achieve places which promote, inter alia, "safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion."*
- 5.5 *Those conclusions were endorsed in the SoS's decision letter at paragraph 20.*
- 5.6 *Mr Lambert also explains why current revenue sources e.g. Council tax receipts, are insufficient to respond to growth in residential development, and are unable to fund much needed infrastructure to mitigate the additional demand placed on police resources by that growth. That position was examined and verified by external consultants employed by Local Councils in the Leicestershire Growth Impact Assessment of 2009; the Executive Summary is reproduced at Mr Lambert's Appendix 4.*
- 5.7 *There is no spare capacity in the existing infrastructure to accommodate new growth and any additional demand, in circumstances where additional infrastructure is not provided, would impact on the ability of police to provide a safe and appropriate level of service and to respond to the needs of the local community in an effective way. That outcome would be contrary to policy and without the contribution the development would be unacceptable in planning terms. It is right, as the Inspector accepted in the Melton Road decision (paragraph 292), that adequate policing is fundamental to the concept of sustainable communities. It is therefore necessary for the developer to provide a contribution so that adequate infrastructure and effective policing can be delivered; that is provided for through the Unilateral Undertaking APP10.*
- 5.8 *Mr Lambert has addressed each and every item of infrastructure required in his evidence and has sought to justify each request by reference to the 3 tests of Regulation 122 of the 2010*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Regulations and also paragraph 204 of the NPPF. Those tests provide the framework in which LP work to assess the appropriate level of contribution necessary to mitigate the impact of residential development - a process which is under constant review to keep requests up-to-date and accurate as demonstrated by the recent letter dated 14 November 2013 amending the total sum sought in respect of Police vehicles downwards to reflect the fact that an average of 10% of the original value of a vehicle will be redeemed upon disposal.

- 5.9 *Furthermore, LP confirms that the contribution can be, and would be spent on infrastructure to serve the appeal development because the sum requested is not required to meet with a funding deficit elsewhere or to service existing development. The contribution sought is therefore directly related to the development.*
- 5.10 *In conclusion, the request for a contribution towards additional Police infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the appeal proposal is a necessary, carefully considered and lawful request. The request is directly related to the development and to mitigating the impacts it would generate based on an examination of present demand levels and existing deployment in the District.*
- 5.11 *The request is wholly related to the scale and kind to the appeal development and the Inspector, and SoS are respectfully asked to conclude the same.*
- 5.12 *The Appellant does not accept that any part of the LP requested contribution meets the tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. The LPA has indicated that it is neutral in relation to the request.*
- 8.42 *APP9 is a signed and completed s106 Planning Obligation Agreement, dated 13 December 2013, between the Appellant, the LPA and LCC. The Agreement covers the following matters...*
- 8.43 *The Appellant has also submitted two s106 Unilateral Undertakings in respect of financial contributions requested by the Police and Crime Commissioner for Leicestershire Police... The Appellant is not satisfied that these contributions are CIL compliant. The LPA has indicated that it is a neutral in relation to both requests.*
- 8.44 *APP10 is a signed and completed s106 Unilateral Undertaking, dated 13 December 2013, between the Appellant, the LPA and the LP. The sum of £106,978 is sought by LP towards Police infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development. Schedule 1 of the Undertaking provides details of the contribution and how it would be used to deliver adequate infrastructure and effective policing. Document LP2, prepared by LP, provides a statement of compliance with the CIL Regulations 2010.*
- 8.45 *In my view the sum of £106,978 has been arrived at following a close and careful analysis of the current levels of policing demand and deployment in Charnwood, so that the impact of the development could be properly assessed and a contribution sought that accurately reflects the precise need that would arise from the development of 250 new homes on the appeal site. The LP has confirmed that the contribution would be spent on infrastructure to serve the appeal development and is not required to meet a funding deficit elsewhere or to service existing development.*
- 8.46 *I consider that the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable, it is directly related to the development and to mitigating the impacts that it would generate and it is*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The Undertaking therefore meets the 3 tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulation 2010 and the criteria in paragraph 204 of the NPPF. I accord the Undertaking significant weight and I have had regard to it as a material consideration in my conclusions.

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/A/13/2200867

Appeal Decision: Dismissed - 02 January 2014

Planning Inspector: Martin Whitehead LLB BSc(Hons) CEng MICE

Appellants: Mrs S Shropshire-Boddy, H Knowles and J E Smith

Land at Seine Lane/Forest Road, Enderby, Leicestershire

The development proposed is the erection of up to 244 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and vehicular access.

Application: 12/0823/1/OX - Blaby District Council

41. *At the inquiry, the appellants submitted an engrossed Section 106 Agreement. The planning obligations would secure 30% affordable housing, contributions towards a bus service, bus passes, travel packs, highway improvements, healthcare, libraries, police and the maintenance of the proposed footbridge and public open space that would form part of the scheme. I have considered the evidence provided in writing and at the inquiry, including that from Leicestershire County Council regarding contributions towards libraries and from Leicestershire Police regarding contributions towards policing services and facilities, to demonstrate that the obligations meet the tests in Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Refs: APP/T2405/A/13/2193758 and APP/T2405/A/13/2193761

Appeal Decision: Appeals A and B Allowed - 01 August 2013

Planning Inspector: Martin Whitehead LLB BSc(Hons) CEng MICE

Appellant: David Wilson Homes (East Midlands)

Land east of Springwell Lane, Whetstone, Leicestershire LE8 6LT

Appeal A: The development proposed is residential development of up to 150 dwellings and parkland with associated access, infrastructure and landscaping.

Application: 12/0952/1/OX – Blaby District Council

Land off Countesthorpe Road and Springwell Lane, Whetstone, Leicestershire

Appeal B: The development proposed is formation of access for use by construction traffic in conjunction with proposed residential development.

Application: 12/0951/1/PY - Blaby District Council

28. *The appellant has submitted an engrossed Section 106 Agreement for Appeal A after the close of the hearing. The planning obligations would secure 25% affordable housing, contributions towards public transport, cycling, a travel pack, highway improvements, healthcare, libraries, police and the maintenance of the public open space that would form part of the scheme. I have considered the evidence provided in writing and at the hearing in support of the contributions to satisfy myself that the obligations meet the tests in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 122. These tests are that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.*
33. *Leicestershire Police (LP) has supported the need for contributions towards policing services and facilities in its statement and at the hearing. The required contributions are significantly less than those considered by the previous Inspector, and LP have suggested that it has used a different method of calculation, based on the impact of the development itself. Therefore, I am satisfied that the sum provided for in the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, having regard to the requirements in paragraph 58 of the Framework to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.*
35. *Having regard to the above, I conclude on the Section 106 Agreement that all the planning obligations meet the tests in CIL Regulation 122 and paragraph 204 of the Framework. Without the obligations, the proposal would fail to accord with the relevant development plan policies and would have unacceptable impacts on local facilities and services and affordable housing in the District.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/A/13/2192205

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 25 July 2013

Planning Inspector: Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

Appellant: Gladman Developments Ltd

Barnett Road, Steventon, Oxfordshire, OX13 6AJ

The proposal is for residential development of up to 50 dwellings, landscape, open space, highway improvement and associated works.

Application: P12/V1980/O – Vale of White Horse District Council

21. *The completed Unilateral Undertaking and Planning Obligation (the latter being the agreement with the County Council) contain other obligations including ones relating to contributions towards police, street naming, works of art, education, public transport, bus stop, library and museum. On the basis of the evidence submitted, I am satisfied that all of these obligations satisfy the tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL regulations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/A/13/2191911

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 11 July 2013

Planning Inspector: J.P. Watson BSc MICE FCIHT MCMI

Appellant: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Land east of Drayton Road, Abingdon, Oxfordshire

The development proposed is described as 160 residential dwellings, open space, a new access off Drayton Road, engineering (including ground modelling) works, infrastructure works (including drainage works, utilities provision and site reclamation), car parking and lighting.

Application: P12/V2266/FUL – Vale of White Horse District Council

95. *The planning obligation between the site owners, the Appellant and Vale of White Horse District Council makes provision for various on- and off-site elements. The on-site elements include a work of art, street nameplates and waste and recycling bins and the off-site elements include sports facilities and equipment for the Police. I find insufficient evidence to support the work of art contribution and so I attribute little weight to it. I am satisfied that in all other respects the planning obligation meets the three tests in Framework paragraph 204, and so I attribute full weight to the planning obligation in those respects.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/A/13/2192131

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 30 May 2013

Planning Inspector: Colin Ball DArch DCons RIBA IHBC

Appellant: J S Bloor (Measham) Ltd

Land south of Moira Road, Ashby-de-la-Zouch LE65 2NJ

The development proposed in 2009 was described as the erection of 83 no. dwellings with associated garaging and formation of new access road to Moira Road.

Application: 09/00620/FUL - North West Leicestershire District Council

36. *...The additional population would also bring additional policing requirements, which would need to be addressed.*
37. *The s106 Agreement would effectively bind the appellant to providing 18 affordable dwellings as part of the development. It would also require the appellant to make, and the District Council and County Council to disburse, contributions of...*
- *£24,903 towards the capital costs of policing the development*
39. *Evidence submitted to the inquiry showed that, without these contributions, the development would not be acceptable in planning terms because of its harmful impact on local infrastructure. These measures are therefore necessary to mitigate that impact. The need for additional facilities arises directly from the development of the site so the contributions are directly related to it. The extent of additional provision in each case has been carefully considered and is proportionate, appropriate and no more than is necessary to meet the additional demands, so the provisions of the Agreement are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. The provisions of the Agreement therefore comply with 203 of the Framework and meet the tests of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010. I therefore consider that the harmful impact of the proposal on local infrastructure would be satisfactorily overcome by the binding planning obligations.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/A/12/2173673

Secretary of State Decision: Allowed - 14 May 2013

Planning Inspector: Keith Manning BSc (Hons) BTP MRTPI

Appellant: Jelson Homes

Land at Melton Road, Barrow Upon Soar, Leicestershire, LE12 8NN

The development proposed is residential development (300 dwellings).

Application: P/10/1518/2 - Charnwood Borough Council

20. *With regard to the Planning Obligation (IR4, IR216-218, and IR283-301), the Secretary of State is satisfied that the provisions set out in the signed and sealed Planning Agreement dated 14 October 2012, as varied by the Deed of Variation dated 15 January 2013 (to make its provisions conditional upon their items being determined by the Secretary of State to meet the statutory tests) can be considered to be compliant with CIL Regulation 122...*
288. *The 'Police Authority Contribution' is for £177,255. The manner in which the authority would seek to spend it is set out in the Third Schedule to the Planning Obligation. By letter to the Planning Inspectorate of 6 August 2012, the Leicestershire Constabulary explained in some detail its approach to the use of S106 monies for police infrastructure throughout the county, supported by a number of appeal decisions in which it was concluded that the contributions in each case passed the relevant tests and could therefore be accorded weight. The letter appends (Appendix 2) a useful note from the Association of Chief Police Officers which draws the distinction between capital expenditure on equipment and premises, the basic infrastructure of policing, and revenue expenditure which might reasonably be expected to be supported by the increased number of households. A January 2012 policy statement from the Leicestershire Police Authority 'Policing Contributions from Development Schemes' is also included. This sets out its approach to the increased pressure on policing from additional housing development. The document includes at Section 7 the principles whereby financial contributions will be deployed, including provision for repayment if the police authority fails to spend the contributions, linkage to the development in question and use for additional needs arising from it and a "clear audit trail demonstrating that financial contributions have been used in a manner that meets the tests" (in the subsequently cancelled Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations.)*
289. *Those tests are essentially the same as those of the extant CIL Regulations and hence there is a clear recognition by the Leicestershire Police Authority that development is not simply a source of additional finance to be spent in an unspecified or unrelated way. Moreover, the appellant in this case has "signed up" to the Policing Contribution, albeit under, it seems, protest. The evidence of Mr Thorley addresses this matter at Section 12 and his Appendix 10 is a paper on the topic that refers to a number of appeal decisions where a contribution to policing has not been supported, for example the appeal in Sapcote (Ref APP/T2405/A/11/2164413) in which the Inspector comments, in paragraph 41 of his decision, that... "it has not been shown, in the light of the statutory tests, that the contribution would be directly linked to the impacts arising from the appeal proposal."*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

290. *Equally, the material submitted by the Police Authority under cover of its letter of 6 August 2012 includes a number of appeal decisions pointing in the opposite direction, for example the appeal in Bottesford (Ref APP/Y2430/A/11/2161786) where the Inspector comments, in paragraph 68, that “there was also specific justification of the individual elements within this global sum directly related to the circumstances of the appeal proposal. Therefore the contribution does meet all three tests for CIL compliance.”*
291. *The Inspectors will have reached their own conclusions on the particular evidence and submissions put to them at appeal and I shall approach the evidence in this case in the same way, i.e. on its merits. It seems to me that the introduction of additional population and property to an area must have an impact on policing, in the same way as it must on education and library services, for example. Moreover, it also seems to me that the twelfth core planning principle of the Framework, that planning should... “take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs”, can only be served if policing is adequate to the additional burdens imposed on it in the same way as any other local public service. The logic of this is inescapable. Section 8 of the Framework concerns the promotion of healthy communities and planning decisions, according to paragraph 69, should aim to achieve places which promote, inter alia, “safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.”*
292. *Adequate policing is so fundamental to the concept of sustainable communities that I can see no reason, in principle, why it should be excluded from the purview of S106 financial contributions, subject to the relevant tests applicable to other public services. There is no reason, it seems to me why police equipment and other items of capital expenditure necessitated by additional development should not be so funded, alongside, for example, additional classrooms and stock and equipment for libraries.*
293. *In this case, the planning obligation clearly sets out in its third schedule the items anticipated to be needed as a consequence of policing the proposed development alongside the existing settlement and apportioned accordingly. It seems to me to be sufficiently transparent to be auditable and at a cost equivalent to, perhaps (if 300 dwellings are constructed) £590.85 per dwelling, it does not equate to an arbitrary “roof tax” of the type complained of, whatever previous practice may have been.*
294. *For these reasons I am of the view that the ‘Police Authority Contribution’ is compliant with the CIL Regulations and that weight should therefore be accorded to it as a means of mitigating the predicted impact of the development.*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/W0340/A/12/2189422

Appeal Decision: Allowed – 13 May 2013

Planning Inspector: Anthony Lyman BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Appellant: Shanley Homes Ltd

1055 & 1057 Oxford Road, Tilehurst, Reading, RG31 6YE

The development proposed is the demolition of the existing dwellings of 1055 and 1057 Oxford Road and the erection of 29 No. dwellings with associated access, parking, turning and landscaping.

Application: 12/02111/OUTMAJ – West Berkshire Council

13. A signed and dated s106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) has been submitted relating to the provision of nine affordable dwellings on the site, and committing the appellants to various financial contributions regarding highway infrastructure; open space provision; library services; health care requirements; adult social care provision; education and equipment for Thames Valley Police. The Council has confirmed that the layout and mix of proposed affordable housing is appropriate, with which I agree. The Council has also submitted statements and topic papers justifying the need for the financial contributions which I have considered with regard to the statutory tests in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. From the evidence submitted, the provisions of the UU fairly and reasonably relate to the development proposed and meet the tests. I have, therefore, accorded the UU appropriate weight.

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/A/12/2187470

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 15 April 2013

Planning Inspector: Paul E Dobsen MA (Oxon) DipTP MRTPI FRGS

Appellant: GEG Properties

Land at (the former) Rearsby Roses Ltd, Melton Road, East Goscote LE7 4YP

The development proposed is “erection of 60 dwellings following demolition of nursery buildings and formation of site access (revised scheme)”.

Application: P/12/1709/2 - Charnwood Borough Council

3. *Likewise, the main parties agree that the provision of some 18 dwellings as affordable housing (30% of 60, in accordance with the Council’s policy), together with various financial contributions towards local infrastructure - including payments to the Council, Leicestershire County Council and Leicestershire Police - would be met by the terms of a unilateral planning obligation [Doc 4], submitted at the hearing.*
35. *At the hearing the appellants tabled a signed and executed S106 unilateral planning obligation containing various clauses including: (in schedule 1) those relating to the provision of 18 units of affordable housing; (in schedule 2) the payment of monies to the Council comprising a health facilities contribution (approx. £14,000), a police contribution (approx. £25,000), and an open space contribution (approx. £42,000); and (in schedule 3) payments to Leicestershire County Council towards education (approx. £110,000) and transport (approx. £17,000); together with miscellaneous matters.*
36. *There was some discussion at the hearing as to the justification for some of the financial contributions sought. However, having regard to all the evidence to the hearing, and the criteria in para. 204 of the Framework, I am satisfied that all these provisions for infrastructure payments are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. They also meet the 3 statutory tests set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/A/12/2179844

Appeal Decision: Allowed - 14 February 2013

Planning Inspector: Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Appellant: William Davis Limited

Land north of Bill Crane Way, Lutterworth, Leicestershire.

The application sought outline planning permission for residential development with associated infrastructure, public open space and provision of vehicular and pedestrian access without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 11/00117/OUT, dated 23 January 2012.

Application: 12/00613/VAC - Harborough District Council

26. *The UU covenants in favour of the Council contributions in respect of the provision and maintenance of open space as part of the development and towards allotments, cemetery provision, policing services, medical facilities, recycling, community facilities and the provision of 30% of the units of affordable housing. The UU also covenants in favour of the Leicestershire County Council financial contributions towards education, public transport measures including bus stops, travel packs and bus passes, and library provision.*
27. *Whilst the Council and the County Council confirmed that the terms of the submitted UU were acceptable, the appellant questioned whether the contribution in respect of policing was compliant with the tests set out in the CIL Regulations. The appellant suggests that there is no evidence that the proposed development would result in a need for increased police resources. It is also argued that there should be no automatic assumption that the development should bear the cost of the provision of additional policing since the anticipated growth of such costs in this area could have been budgeted for and the new residents will generate Council Tax revenue.*
28. *However, it is recognised by both the County Council and the Council's guidance that a contribution towards policing could be triggered if there is a need arising from the development. The guidance therefore establishes the principle of a contribution although there needs to be clear evidence that the level of contribution would be justified having regard to the tests set out in the CIL Regulations.*
29. *The written evidence submitted by Leicestershire Police detailed the impact the proposed development would have on policing, forecasting the number of potential incidents and the anticipated effect this would have on staffing, accommodation, vehicles and equipment. In view of the requirement of national planning policy to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life, it is considered that, on the evidence before me, a contribution towards policing is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.*
30. *Whilst the additional staff, accommodation, vehicles and equipment detailed by the Police could not be regarded as being for the exclusive use of the development, they would be necessary to*

EXAMPLES OF APPEAL DECISIONS SUPPORTING THE POLICE

provide for the effective policing of and to attend incidents on the site. In addition the number of staff and level of resources required to police the development has been based on the number of incidents estimated to be generated by the site. In respect of policing services the UU makes provision for the payment of £426 per dwelling and this is the figure sought by Leicestershire Police. The level and range of the mitigation would therefore appear to be directly related to the development and also to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it.

- 31. I have had regard to the fact that the s106 Agreement, dated 18 January 2012, in respect of the existing outline planning permission makes provision for a contribution of £606 per dwelling for policing. The appellant has indicated that this agreement was concluded under time pressure and the police have had a change in policy since, under which only major developments would be targeted for contributions. However, the report also states that contributions would be pursued where a significant impact on policing is foreseen and can be quantified. It would appear that the most relevant implication of the change in policy is that the contribution required by the police in respect of this appeal was reduced following quantification of the anticipated effect of the development. This affirms my view that the UU before me meets the CIL tests.*
- 32. Reference has been made to a number of appeal decisions where it has been concluded that the police contributions failed to meet the tests and others where a contrary conclusion has been reached. However, I am not aware of the scope of the evidence provided in these cases and a comparison with the appeal cannot therefore be made.*
- 33. On the basis of the evidence before me, therefore, I am satisfied that the contribution towards policing set out in the UU is necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind – as required by the tests set out in the CIL Regulations. I conclude the same with regard to the elements of the UU which are not in dispute and I have taken the UU into consideration in reaching my decision.*