

## **WBC response to Arborfield and Newland Parish Council: Reconciliation of infrastructure projects**

---

1. Arborfield and Newland Parish Council (the Parish Council) have queried differences between the costs contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) ([WBC 28](#)) and the Loddon Valley Financial Viability Assessment (FVA) ([WBC 29](#)) as set out in documents [REP 2A](#) and [REP 2B](#). The costs contained within the FVA are around £80m higher than those in the IDP.
2. The differences are simply explained by two aspects:
  1. The different purpose and scope of the IDP and FVA; and
  2. The different naming or disaggregation of projects within the IDP and FVA.
3. Accounting for the above, the costs are consistent and demonstrate that the Loddon Valley Garden Village (LVGV) allocation can be delivered viably.

### The different purposes and scope of the IDP and FVA

4. This IDP has been prepared to identify the key infrastructure necessary to support the growth promoted in the plan, including relating to the LVGV allocation.
5. The FVA provides a holistic appraisal of development values and costs. In doing so, the FVA considers the costs of infrastructure items identified in the IDP plus costs which are integral to the delivery of the site itself and items which do not constitute physical infrastructure. For example, the FVA includes costs for site preparation, internal drainage, internal roads, internal junctions, the recruitment of a community manager, the implementation of an employment and skills plan, and a contribution to a parish council fund.

### The naming and disaggregation of projects

6. A small number of infrastructure projects are named differently or disaggregated in the FVA compared to the IDP.
7. One example is the costs associated with primary school provision. In the IDP a cost of £13.5 million per 3 form entry primary school is identified, which includes space for the integrated teaching of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities. The FVA includes these costs but disaggregated into three projects:
  - URN60A – Primary education 3 form entry. £11,646, 475.
  - URN62A – Early years provision – within new primary schools. £880,080.
  - URN63A – SEND Provision primary. £880,080.
  - Total: £13.4 million.

8. A second example is the costs relating to Lower Earley Way. The IDP refers to 'Lower Earley Way: Single lane widening between Rushey Way and Hatch Farm Way' at a cost of £2.91 million. The FVA disaggregates this item into three projects:
- URN38A - Upgrade Lower Earley Way 1 lane widening between Rushey Way and Winnersh Relief Road – North. £1,146,177.
  - URN38B - Upgrade Lower Earley Way 1 lane widening between Rushey Way and Winnersh Relief Road – South. £1,286,496.
  - URN38C - Upgrade Lower Earley Way 1 lane widening between Rushey Way and Winnersh Relief Road – Bridge. £470,847.
  - Total: £2.9 million.

#### Summary and conclusion

9. The difference of circa £80m reflects the different purpose and wider scope of costs considered by the FVA, covering both the costs of infrastructure identified in the IDP plus costs which are integral to the development site itself. A small number of items are named or amalgamated differently in the IDP and FVA.
10. Accounting for the different purpose and scope of the documents, the costs are consistent and demonstrate that the LVGV allocation can be delivered viably.