


Planning for

Infrastructure

in Worcestershire

ESTABLISHING PRIORITIES




**Worcestershire:
Fit for the Future**

- Open for Business
- Children and Families
- The Environment
- Health and Well-being

Update

June 2012

Find out more online:
www.worcestershire.gov.uk

 **worcestershire**
county council

1. Introduction

1.1 This paper presents issues and options for the prioritisation of infrastructure required to support sustainable growth within Worcestershire. It forms part of the background to inform the County Infrastructure Plan.

1.2 This paper seeks to:

- Identify key strategic policy objectives in relation to infrastructure delivery in Worcestershire;
- Research and review existing criteria;
- Establish criteria to help the prioritisation process;
- Identify potential priority infrastructure projects by theme and geography within a 5-year phased period linked, where relevant, to strategic development sites;
- Acknowledge expectations and any competing priorities;
- Identify consultation to be undertaken with stakeholders.

2. What does 'priority' mean?

2.1 Priority infrastructure is that which is needed most urgently to meet strategic economic, environmental and social policy objectives, respond to demographic change and enable the delivery of new development. It is important to ensure that resources are targeted towards those infrastructure elements that deliver the greatest benefit, and wherever possible, provide multiple benefits across a range of thematic/geographic areas to ensure maximum value. This may include infrastructure necessary to 'unlock' sites that would otherwise not be ready for development.

3. Defining the priorities

3.1 The challenge of providing infrastructure to support sustainable development is significant. There are many with an interest in infrastructure, and they may have different expectations of what types of infrastructure need to be delivered, to what extent, and to what timescales. This paper considers infrastructure priorities to help inform the needs of development planned through the local planning process, as well as wider strategic objectives in relation to supporting economic growth, the provision of public services, and climate change mitigation and adaptation. In doing so the paper attempts to distinguish between the geographical levels (sub-regional/county, district, and strategic site) at which different types of infrastructure should be planned, and how this may influence prioritisation.

4. Review of existing priorities

4.1 Local and wider policy, guidance and documentation provide a wide range of infrastructure issues that are important to different groups. It is necessary to make a judgment on which of the documents and directions carry the most weight in order to establish which are the highest priority infrastructure 'themes' which need to be delivered. Because it would be unmanageable to consider every potential thematic plan due to the specific and detailed issues covered, the documents selected are those providing strategic overview. For example, whilst specific PPG17 audits and the Worcestershire Biodiversity Action Plan have not been included, the emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy which takes these into account has been included. The following sources should be considered in helping to inform the priorities:

- Worcestershire Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-13
- Worcestershire Single Sustainable Community Strategy Consultation April 2011
- Worcestershire County Council Corporate Plan 2009-13
- Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership submission document
- Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026 (Draft)
- Worcestershire Local Investment Plan
- Worcestershire Economic Strategy 2008-18
- Worcestershire Climate Change Strategy 2005-11
- Worcestershire PCT Operational Plan 2009
- Worcestershire PCT 5 Year Strategic Plan
- Worcestershire Health Improvement Strategy 2008 – 2013
- Worcestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Adult Health and Well-being 2009/10
- Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy
- South Worcestershire Development Plan Public Consultation September 2011
- Redditch Borough Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy
- Bromsgrove District Draft Core Strategy 2
- Wyre Forest District Core Strategy 2006-2026

4.2 The Worcestershire LEP referred to a number of infrastructure requirements in its 'Worcestershire Works' submission document; these priorities are included in Appendix 1 and have informed the lists at Section 4.

4.3 The key issues and priorities from these sources have been summarised at Appendix 1. It is recognised that the policy framework continues to evolve, as plans, strategies and policies are revised. To ensure infrastructure needs are informed by the most appropriate set of priorities, this document will be updated periodically, and at least annually, to reflect the latest policy developments.

4.4 The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) provides a useful list of those elements that are needed to create sustainable communities. These are utility services, transport, schools, open space, community, health and leisure services. For the purposes of demonstrating the deliverability of Local Development Frameworks, PAS suggest that

local authorities should *"try and take a proportionate and pragmatic approach and focus on those requirements that are **key to delivery in the first few years** of the plan, and **which if not delivered would impact on the overall spatial vision** – what proposals are **central to the strategy**, and where funding is not available what other options have been considered"*.

4.5 At the county level, based upon the key sources listed above, and from discussions with infrastructure providers, the overarching county-wide issues/ambitions of key importance for Worcestershire can be summarised as:

1. High speed broadband
2. Developing high growth strategic employment sites and creating & sustaining business and inward investment in main centres
3. Investing in skills in the workforce
4. Housing to support high growth employment sites and main employment centres
5. Mitigating and adapting to climate change
6. Strengthening highways infrastructure and public transport
7. Developing social, community and green infrastructure
8. Managing Worcestershire's resources (utilities infrastructure)
9. Tackling the environmental contributors to obesity and improving access to health services

4.6 Whilst overarching strategic infrastructure can best be planned at a LEP and county level through considering broad, county-wide ambitions, it is also necessary to drill down to a finer level of detail and to add a spatial dimension to the prioritisation, by identifying key infrastructure needs for specific areas within north and south Worcestershire. There may be 'tensions' between infrastructure needed at the county and district scale, and dividing the key themes between the northern districts (Bromsgrove, Redditch and Wyre Forest) and the southern districts (Malvern Hills, Worcester City and Wychavon) should help to ensure local issues are fully considered.

North Worcestershire Priorities

1. Regeneration of Kidderminster through the 'ReWyre' programme.
2. Investment in Bromsgrove town centre
3. Providing employment to the north side of Stourport
4. Investment in housing and regeneration in Redditch town centre and district centres.
5. Support the future development of technology-intensive business activity along the A38 corridor, including Bromsgrove Technology Park and potentially Longbridge Technology Park
6. Kidderminster Transport Strategy;
7. Redditch Transport Strategy.
8. Creating better access for strategic businesses and supply chains to the motorway network through improvements to east-west links and the A449.

South Worcestershire Priorities

1. Enabling the development of Worcester Technology Park
2. Continued investment in Malvern Hills Science Park
3. Expansion of the University of Worcester and Worcester College of Technology
4. Further investment in Malvern town's retail, office and public realm.
5. Secure new employment in Droitwich Spa
6. Regenerating Evesham's high street, station and riverside, and developing a leisure project at Evesham Country Park
7. Investing in town centre environment and providing small office space in Pershore, Upton and Tenbury
8. Road access from the motorway network to north Worcestershire
9. Evesham Abbey Bridge and Viaduct major transport scheme;
10. Worcester Transport Strategy (Phase 1); Worcestershire Parkway; Improving the by-pass leading to the Hereford and Bromyard roads to Herefordshire.
11. Road access from the motorway network to Malvern Hills Science Park

5. Wider issues not (yet) covered in policy

5.1 Alongside the issues identified in the document review, there are key themes such as the natural environment that must be taken into account.

5.2 Discussions with infrastructure providers as part of ongoing work for the Worcestershire Infrastructure Strategy will help to establish the level of importance of each infrastructure element. Different interests may each consider their own particular infrastructure requirement to be non-negotiable, but in practice planners/councillors will need to decide whether or not a given piece of infrastructure is needed for a site to go ahead, or for a strategy to be delivered.

6. Difficulties and Conflicts

6.1 The all-encompassing nature of Sustainable Community Strategies makes it difficult to extract specific priorities. Whilst there are 'themes' and 'priority outcomes' in the SCS, by seeking to address all thematic areas there is an inevitable lack of focus, leading to a lack of clarity over which issues are most important or need to be addressed most urgently. Similar difficulties arise when considering the visions of the overarching corporate and planning documents; by referring to almost all possible issues and adopting very idealistic approaches, it is impossible to extract those issues which must be prioritised. A robust consultation process, alongside a close consideration of what can realistically be delivered, will help to clarify the priorities.

6.2 The priorities of different organisations will differ, and in many cases will be determined by legal obligations. The powers and objectives of different agencies involved in the planning and delivery of infrastructure can vary significantly. As an example, there may not be a close match between the priorities of service providers and the priorities of the LEP; for transport, the LEP's primary concern may be the efficient transport of goods and workers, but service providers must also consider wider access

to services, including by the non-economically active (children, the unemployed and retirees), and are likely to give greater attention to walking, cycling and public transport.

6.3 The needs of businesses and the need for housing growth - as expressed through the LEP and the LIP - may not always be complementary to environmental and social criteria. A key example of this is the desire from business to secure greater road access to the motorway network, and the need to reduce climate change by reducing CO₂ emissions.

6.4 Affordable housing presents a particular difficulty in terms of its status and funding, as it is often omitted from wider 'infrastructure' considerations (for example Core Strategy Infrastructure Schedules). Indeed, it is not included within the needs and issues papers produced as part of this infrastructure work. However, affordable housing raises many of the same issues of funding and prioritisation as other infrastructure items. There has been speculation that the government's proposed CIL Regulations may be amended to allow affordable housing to be included within the definition of infrastructure for the purposes of CIL spending.

7. Limitations: Influence of Funding

7.1 Infrastructure will only be delivered where it can be funded. While funding streams can and will change over time, it is important to ensure a realistic consideration of how successfully a given piece of infrastructure can be progressed. Certain funding regimes are likely to be guaranteed to provide at least some infrastructure funds (Community Infrastructure Levy, s106 developer contributions), but there are some streams (such as Tax Incremental Financing) which cannot be guaranteed, and some infrastructure will be dependent on successful bidding (e.g. Regional Growth Fund). Market conditions will also influence delivery of infrastructure, as an identified infrastructure item may be contingent on wider development, the viability of which can change over time. A weakened market could also lead to developers seeking to renegotiate earlier agreements, with potentially negative impacts on infrastructure delivery, whilst the need for the infrastructure could actually increase. Such instances should be minimised with the introduction of CIL, as the charges will generally be non-negotiable, but delivery will still depend upon parent schemes actually being developed. Further information on funding is contained within the *Infrastructure Funding Mechanisms* evidence paper.

8. Flexibility and Risk

8.1 In order to ensure that the right type of infrastructure can be delivered where and when it is needed, the priorities must have a degree of flexibility, and must recognise risk of non- or delayed delivery. Inevitably, circumstances will change over time; funding streams may disappear, developers may withdraw from major schemes, and the policy context and political priorities could shift. All of this means that the priorities must be able to respond to change. For this reason, it is recommended that the priorities are established for 5-yearly periods and kept under annual review. An additional list of longer-term, aspirational priorities can be established to provide an indication of likely future development.

9. Community/localism

9.1 An increasingly important factor guiding infrastructure priorities is the community/localism agenda. The CIL, for example, will be used in part to address locally-derived community concerns. It is therefore crucial to ensure that these concerns, where they exist, are known and costed. In terms of prioritising infrastructure, it is essential to ensure that whilst community concerns are recognised, overly-localised requirements cannot override evidence-based strategic needs. A county-wide infrastructure strategy is not the appropriate place to address specific local impacts, which will be dealt with at the district/neighbourhood scale. As Neighbourhood Plans come forward, they may call for specific infrastructure within particular neighbourhoods, but where this is not a strategic issue (and such issues are unlikely to be crucial to delivering large-scale development) it is unlikely to be prioritised.

10. Which infrastructure types should be prioritised over others?

10.1 The breadth of priorities from all sectors means there are many types of infrastructure spanning the social, environmental and economic themes.

10.2 At a national level, the government's National Infrastructure Plan lists energy, water, transport, digital communications and waste disposal networks and facilities as constituting 'infrastructure'. These are all engineering-based and do not take into account social infrastructure such as education facilities or emergency services, or environmental infrastructure. While they serve to usefully highlight the absolute physical essentials needed to deliver economic growth, it would not be possible – for wider sustainable development reasons - to take forward large-scale development without providing for these other needs.

10.3 This does not mean that all infrastructure must necessarily be in place at the same time. While all infrastructure is important, certain infrastructure items will inevitably be more important than others. In order to clarify priorities, at this strategic level it is necessary to make difficult choices and it may be that strategic infrastructure necessary to facilitate development will be given a higher priority than community infrastructure. These kinds of decisions will be made as the strategy is further developed, reflecting the need to prioritise infrastructure required to unlock development sites in order to demonstrate deliverability of Core Strategies/Local Plan. There may also be other, non-development related reasons to prioritise infrastructure investment. It may be triggered by wider demographic (e.g. ageing population, increased birth rates), environmental (e.g. adaptation to climate change), economic or technological (e.g. broadband) changes.

10.4 This paper seeks to develop a set of prioritisation criteria to enable these objectives to be taken into account.

11. Which locations should be prioritised?

11.1 The following is an overview of currently known or anticipated development sites of a strategic scale which are likely to require significant infrastructure in order to ensure they contribute to sustainable development. This information is from the Core Strategies and other relevant DPDs of Worcestershire districts.

North Worcestershire

Bromsgrove

Bromsgrove Town Expansion Sites
Bromsgrove Technology Park

Redditch

Brockhill East and West
Land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital
Woodrow Strategic Site
Redditch Town Centre

Wyre Forest

South Kidderminster Business Park (includes British Sugar, Stourport Road)
Kidderminster Central Area Regeneration Sites

South Worcestershire

Malvern Hills

Malvern Hills Science Park
Malvern QinetiQ
Newland

Worcester

Worcester City Centre
Worcester Technology Park
Grove Farm (University Park)
South of Worcester (Broomhall and Norton Barracks)
West of Worcester (Temple Laughern)
Shrub Hill Opportunity Zone

Wychavon

Copcut Lane (Droitwich)
Vale Park (Evesham)
Keytec (Persore)
Urban Extensions to Evesham and Persore

12. Examples from other authorities

12.1 West Berkshire's [Infrastructure Delivery Plan](#) divides infrastructure into three categories: **'critical'** (must be in place before development can proceed); **'necessary'** (needed to support development, but less constrained by timing/phasing); and **'preferred'** (the timing of which is least important). The plan does not specify how the categories of each infrastructure element had been determined.

The above examples illustrate that prioritisation has a temporal and a spatial dimension. This is illustrated in the table below:

	Required to unlock development (in advance)	Required to support major development schemes	Not necessarily development dependent
Strategic Infrastructure	Strategic Highway Capacity WWT upgrades	Secondary Education Broadband	Decentralised Energy Acute healthcare Upgrading existing flood defences Strategic green infrastructure Further / Higher Education Emergency services
Local infrastructure	Flood defences for new development Local electricity upgrades (sub-station) Local highway works	Primary education On site renewables SUDS Local green space	Primary healthcare Libraries

13. Developing Criteria

13.1 The following considerations have been used to inform the prioritisation criteria:

- Strategic fit with local and wider strategies;
- Deliverability/robustness; and
- Contribution to critical interdependencies & sequencing of development activity.

13.2 In addition to these issues, several secondary considerations have been identified that could influence prioritisation. These are:

- Resilience to climate change;
- Multi-functionality;
- Being within an economic/housing/environmental priority area;
- Having community support (can be difficult to determine);
- Value for money (difficult to assess without cost/benefit analysis of all schemes)

13.3 Each of these broad headings can be used to 'test' a given infrastructure element. An aggregated 'score' can then be established for, say, high-speed broadband. While a precise, arithmetical calculation of priority would be desirable, in practice this is unlikely to be sufficiently robust to accommodate the reality of development economics and political decision making. A broad approach has therefore been adopted, whereby infrastructure is assessed against the headings above, with the assessment guided by a series of additional questions. Consultation on earlier versions of the criteria-setting methodology suggested that precise weightings create useful debate, but that the real test of the judgements made comes through consensus agreement.

13.4 An assessment may therefore be made of each identified infrastructure element, with a commentary against each of the relevant issues. Some questions have been deliberately excluded as they would not help in 'filtering' (for example whether or not the infrastructure would contribute to satisfying the SCS – whereby almost all would). The question of risk is determined through considering specific questions relating to deliverability, funding and timeliness.

Strategic fit with local and wider strategies

Would it fulfil corporate and political objectives within Worcestershire?

Is it essential to deliver the Core Strategy/Strategies?

Would it support the Core Strategy vision(s)?

Would it support a DPD (e.g. AAP) or Neighbourhood Plan?

Does it form part of a Major Scheme or package in the Local Transport Plan?

Would delivery help to reduce CO₂ emissions?

Would delivery help adapt to climate change?

Would it provide positive impacts on health?

Would it help to preserve and enhance the natural and historic environment?

Could the infrastructure provide for multiple benefits and increase value?

Will it support sustainable economic development and create jobs?

Deliverability/robustness

Is funding secured?

Are land-ownership issues resolved?

Can it be delivered in time to support development?

Is delivery dependent on other infrastructure being in place first?

Are there any potential alternatives that could deliver similar benefits for less?

Contribution to critical interdependencies

Could delivery compromise other infrastructure or development?

Is there community buy-in?

Does it form part of a wider programme of development?

Is there a statutory duty to provide the infrastructure?

An absolute mechanism for 'scoring' infrastructure needs can be difficult to apply, and some degree of subjective judgment will always be needed. However, as far as possible it is considered useful to apply scoring criteria to each infrastructure 'need' to arrive at a level of priority which is robust and defensible.

Possible criteria applicable at different spatial scales: (Other criteria specified above would apply to all projects)

Sub-regional / County

Is there a statutory duty to provide the infrastructure?

Would it fulfil corporate and political objectives within Worcestershire?

Core Strategy

Is it essential to deliver the Core Strategy?

Is the scheme deliverable (funding secured/land-ownership issues resolved)?

Could delivery compromise other infrastructure or development?

Is there community buy-in?

Strategic Sites (as for Core Strategy plus:)

Can it be delivered in time to support development?

Is delivery dependent on other infrastructure being in place first?

Could the infrastructure provide for multiple benefits and increase value?

An alternative approach to the above would be to consider priorities in terms of overall county-wide list, broken down by an urban/rural split.

Appendix 1: Existing Identified Ambitions

Source	Ambitions
<p>A Single Sustainable Community Strategy for Worcestershire 2011-21</p>	<p>Three key overarching priorities for Worcestershire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A skilled and prosperous economy • An environment that is cherished and resilient • Improving health & wellbeing <p><u>Bromsgrove Partnership Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economic Growth - Balanced Communities - Environment <p><u>Malvern Hills Partnership Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reduce the impact of rurality on our local communities - To tackle issues associated with inequalities, including health inequalities - To raise awareness of key environmental issues and to drive down our reliance on fossil fuels - To protect residents and businesses from the impact of flooding <p><u>Redditch Partnership Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health Inequalities - focus is on three issues: smoking; alcohol; and obesity/health lifestyles. - Education attainment and raising aspirations of young people - focus is on three issues: improving literacy and numeracy; raising aspirations; and improve statistical levels of attainment. - The economy of Redditch with a focus on providing a larger and more diverse job offer - focus is on three broad issues: promotion of Redditch as a business location; jobs and worklessness; and fostering economic ambition in young people. - Areas of deprivation with an initial focus on Winyates and Church Hill - Winyates project focuses on: enhanced security measures for residential areas in Centre; and community engagement in the area. <p><u>Worcester Alliance Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Priority One - Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To have the right infrastructure in place to support a successful and growing economy ➤ To support business growth and expansion and attract new businesses which provide a diverse economy and more, higher paid, quality jobs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To ensure the City has a vibrant retail offer ➤ To make sure that people have the right skills for existing, growing and new businesses ➤ To develop plans to reduce the numbers of young people not in employment or education and encourage more apprenticeships <p>- Priority Two – Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To improve the quality of life for local residents across the City as a whole and with a focus on areas of highest need ➤ To work creatively and innovatively in partnership with local communities to tackle local issues and meet local needs and build resilience ➤ A range of quality housing which meets local needs and supports cohesive neighbourhoods ➤ To ensure local people benefit from improved health and wellbeing, reducing health inequalities in the City and promoting healthier lifestyles <p>- Priority Three – Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To ensure Worcester continues to be an attractive place to visit, work and live in, enhancing and protecting open and green space which is seen as important ➤ To help make the city resilient to flooding, climate change and extreme weather events ➤ Promoting strong planning policies and working with partners to minimise the impact of development on the natural environment <p><u>Wychavon Strategic Partnership Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting and improving the local economy - Developing skills and lifelong learning - Delivering housing that meets local needs - Reducing health inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles - Supporting older people - Providing positive activities for young people - Supporting people to play an active role in their communities and to take responsibility for improving their lives <p><u>Wyre Forest Matters Priorities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To boost the economy and encourage employment within the district - To encourage better health and well-being - To help to provide education as a means to employment - To improve the local environment
Worcestershire County Council	We have defined four areas which we believe are fundamental to delivering our vision of a prosperous Worcestershire. These key areas

Fit for the Future: Corporate Plan 2011-16	<p>of focus are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open for Business • Children and Families • The Environment • Health and Well-being
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership submission document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliver the strategic employment sites and related infrastructure needed to secure sustainable economic growth and a low carbon economy. - Ensure we have the right support for business start up, business growth, business retention – focussing on meeting the needs of our strategic businesses, ‘high growth’ SMEs and the social enterprise sector. - Deliver the right infrastructure for business, including improved high speed broadband availability, improving access from the M5 to the Malvern Hills Science Park and QinetiQ, improving the by-pass leading to the Hereford and Bromyard roads to Herefordshire and creating better access for our strategic businesses and their supply chains in the north of the county to the motorway network through improvements to east-west links and the A449. - Invest in the skills of our workforce ensuring that provision is responsive to business needs, and relevant to future growth and business opportunities.
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership draft Vision and Strategy document	<p>The Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership's draft 'Vision and Strategy' document sets out the LEP's 'keys to unlocking growth'. For infrastructure, these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fast Broadband across the County - Dualling of the Southern Link Road in Worcester - The creation of Norton Parkway - The creation of Worcester Technology Park
Worcestershire Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LTP Objectives derived from SCS Objectives - LTP identifies five Major Schemes which will form bids to central government. These are the schemes that need significant investment to deliver significant benefits. The schemes are: Evesham Abbey Bridge and Viaduct; Worcester Transport Strategy (Phase 1); Worcestershire Parkway; Kidderminster Transport Strategy; and Redditch Transport Strategy. - Currently outlines many 'packaged schemes' which are to be assessed to determine whether they are prioritised. Successful schemes will be entered into three-year rolling Detailed Delivery Plans.
Worcestershire Local Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating more employment opportunities. - Providing the right housing for all communities. - Developing Worcestershire’s infrastructure (in this context,

Plan	<p>infrastructure needs are <i>"very broadly defined, since they range from investment to maintain and develop highways to Worcestershire's ability to provide the social and community infrastructure (eg. schools, community buildings) that is essential for well functioning communities"</i>).</p>
Worcestershire Economic Strategy 2008-18	<p>Vision: "In ten years time, Worcestershire will be economic driver for the region – with a prosperous and sustainable economy, driven by technology – led enterprises, offering well paid and highly skilled and high quality of life for its residents"</p> <p>Identifies primary and secondary spatial areas of focus.</p> <p>Primary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Areas of market failure and disadvantage (Regeneration Zones including the Rural Regeneration Zone) ii. Concentrations of knowledge assets (including the Central Technology Belt) iii. Birmingham <p>Secondary (more limited investment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Growth Points and strategic centres (including Worcester) 2. Towns undergoing economic restructuring (including Kidderminster and Redditch) 3. Market towns as a focus for rural regeneration
Worcestershire Climate Change Strategy 2005-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise awareness of the issue of Climate Change & its impact on the County - Reduce Climate Change causing gas emissions across the County - Plan for and adapt to the inevitable impacts of Climate Change on the County
Worcestershire PCT Operational Plan 2008-11	<p>National Health and Service Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cleanliness and Health Care Acquired Infections - Improving access - Keeping adults and children well, improving health and reducing health inequalities - Improving life expectancy and reducing health inequalities - Local plan focus - National Priorities for local delivery (Improving Cancer Services; Stroke; Reducing childhood obesity; Improving Maternity Services) <p>Local priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Equality and diversity B. Mixed-sex accommodation C. Learning disabilities

	<p>D. Diabetic retinopathy E. Crisis resolution (see mental health)</p>
<p>Worcestershire PCT 5 Year Strategic Plan</p>	<p>1. Staying Healthy 2. Maternity Services 3. Children & young people 4. Adult mental health and well being 5. Long term conditions 6. Falls prevention 7. End of Life care 8. Planned care National Requirements (To reduce health inequalities within the county; To increase life expectancy within the county).</p>
<p>Worcestershire Health Improvement Strategy 2008 – 2013</p>	<p>The thrust of this strategy is to improve the health by influencing the determinants of health. Many different organisations play a part in creating the conditions for good or poor health. The NHS itself can only directly control about 10-20% of health outcome. The remainder is a consequence of the actions of those organisations which influence determinants of health such as education, income, employment, transport, the environment and housing.</p> <p>Strategy has four goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To strengthen leadership of the health improvement agenda across the County; 2) To develop a suite of evidence based healthy lifestyle services so that everyone in the County is enabled to make healthy lifestyle choices, regardless of where they live or the social group to which they belong; 3) To improve the quality of and access to information about healthy lifestyles; 4) To train staff so that they are better able to look after their own health, provide advice to others and signpost to healthy lifestyle services.
<p>Worcestershire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment For Adult Health and Well-being 2009/10</p>	<p>Key Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ageing Population - Limiting Long Term Illness - Dementia - Home Care - Residential and Nursing Home Provision in Worcestershire - Supporting People - Alcohol
<p>Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy</p>	<p>Strategy due for publication later in 2011/2012.</p> <p>Current Green Infrastructure Framework identifies priority locations for GI 'interventions'.</p>

<p>District Council Core Strategies</p>	<p>Adopted and draft Core Strategies contain a range of visions, objectives and policies. Objectives cover issues such as green infrastructure, mitigating and adapting to climate change, maintaining high quality natural and historic environments, sustainable construction, landscape, sustainable travel, ensuring vibrant town and district centres, providing for new homes to meet needs, reducing fear of crime, etc. Each district has specific objectives and policies for their respective areas.</p>
<p>Malvern Hills and Cotswolds AONB Management Plans</p>	<p>The primary purpose of the AONB designation is to conserve and enhance natural beauty. The respective Management Plans provide a range of objectives and policies to help achieve this purpose.</p>

References

National Infrastructure Plan, HM Treasury (October 2010)
<http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/nationalinfrastructureplan251010.pdf>

Worcestershire LEP Submission, final proposal, September 2010
<http://www.worcestershirepartnership.org.uk/cms/pdf/Worcestershire%20Works%20-%20Final%20Bid%20Sept%202010.pdf>

Infrastructure Investment in Local Enterprise Partnerships: The contribution of local Infrastructure Delivery Plans, Janice Morphet, February 2011
<http://www.communities.idea.gov.uk/c/1694510/doclib/document-display.do?backlink=ref&id=9470858>)

Infrastructure requirements within Worcestershire to 2026 arising from Phase Two Review of West Midlands RSS Preferred Option - Final Report, Baker Associates/TPI (March 2009)
<http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/cms/environment-and-planning/strategic-planning/infrastructure-planning/infrastructure-study.aspx>

Local Growth White Paper: Realising Every Place's Potential, HM Government October 2010
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/economic-development/docs/l/cm7961-local-growth-white-paper.pdf>