# Infrastructure Funding Statement

**Broxbourne Local Plan 2018-2033**

**Small Sites CIL Examination October 2026**

1. This Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) provides the evidence necessary to justify the introduction of a small sites CIL as proposed in the draft Charging Schedule.

2. The CIL is proposed to be introduced to support the delivery of infrastructure necessary to support growth set out in the Local Plan 2018-2033 (adopted 2020).

3. Detailed explanation of the infrastructure requirements generated by the Local Plan growth were originally set out in the 2017 Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which sits behind the present document and is published alongside this document for the purposes of the CIL examination. Delivery of development has been slower than set out in the trajectory within the IDP.

4. The summary of costs is set out in a schedule on page 121 of the IDP (repeated in the summary on p141). This estimated the total cost to be £263 million at 2017 prices. Using RPI cost inflation indices since 2017 adds a further £97million to the total costs of infrastructure.

5. Alongside the total infrastructure costs in the first column, Table 1 below sets out the contributions received, expected, and allocated. This suggests that there will be a substantial funding gap across the majority of different infrastructure types.

6. A small-sites CIL could raise £528,000 per year towards the infrastructure necessary to support Local Plan growth. This figure is derived from an average 66 new dwellings per year[1] on schemes of between 1 and 9 dwellings and then applying an average dwelling floor area of 80 square metres and multiplying by the £100 proposed charge. In terms of the total infrastructure bill, this would represent a small but nevertheless important contribution towards infrastructure which would otherwise be unavailable to support the evidenced need.

7. Since publication of the IDP, a number of major transport schemes totalling £36.4million have been delivered, mostly funded from other sources (not developer contributions) shown in the IDP costs. These include a major upgrade of Junction 25 paid for by National Highways (£26.9million), a £3 million roundabout at High Leigh Garden Village, and £6.5million for a new road bridge

[1] 66 per year reflects recent delivery

at Essex Road, Hoddesdon, mostly funded by the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership. The bulk of the funding derived from other sources rather than financial contributions from development. The IDP includes a further £10million of highways works to the A10 but these are currently the subject of a funding bid to the Department of Transport.

8. To date the only education project to be completed to support Local Plan growth is the relocation and expansion of Westfield Primary School in Hoddesdon. £12.6 million has been allocated towards a new primary school at Rosedale Park. Haileybury Turnford Secondary School is in receipt of money from the Department for Education to complete a rebuild, however this will not lead to additional school place provision. Feasibility work is currently being carried out to expand Goffs Churchgate Secondary School but this is yet to conclude. Hertfordshire County Council has advised that a need for a new secondary school cannot be ruled out to support Local Plan development; and therefore that financial contributions from development will continue to be vital to potential future provision.

9. As shown in Table 1, there are anticipated to be significant shortfalls in relation to education, transport, public realm, and healthcare. Waste and recycling, emergency services and gypsy and traveller sites are Brookfield scheme-specific development costs but are included for completeness as shown in the IDP.

10. Actual and expected receipts for outdoor recreation and open space are expected to exceed the IDP-based need. This reflects the *Indoor and Outdoor Sports and Recreation Strategy* (2023-2033) which indicates a higher level of need than generated by the methodology set out in the original IDP.

11. If publicly funded highways schemes (£36.4 million) are subtracted from the £220.2m total funding gap this still leave a gap of £185.80 million at 2026 prices. Whilst funding from the Department for Education and a successful bid to the Department for Transport for A10 funding could close some of the gap, this is unlikely to close the funding gap for those items. Furthermore, there is a major shortfall in funding for a critical Local Plan related major public realm scheme at Cheshunt Old Pond (the main project within the Cheshunt Old Pond Strategy 2020) for which no other funding is available.

12. The funding gap is <u>after</u> contributions expected from six large remaining Local Plan sites as shown in Table 2. The expected sums shown are taken from the tables within Section 5 of the IDP (pages 27- 33) and adjusted upwards for inflation using RPI indexation in Table 1. For sites partially completed (Rosedale Park/Tudor Nurseries and Cheshunt Lakeside) the sums shown are derived by applying the cost per dwelling pro-rata across the remaining development.

*Table 1: Infrastructure funding to support development contained within the Broxbourne Local Plan (2020)*

| Category | Estimated cost (£million) | | S106 amount received as at October 2026 (£million) | Other S106 Due (£million) | Expected | | Expected funding gap* (£million) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IDP 2017[2] | Adjusted 2026[3] | | | IDP 2017 (Table 2) | Adjusted 2026 | |
| Education | 91.37 | 126.78 | 14.05 | 0.5 | 36.96 | 51.28 | 60.95 |
| Transport | 132.77 | 184.22 | 9.36 | 0.163 | 27.15 | 37.67 | 137.03 |
| Healthcare | 22.783 | 31.61 | 0.59 | 0.156 | 1.44 | 2 | 28.86 |
| Social Infrastructure – Built facilities | 4.205 | 5.83 | 6.39 | 0.205 | 1.02 | 1.42 | -2.19 |
| Social Infrastructure – outdoor recreation and open space | 5.7 | 7.91 | 2.99 | 0.167 | 7.07 | 9.81 | -5.06 |
| Public realm | 2.5 | 3.47 | 0.13 | 0 | 0.47 | 0.67 | 2.67 |
| *Emergency Services†* | *1.2* | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| *Gypsy and traveller sites†* | *1.4* | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| *Waste and Recycling†* | *1.5* | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL** | **263.428** | **359.82** | **33.573** | **1.193** | **74.11** | **102.85** | **222.27** |

*funding gap = need at 2026 prices minus amounts received, due, and expected.

† Emergency services, gypsy and traveller sites, and waste and recycling are internal costs specific to the Brookfield development rather than off-site S106 contributions (see footnote to IDP Table 5.3 p 29) but are shown here for consistency with IDP Table 17.4.

[2] IDP 2018, table 17.4 (p 121)

[3] 2026 prices calculated using the Retail Price Index (RPI). Can be verified using the Bank of England inflation checker: https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/monetary-policy/inflation/inflation-calculator

*Table 2: Expected contributions from strategic sites before RPI inflation (applied pro-rata for partially finished sites)*

| **Category** | **Cheshunt Lakeside** (410 dwellings remaining) IDP Table 5.1p27 | **Brookfield Riverside/Garden Village** (1,500 dwellings) IDP Table 5.3 p 29 | **Rosedale Park (Rags Brook)** (360 dwellings remaining) IDP Table 5.4 p 31 | **Park Plaza West** IDP Table 5.5 p32 | **Park Plaza North** IDP table 5.6 p33 | **TOTAL** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education | 6.58 | 24.09 | 6.29 | 0 | 0 | **36.96** |
| Transport | 1.73 | 7.1 | 2.07 | 12.75 | 3.5 | **27.15** |
| Healthcare | 0.26 | 0.93 | 0.25 | 0 | 0 | **1.44** |
| Social Infrastructure – Built facilities | 0 | 0 | 1.02 | 0 | 0 | **1.02** |
| Social Infrastructure – outdoor recreation and open space | 0.18 | 5.4 | 1.29 | 0.1 | 0.1 | **7.07** |
| Public realm | 0.47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0.47** |
| **TOTAL** | **9.22** | **37.52** | **10.92** | **12.85** | **3.6** | **74.11** |