

## **LEEDS INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING GAP**

### **JUSTIFICATION FOR THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

#### **Introduction to the Funding Gap**

- 1.1 This paper sets out the justification for progressing with the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Leeds and forms part of the evidence base for the Leeds CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.
- 1.2 The Planning Act 2008 (as amended), the Localism Act 2011, and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010<sup>1</sup> (the CIL Regulations 2010) set out that a charging authority can collect a CIL in its area. In particular, the CIL Regulations 2010 state at Regulation 14 that authorities must strike an appropriate balance between “the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding and the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.”
- 1.3 Statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State ‘Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance (December 2012, CLG) states at paragraph 12 that: “A charging authority needs to identify the total cost of infrastructure that it desires to fund in whole or in part from the levy. In order to do this, the charging authority must consider what additional infrastructure is needed in its area to support development and what other funding sources are available (for example, core Government funding for infrastructure, which will continue following the introduction of a levy, anticipated section 106 agreements and anticipated necessary highway improvement schemes funded by anyone other than the charging authority) based on appropriate available evidence.”
- 1.4 The guidance goes on to state at paragraph 14: “In determining the size of its total or aggregate infrastructure funding gap, the charging authority should consider known and expected infrastructure costs and the other sources of possible funding available to meet those costs. This process will identify a Community Infrastructure Levy infrastructure funding target. This target should be informed by a selection of infrastructure projects or types (drawn from infrastructure planning for the area) which are identified as candidates to be funded by the levy in whole or in part in that area. The Government recognises that there will be uncertainty in pinpointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term. The focus should be on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to levy the CIL.”
- 1.5 This paper is intended to set out the aggregate funding gap in line with the above guidance and regulations.

---

<sup>1</sup> As amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011 and 2012

## Infrastructure Projects

- 1.6 The CLG guidance states that information on the Council's infrastructure needs should be drawn directly from the infrastructure planning that underpins its Development Plan (paragraph 13). The existing development plan for Leeds is the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and this is being replaced by the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF). Within the LDF the Leeds Core Strategy is currently at Publication Draft stage (March 2012) including the Publication Draft Pre-Submission Changes (December 2012). Submission is expected in Spring 2013. The Core Strategy is supported by a draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), the published version of which was also consulted upon in March 2012. The IDP identifies the current infrastructure provision in the Leeds District, and where possible bearing in mind funding uncertainties and shorter timescales of partner infrastructure providers, the critical infrastructure necessary for the delivery of the Core Strategy over the plan period including funding gaps and priorities.
- 1.7 The March 2012 Draft IDP is not the final document intended to support the Core Strategy as it is a draft 'living' document which will be updated as necessary. The IDP will be published as a final version alongside the Core Strategy Submission document, and reviewed in future as necessary. However, in developing the Economic Viability Study and the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for the CIL, the March 2012 Draft IDP has been used as the main piece of evidence in relation to the cost gap for Leeds.
- 1.8 For the purposes of this justification paper the IDP has been updated with amendments and refinements as a result of further consultation and discussion with infrastructure service providers. Taking into account the list of infrastructure needs, a fuller assessment was made of sources of funding for each item of infrastructure identified and whether CIL was an appropriate tool for plugging any gaps, once other sources of funding had been explored. This review resulted in the much shorter list of infrastructure items, as set out in Table 1. Table 1 also includes a column outlining the assumptions made on the level of CIL needed to support each project. For many projects no alternative sources of funding have yet been identified, so the full cost has been included for funding from the CIL, albeit that in reality it is expected that such other sources would come forwards for instance as new Government programmes and grants become available. This is in line with the CIL guidance as outlined further below.
- 1.9 The guidance states that "where infrastructure planning has been undertaken specifically for the CIL and was not tested as part of another examination, the CIL examiner will need to test that the evidence is sufficient in order to confirm the aggregate infrastructure funding gap and total target amount that the authority proposes to raise through the levy" (paragraph 17). However, in Leeds, the infrastructure evidence will have been tested at examination of the Core Strategy and therefore in line with paragraph 18 it is not intended that the CIL examination should re-open detailed discussion on this infrastructure planning.
- 1.10 Table 1 should not therefore be considered to be the Council's programme for spending on infrastructure, or the definitive list of the infrastructure items that CIL will contribute to. The infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure that LCC intends will be wholly or partly funded by CIL will be set out in its Regulation 123 list. Table 1 is the best available information at this time on the funding gap for the infrastructure

needed to support planned development in the District, and for which CIL is a suitable mechanism for contributing to filling that gap. Infrastructure requirements and costs may change over the plan period and will be updated accordingly in future revisions of the IDP or supporting CIL documentation.

- 1.11 Predicting future levels of funding beyond the short-term is difficult and it is particularly problematic in the current economic and funding climate, where funding has considerably reduced from the levels available in previous years. Where exact levels of funding are unknown and therefore are not included within funding assumptions, Table 1 identifies indicative future funding sources and expected value, in line with national guidance.
- 1.12 For instance, the resources available to fund the Council's infrastructure provision may be provided by central Government in the form of supported borrowing and grants (normally for specific purposes, and particularly from the Department for Transport and the Department for Education), in the form of grants from other external bodies, or from developer contributions. Funding sources investigated for LCC services also include the capital programme including Council tax, generation of capital receipts, the New Homes Bonus, and other innovative sources of funding and borrowing such as TIF and the Aire Valley Enterprise Zone. The recent City Deal for the Leeds City Region will also be a very important tool in bidding for funding and attracting investment.
- 1.13 **In summary, an overall 'funding gap' of £1.3 billion has been identified for the Leeds District up to 2028.**

**TABLE 1 - INFRASTRUCTURE POTENTIALLY TO BE FUNDED FROM THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY UP TO 2028**

TOPIC	SCHEME	TOTAL COST	CONFIRMED FUNDING SOURCES	FUNDING GAP	DELIVERY NOTES
<b>PUBLIC TRANSPORT, PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE</b>					
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 1</b> East Middleton Spur	£190k	None	£190k	Spur to extend coverage of route 3. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 4</b> Adel Spur	£157k	None	£157k	Spur to extend coverage of route 15. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 6</b> North Morley Spur	£448k	None	£448k	Spur to extend coverage of route 13. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 7</b> Scholes to City Centre	£611k	None	£611k	Connects to Penda's Way (17) and Wyke Beck Way (16). LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 8</b> Rothwell to City Centre	£887k	None	£887k	Connects to Route 3 and Aire Valley. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 11</b> Farnley - Leeds City Centre	£1.107m	None	£1.107m	Links to Route 10. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 13</b> Morley to City Centre	£932k	None	£932k	Links to White Rose shopping centre and Holbeck regeneration area. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 14</b> A64 York Rd corridor improvements	£482k	None	£482k	Connects with Route 16. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 16</b> - Wyke Beck Valley (phase 2)	£573k	None	£573k	Connections to East Leeds Radial, Aire Valley and Trans-Pennine trail. LTP3 scheme post 2014
<b>Cycle</b>	Leeds Core Cycle Network <b>Route 17</b> Penda's Way	£1.441m	None	£1.441m	Links to Routes 7 and 14. LTP3 scheme post 2014

<b>Pedestrian</b>	Public Right Of Way Network	£1.2m	£800k from LTP, grants, and on-site provision	£400k	The Leeds ROWIP will be reviewed again by 2017. If all of the identified projects were to be delivered over the next ten years, the City Council would need to seek funding between £2.3m and £3.9m, including through S106, West Yorkshire Transport Plan and third party grants. The Plan should mainly be viewed as an aspirational document highlighting improvements (which in part) are over and above the basic statutory requirements. A cautious estimate has therefore been used of £1.2m (half the lowest estimate) to reflect that schemes are aspirational. The current PROW network is a LTP3 scheme, supported through LTP3 for next 3 years with £75k and likely to extend beyond this through ongoing work. An assumption of £75k LTP funding has therefore been assumed for each 3 year period = £300k. Additional 3 <sup>rd</sup> party grants and provision on site as part of development schemes has assumed an additional £500k.
<b>Public Transport</b>	Leeds NGT trolleybus network; Stourton - Holt Park, Stourton Park and Ride, Bodington Park and Ride	£250m	£173m DfT, £50m LCC and Metro	£27m	Overall cost £250m, due to start construction late 2016.
<b>Public Transport</b>	Leeds NGT trolleybus network extension to Aire Valley Leeds	£59.2m	None	£59.2m	NGT extension from City Centre to Aire Valley (WYTF scheme) Currently unfunded, further study required.
<b>Public Transport</b>	Leeds NGT trolleybus network extension to East Leeds (including City Centre loop)	£97.4m	None	£97.4m	NGT extension to St James' Hospital and east Leeds (WYTF scheme) Currently unfunded, further study required.
<b>Public Transport</b>	East Leeds Link Road park and ride	£5m	None	£5m	TfL study. Timescale dependent on funding bids, estimated at 2014. Currently unfunded
<b>Public Transport</b>	Railways - East Leeds Parkway Station, Micklefield	£8.8m	National Rail/ DfT/ Metro	£8.8m	Scheme identified in regional RUS and Initial Industry Plan for CP5 (2014-19) awaiting publication of Network Rail business plan expected early 2013 and subsequent decision on funding. Upgrade to City Region Parkway scheme would be contingent on funding and business case. Implications of Trans-Pennine electrification on this scheme yet to be understood. Scheme for 'smaller' station is not currently funded but forms part of the HLOS for CP5
<b>Public Transport</b>	Railways - Horsforth Woodside Station	Not yet costed	None	Not yet costed	Requires further study. Outline business case is prepared but scheme has no status in DfT publication "Investment in Local Major Transport Schemes' and is not included in LTP Railplan 7. To be progressed with developer funding. No funding from Network Rail for this scheme.

<b>Public Transport</b>	Railways - Leeds City Station new platform and platform 17 extension	£30m	DfT	£30m	Scheme is not currently funded but forms part of the High Level Output Specification for Control Period 5 (2014-2019).
<b>Public Transport</b>	Railways - New Pudsey park and ride extensions and access	£1m	None	£1m	TFL study. Scheme to extend the existing provision of park and ride spaces at new Pudsey Station and carry out associated improvements to the highway to accommodate increasing demand for access to the station. Timescale dependent on the outcome of a bid for partial funding to DfT - to be determined 2013. Metro scheme?
<b>Public Transport</b>	Railways - TransPennine electrification between Manchester Victoria and Leeds, and on through Garforth to Colton Junction west of York	£1.5m	Dft/Metro LPA & developer contributions for Garforth only	£1.5m	Announced in Chancellor's Statement Nov 2011. Preliminary feasibility work undertaken, with a view to implementation around 2016/17, although likely DfT will ask for programme to be accelerated. Work on GRIP stage 3 to start Autumn 2012. DfT commitment to fund core route Stalybridge to Leeds, Neville Hill to Colton Junction and Selby. Only potential CIL contribution would be access improvements at Garforth station (£1.5m).
<b>Public Transport</b>	Yorcard - provision of card vending machines and top-up points, integration of other services onto smartcards (school and leisure), on-bus equipment, enabling internet sales, development of Leeds City Region MetroCard product by smart media.	Not yet costed	£6.14m	Not yet costed	<p>West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority Executive Board on April 27 2012 agreed £6.14m to be spent on the project from the Better Bus Area Fund (£4.33 million plus £0.65 million relating to York City Council funding) and LTP3 funding £1.16million.</p> <p>Later phases assume contributions from City Region Authorities and Metro although split not yet determined.</p> <p>Metro, together with local bus operators, recently made a successful Better Bus Area Fund bid to the Department for Transport for almost £5m to develop West Yorkshire's smartcard network. It will allow passengers to load money on to their tickets, the new system should be in place across West Yorkshire and York by early 2014. Key targets include developing a county-wide retail network including local shops, vending machines and an online 'top up' service. Almost 400 buses run by smaller operators would be fitted with smartcard readers, while further work on the complex back-office systems that make the scheme work would continue. Transdev Keighley and Arriva have already switched on their smartcard readers, and First are currently testing their equipment, much of West Yorkshire's bus fleet will soon be smartcard enabled. Currently it is just senior, disabled and blind concessionary pass-holders who can swipe on to local bus services, the scheme is aimed to open up to all bus users as soon as possible. Establishing a smartcard retail network, equipping more vehicles and completing the development of back-office technology are the next steps to extending smartcard travel to all bus users, rather than just concessionary pass-holders, and eventually rail passengers as well.</p>

<b>Airport</b>	Leeds Bradford International Airport tram-train link - fixed link from the Harrogate Rail line	£132.6m	None	£132.6m	Unfunded, but included within the City Region Connectivity Study and Core Strategy priority (on Key Diagram).
<b>HIGHWAYS</b>					
<b>Highways (local)</b>	Aire Valley Leeds - East Leeds Link Road and river crossing	£24.8m	Enterprise zone borrowing, developer funding, LCC.	£12.3m	New river bridge and link road to connect East Leeds Link Road with Pontefract Road. Unfunded. Includes Skelton Grange link route protection for a new road link and river crossing into the Cross Green Development area and improvement at the junction between Skelton Grange Road and Pontefract Road. In LCC Capital Programme Dec 2011 £2.5m provided to support a new spine road in the AVL enterprise zone. This will enable public transport to connect to East Leeds and enable local people to access the new jobs. The LEP has agreed that Leeds will use funding raised from increased business rates in the Enterprise Zone to pay the borrowing costs for this investment, but there may still be a role for the CIL.
<b>Highways (local)</b>	Armley Gyratory major improvement	Not yet costed	£130K contribution from LTP3 IT Block	Not yet costed	TfL scheme - linked to City Square improvements. This would form part of the city centre transport strategy which is still in development and not yet costed.
<b>Highways (local)</b>	City Square renaissance public space and public transport priority	Not yet costed	None	Not yet costed	TFL study and LTP3 block fund. This would form part of the city centre transport strategy which is still in development.
<b>Highways (local)</b>	A6120 dualling – Dawson's Corner-Horsforth	£24.2m	None	£24.2m	Conversion of single carriageway to dual carriageway (TfL scheme)
<b>Highways (local)</b>	Meadow Lane / Victoria Road scheme	Not yet costed	None	Not yet costed	Meadow Lane / Victoria Road scheme. This would form part of the city centre transport strategy which is still in development.
<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	A65-A658 Link Road (bypassing Rawdon and Horsforth) - includes extension of A65 Quality Bus Corridor to serve the airport.	£30m	Dft and developers	£15m	At early development and unfunded but initial work shows a potentially robust benefit cost ratio within DfT guidelines, and is included within the City Region Connectivity Study. Cost estimate £30m, would expect DfT funding with private sector contribution plus s106/CIL, use 50% as very approximate estimate.
<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	Loop road extensions	Not yet costed	None	Not yet costed	Proposed south west and south east extensions of the Loop road. This remains a concept rather than a defined scheme. It would form part of the city centre transport strategy which is still in development.

<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	M1 J39-42 Managed Motorway - Use of hard shoulder running and active traffic management during peak periods	Not yet costed	Highways Agency	Not yet costed	Major Scheme. Remains in programme following CSR. Estimated cost £120m to £170m but would benefit from Highways Agency funding. Funding gap for CIL not yet costed so overall figure not been included either.
<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	M1 J46 southbound slip road - ramp metering	Not yet costed	Highways Agency	Not yet costed	Original target 2015 although currently being renegotiated to be traffic dependent. The scheme is to be delivered by Leeds City Council under a Section 6 agreement with the Highways Agency. Current Agreement states works to be delivered in 2019.
<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	M1 Junction 45 Phase 2 improvement	£8m	None	£8m	Widening of northbound and southbound off slip road and ELLR entries to roundabout, roundabout widening from 2 to 3 lanes, enhancement of traffic signal control (including entry to Skelton Business Park), extension of northbound on-slip road from Type A to Type C merge. Original target 2015 although currently being renegotiated The scheme is to be delivered by Leeds City Council under a Section 6 Agreement with the Highways Agency. Current Agreement states works to be delivered by end of 2015, however the Highways Agency is in the process of renegotiating the delivery date (as at October 2012) to be traffic dependent and progression linked to build out of developments in Aire Valley.  Recent estimate from Connect (operators of this section of the M1) suggested indicative cost of £8m, although as yet this is not based on any detailed design or surveys.
<b>Highways (strategic)</b>	M621 Corridor Management Plan	Not yet costed	None	Not yet costed	M621 Corridor Management Plan including Active Traffic Management. Ongoing work (as at Oct 2012), level of intervention required not yet ascertained or costed until have details of LCC's City Centre Transport Strategy.
<b>EDUCATION</b>					

<b>Education</b>	School requirement District wide resulting from Core Strategy housing growth	£655m	None at present to support new growth	£655m	<p>Build costs (notwithstanding land costs) approximately:            £5 million for 1FE primary school            £7 million for 2FE primary school            £20 million for 5FE secondary school            £30 million for 8FE secondary school</p> <p>The need for adequate and appropriate school provision is factored into decisions regarding the strategic location of development outlined in the Core Strategy and in particular, more detailed proposals in relation to specific areas of the city are being worked up for the Site Allocations DPD. In very broad terms the overall growth to 2028 equates to 83 new form entry (without adjustments for location and current capacity), to be provided by extensions and new schools. Therefore build costs approximately:            83 x 1FE primary schools = £415 m            17 x 5FE secondary schools = £340 m <u>total</u> = £755m</p> <p>Or, if larger schools were built the figures would be:            42 x 2FE primary schools = £294m            10 x 8FE secondary schools = £300m <u>total</u> = £594m</p> <p>The size of schools will depend on the size of development planned and is likely to be a mix of 1FE and 2FE primaries, and 5FE and 8FE secondaries. The assumed mix for the purposes of the cost gap is therefore:            23 x 1FE and 30 x 2FE primary schools (£325m),            12 x 5FE and 3 x 8FE secondary schools (£330m) <u>total</u> = £655m</p>
<b>FLOOD DEFENCE</b>					
<b>Flood Defence</b>	River Aire Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) – Phase 1	£52m	LCC capital programme £10m , ERDF £10m, RGF £4m, FDGiA £8.8m, BID £1m, developers £1m	£17.2m	<p>Phase 1 - Create flood defences protecting the city from flooding along a 3.5 kilometre stretch of the River Aire between Leeds Central Station and downstream to Knostrop Weir. The FAS Phase 1 will provide a 1 in 75 years Standard of Protection from flooding. Completion anticipated 2015, subject to planning permission and funding availability.</p> <p>The FAS Phase 1 comprises 3 elements to be undertaken as funding becomes available :</p> <p>i) Remove existing weirs and install moveable weirs at Knostrop and Crown Point            ii) Provide defences: embankments, terracing, setting back of defences, walls as required between Leeds Train Station and Granary Wharf            iii) Remove Knostrop Cut to merge the Canal and River Aire</p>

					£47m cost plus £5m maintenance. Assumed funding sources, although none yet confirmed: European Regional Development Fund £10m, Regional Growth Fund £4m, Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA) via Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee and EA £8.8m, Business Improvement District (assume nominal £1m), development industry contributions (assume nominal £1m outside of the CIL).
<b>Flood Defence</b>	River Aire Flood Alleviation Scheme – Phase 2	£25m	ERDF, BID, FDGiAF Jessica, LCC, development industry contributions	£25m	Phase 2 - to provide a 1:75 year Standard of Protection along the River Aire, from Newlay Bridge the City Centre and from Knostrop to Woodlesford.  As at October 2012 Phase 2 has not been sufficiently costed to allow for an accurate figure, but £25m is the best estimate possible – this is a minimum figure so as not to overstate the cost gap.
<b>Flood Defence</b>	River Aire Flood Alleviation Scheme – Phase 3	£25m	ERDF, FDGiA, BID Jessica, LCC, development industry contributions	£25m	Phase 3 - to increase the overall level of protection offered by the defences to a 1:200 Standard of Protection for the whole scheme.  As at October 2012 Phase 3 has not been sufficiently costed to allow for an accurate figure, but £25m is the best estimate possible – this is a minimum figure so as not to overstate the cost gap.
<b>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND LEISURE</b>					
<b>Green Infra</b>	City Centre Park and smaller pocket parks in city centre	£34.5m	None, in partnership with developers	£34.5m	£4.5m investment is required to develop the smaller pocket parks in the City Centre i.e. Hanover Square, Lovell Park, Queens Square, and Sovereign Street. For the city centre park a broad estimate including restructuring works of some of the highways is £40m. As the highway works may be scaled back a cautious estimate of £30m for this has therefore been used.
<b>Green Infra</b>	District wide child fixed play, MUGA, and skate/BMX improvements as result of new housing development	£35.4m	Some would be provided on larger sites by developers, so assume £17.7m (half)	£12.5m	Example costs from S106 equivalent: At 2012 rates, greenspace calculator gives cost per child for play as £975. At 0.62 children per house and 0.1 children per flat = costs £605 per house and £98 per flat (rounded). Core Strategy housing figures of 74,000 dwellings gross to 2028, of which target is 25% flats, = total cost of child play £35,356,400.  Some of this would be provided by developers within their sites, so assume it can be discounted by half (£17.7m). A proportion of the remainder will also be incorporated within the specific schemes listed below, and therefore there a further discount has been applied of £1.2m (community parks) + £4m (outdoor recreation) leaving a total gap of £12.5m

<b>Green Infra</b>	Improvements to greenspace quantity and/or quality as result of new housing development	£55.25m	None	£55.25m	<p>The increase in population will lead to need for new areas of greenspace as well as improvements to existing parks. Core Strategy housing figures of 74,000 dwellings gross to 2028, of which target is 25% flats.</p> <p>Example cost taken from the current S106 policy equivalent is £67,574,718. Assumptions are at 2012 rates, that maintenance is only taken for N2.1, 50% of all N2 greenspace would be provided within sites (and therefore no contribution necessary), and that a further 50% of the sites which do not provide it on site would be located within an area of adequate provision (and therefore no contribution for N2.2 and N2.3). Some of this £67.6m figure would also be incorporated within the specific schemes listed below, and therefore has been discounted by a further £3.6m (community parks) + £8m (outdoor recreation) + £75k (allotments) = £55.25m total cost.</p>
<b>Green Infra</b>	62 Community Parks city wide.	£6m	None	£6m	In order to gain understanding of standards of all parks and green space, an assessment programme was devised in 2004 to assess a representative sample of 144 parks and green spaces over a rolling 3 year period against the national Green Flag standard criteria. This investment is required to achieve the Parks and Green Space Strategy target of all 62 Community Parks attaining the national Green Flag standard by 2020. Prior to the CIL being introduced S106 funding is generally used for this purpose.
<b>Green Infra</b>	7 City Parks – Major Visitor Attractions	£10m	Assume external funding of £8m	£2m	Investment required to develop our City Parks: Roundhay Park, Temple Newsam, Lotherton Hall, Middleton Park, Golden Acre Park, Otley Chevin and Kirkstall Abbey. Funding is primarily sourced from external bodies namely Heritage Lottery Fund, assume 80% of costs.
<b>Green Infra</b>	Outdoor recreation city wide	£20m	None	£15m	Parks and Countryside are responsible for the majority of parks and green spaces throughout the city. New housing growth and increased usage means that they will require investment to improve standards. Prior to the CIL being introduced S106 funding is generally used for this purpose, along with additional match funding from external sources (assume £5m).
<b>Green Infra</b>	Allotments city wide	£1.5m	None	£1.5m	There is currently a waiting list of 1100 people requesting an allotment across the city, and increased housing growth will increase pressure on allotments. To accommodate this provision significant investment is required to create new allotment sites and to provide for the future level of demand. Prior to the CIL being introduced S106 funding is generally used for this purpose.
<b>Leisure</b>	Fearnville and East Leeds Leisure Centre replacement	£12.5m	None	£12.5m	Reprovision of Fearnville and East Leeds Leisure Centre in the form of one new, purpose built, wellbeing centre, with a commitment to deliver and resource by 2013 / 2015. Investment continues to be sought for this proposal, a PFI bid was unsuccessful. Develop a sustainable community asset transfer model in-line with this development. Cost £10m - £15m.

<b>Leisure</b>	Kippax and Garforth Leisure Centre replacement	£10.5m	None	£10.5m	Reprovision of Kippax and Garforth Leisure Centre in the form of one new or re-furbished swimming pool, fitness suite and other appropriate dry side sports facilities, with a commitment to resource and deliver by 2017. Cost £8m - £13m.
<b>Leisure</b>	Aireborough Leisure Centre Refurbishment	£3.8m	None	£3.8m	Refurbish changing rooms, reception, and exterior, extend gym, access work. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>Leisure</b>	Otley Chippindale Swimming Pool	£250k	Prince Henry Grammar School	£250k	Accessibility, energy and wider refurbishment. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>Leisure</b>	Wetherby Leisure Centre	£1.4m	None	£1.4m	Refurbish changing rooms, extend gym, access work. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>Leisure</b>	Pudsey Leisure Centre	£2m	None	£2m	New entrance and frontage, interior refurbishment, extend gym. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>Leisure</b>	Kirkstall Leisure Centre	£1m	None	£1m	Refurbish changing room, re-orientate reception, works to heating / lighting / ventilation, reception, access. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>Leisure</b>	Rothwell Leisure Centre	£5.8m	None	£5.8m	Pool hall refurbishment - new atrium, circulation and relaxation area. Refurbish dryside changing, additional car parking, fitness studio / spinning area, extend gym. By 2020 and dependent on funding.
<b>TOTAL FUNDING GAP FOR CIL</b>		<b>£1.7 billion</b>	-	<b>£1.3 billion</b>	<b>(Total cost = £1,747,428,000) (Funding gap = £1,335,428,000)</b>