



DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

**INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING GAP
ASSESSMENT**

DECEMBER 2012

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Planning Policy Context.....	6
3. Existing Evidence Base.....	8
4. The Infrastructure Funding Gap.....	10
APPENDIX A: Schemes included in the calculation of the Infrastructure Funding Gap.....	13

1 Introduction

Background

- 1.1 This report has been produced by Dacorum Borough Council to expand upon the methodology for the assessment of the Infrastructure Funding Gap used to support the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS).
- 1.2 This document sets out the Council's approach to infrastructure planning in accordance with the CIL Regulations¹ and the relevant Government Guidance².
- 1.3 The starting point for preparing a CIL Charging Schedule is for the Local Authority to demonstrate that there is a funding gap in the provision of infrastructure required to support new development. Government Guidance recognises that there will be uncertainty in pinpointing funding sources for the provision of infrastructure, particularly beyond the short-term. The focus should be on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to levy CIL.
- 1.4 This document uses existing evidence about infrastructure requirements to show how the infrastructure funding gap used to support the CIL PDCS has been derived. It is not the purpose or the role of this document to prioritise or identify infrastructure projects that may be funded partly or wholly through CIL monies in the future. As set out in the PDCS (section 10) the Council will work with infrastructure providers and the local community to establish protocols for prioritising infrastructure projects for receipt of CIL monies.

¹ Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations (2011).

² Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance – Charge setting and charge schedule procedures (DCLG 2010).

2 Planning Policy Context

National Policy and Guidance

- 2.1 During the course of preparing the evidence base on infrastructure requirements, the national context for infrastructure planning has changed. Initially the evidence was prepared according to Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12): Local Spatial Planning, however, this was superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012.
- 2.2 The overarching emphasis of the NPPF is that Local Planning Authorities should plan to meet the identified development needs of their areas, in a way which represents sustainable development. The three dimensions of sustainable development mean that the planning system has economic, social and environmental roles. The need to identify and plan for the provision of necessary infrastructure is embedded in the economic and social roles of the planning system.
- 2.3 The NPPF requires Local Plans to plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area, and as such it expects Local Planning Authorities to work with other authorities and providers to:
- assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure, and its ability to meet forecast demands; and
 - take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.
- 2.4 With regards to the evidence on infrastructure need appropriate to support a CIL Charging Schedule, the Government Guidance³ recommends that it should be drawn directly from the infrastructure planning that underpins the development plan. This evidence will identify the quantum and type of infrastructure required to support local development needs and will not be re-examined at the CIL examination.
- 2.5 In order to support a CIL charge, the evidence on infrastructure planning should demonstrate that there is a funding gap for the provision of infrastructure required to support development. The guidance recognises that there will be a number of uncertainties in developing this evidence, particularly in terms of identifying other sources of funding for the provision infrastructure beyond the short term. In light of such uncertainties, the main focus should be on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to levy CIL.
- 2.6 The role of this evidence is not to provide assurances as to how an authority will spend its CIL monies; indeed authorities may spend their CIL revenues on

³ Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance – Charge setting and charge schedule procedures (DCLG 2010).

different projects and types of infrastructure from those identified in the infrastructure funding gap.

The Local Planning Framework

- 2.7 Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy is at an advanced stage. The Examination in Public is currently underway. The Hearing was conducted by a Planning Inspector in October 2012 and the Council is awaiting the outcome of the Inspector's report on the Core Strategy, which will identify whether it is sound. The Council hopes to adopt the Core Strategy in the Spring of 2013.
- 2.8 The Core Strategy covers the period 2006 – 2031 and makes provision for an average of 430 additional dwellings to be provided each year which equates to 10,750 new homes over the whole period. The Council expects that, with the likely additional provision through windfall, this target to be exceeded by about up to 6%. The Core Strategy also aims to accommodate growth in the local economy of around 10,000 jobs over the plan period. Two of the Core Strategy's strategic objectives are:
- To co-ordinate the delivery of new infrastructure with development; and
 - To ensure that all development contributes appropriately to local and strategic infrastructure requirements.
- 2.9 The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which identifies required schemes, timeframes, costs of provision, funding sources and responsibility for delivery. Section 3 of this document discusses the IDP in more detail.
- 2.10 Other planning policy documents which will drive the development of Dacorum over the period to 2031 include the Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan, the Site Allocations DPD, the Development Management DPD and the East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan.
- 2.11 The Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan is likely to be adopted early in 2013. It has been developed in conjunction with key infrastructure providers and the resultant requirements are identified throughout the document. One of the regeneration principles identified in the Masterplan is that all development should contribute appropriately to local and strategic infrastructure requirements.
- 2.12 The Site Allocations DPD (pre-submission draft) is due to be published in the Summer of 2013 and will include site specific infrastructure requirements as advised by infrastructure providers. The other DPDs identified in paragraph 2.10 are still in preparatory stages, but will include infrastructure requirements as appropriate.

3 Existing Evidence Base

- 3.1 As discussed, the infrastructure evidence used to support the Core Strategy is the most appropriate evidence for the support of a CIL charge. The Core Strategy is supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (InDP) (June 2012), which identifies the known infrastructure requirements arising from development expected to occur the period 2011-31.
- 3.2 The Examination into the Core Strategy is currently underway. The Hearing was conducted by a Planning Inspector in October 2012, which included an assessment of the technical evidence including the InDP. The Council is awaiting the Inspector's report on the Core Strategy, which will identify whether it is sound, or whether changes are required. The Council hopes to adopt the Core Strategy in the Spring of 2013.
- 3.3 The InDP complements and updates the Dacorum Strategic Infrastructure Study (DSIS) (February 2011) which assessed the infrastructure required for two different levels of development. The information in the DSIS relating to providers' plans and programmes, and established standards of provision remains largely valid, and the InDP makes it clear where this is no longer the case.
- 3.4 The InDP sets out the amount and type of infrastructure required, and the location and timescales for provision, to support the development planned through the Core Strategy. The InDP also considers how new infrastructure might be funded and delivered. It contains an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS), which is a list of the infrastructure schemes which are planned or required to support the development of Dacorum. The IDS will be updated on a regular basis.
- 3.5 The InDP was developed following face to face discussions with most of the infrastructure providers. Providers were asked about the impacts on their services of the level and distribution of development planned in the Core Strategy. The expected distribution and phasing of residential development was broken down by location, size of site and timescales to help inform discussion.
- 3.6 Table 3.1 shows the level and distribution of development planned through the Core Strategy.

Table 3.1: Development planned in the Core Strategy (2006 – 2031)

Residential Development – Number of dwellings								
	Hemel Hempstead	Berkhamsted	Tring	Bovingdon	Kings Langley	Markyate	Rest of Dacorum	Total
2006 – 2031	8,800	1,180	480	130	110	200	420	11,320
Completed 2006 – 2010	875	382	61	19	22	21	59	1,439
2011 – 2031	7,925	798	419	111	88	179	361	9,881
Non-Residential Development – Floorspace (sqm)								
Offices								131,000
Industry								0
Warehousing								0
Retail	53,500	7,000	3,250					63,750

4 The Infrastructure Funding Gap

Background

- 4.1 In order to consider where the appropriate balance lies between the desirability of funding infrastructure and the impact on the viability of development, the Council must first identify the cost of infrastructure it wishes to fund through CIL. It is not possible to identify an exact cost as there are too many unknowns, especially over the 25 year plan period. However, it has been possible to establish a robust estimate based on a selection of infrastructure schemes which are indicative of those likely to be funded by CIL.
- 4.2 Government Guidance states that the Council should focus on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to levy CIL. This should be the funding gap associated with the schemes likely to be funded by CIL once alternative sources of funding have been taken into account.

Calculation of the Funding Gap

- 4.3 It is not considered appropriate to base the infrastructure funding gap on all of the infrastructure requirements identified in the InDP. Some of the schemes identified in the InDP are required to correct existing shortages in provision, which would not be suitable for receipt of CIL monies. Furthermore, there are significant gaps in the information for some schemes around costs and possible funding sources that make their inclusion impossible. Instead, it is based on those schemes identified in the InDP that meet the following criteria:
- The total cost of the project is known⁴;
 - The project is specific to Dacorum (or the cost of the Dacorum element of a wider scheme is known);
 - The project will support the development of the borough, rather than correct an existing shortage in capacity;
 - The project is for something tangible, i.e. not a review or feasibility study;
- 4.4 Furthermore, schemes for the provision of utilities infrastructure⁵ have been removed from the funding gap analysis as they will be funded via revenue from consumer bills.
- 4.5 Table 4.1 shows the Infrastructure Funding Gap by type of infrastructure. The difference between the total identified cost and the funding gap represents identified alternative sources of funding. In some instances, the funding is secured, for example, if it is already allocated from the Council's Capital budget. In other cases, a reasonable alternative to CIL has been identified, for

⁴ The exception for this is where there is a requirement for land, the cost of which is unknown.

⁵ For the purposes of this assessment, utilities infrastructure relates to infrastructure for the provision of gas, electricity, potable water and waste water services.

example funding from the Department for Transport. Where a scheme is likely to be funded via a S106 Agreement rather than CIL, then this is assumed as a reasonable alternative source of funding. The schemes included in the infrastructure funding gap are shown in Appendix A.

Table 4.1: Infrastructure Funding Gap 2011 - 2031

Infrastructure Type	Total identified infrastructure cost	Funding Gap
Transport	£34.6m	£16m
Education	£64.6m	£38.9m
Green spaces	£7.9m	£2.95m
Police	£0.7m	£0
Waste	£3.1m	£1.1m
Sports facilities	£8m	£0m
Burial space	£1.8m	£1.8m
Total	£120.7m	£60.8m

- 4.6 The Infrastructure Funding Gap is **not** a prioritised list of infrastructure delivery and it does **not** identify the infrastructure which will necessarily be funded by CIL. Its purpose is **demonstrate the existence of a funding gap** for the provision of infrastructure requirements, which justifies the imposition of a CIL.
- 4.7 The Infrastructure Funding Gap identified in Table 4.1 is inevitably an under-estimation of the true funding gap for all the infrastructure required for the period 2011-31. This is because a number of requirements do not have costs of provision identified, and so have been removed from the assessment. It is also important to note that the list of infrastructure requirements is a lot more accurate for the short term and so most of the schemes relate to first half of the Plan period. More detailed requirements for the period 2021-31 are likely to be identified nearer the time.

APPENDIX A: Schemes included in the calculation of the Infrastructure Funding Gap

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Transport						
Gade Valley Bus Service	£194K	£194K	n/a	Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF)	£0	Hertfordshire Highways, then commercial operator
QNP support officers	£240K	£240K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
QNP smart ticketing	£70K	£70K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Maylands bus interchange improvements	£115K	£115K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Maylands to station bus link	£209K	£209K	n/a	LSTF contributions from businesses	£0	DBC/operators
QNP household marketing	£149K	£149K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
QNP stop specific information	£102	£102K	n/a	LSTF	£0	HCC/Bus operators
Bus priority on key routes	£1m	£0	£0	n/a	£1m	HCC
Central corridor bus priority scheme	£1m	£0	£1m	HCC/operators	£0	Hertfordshire Highways/bus operators
CCTV on buses and at stations	£500K	£0	£500K	Bus operators/ London Midland	£0	Bus operators/ London Midland
Tactile paving at crossings	£3K	£0	£0	n/a	£3K	HCC
Signage	£4K	£0	£0	n/a	£4K	HCC

⁶ Funding in this column has been identified and is considered to be a reasonable alternative to CIL monies with a reasonable prospect of coming forward

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Cycle maps	£5k	£5K	n/a	LSTF	£0	DBC
Kingshill Way Pedestrian Crossing	£500K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	Hertfordshire Highways
Travel Smart (Hemel Hempstead)	£525K	£525K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Maylands Avenue Urban Realm Improvements	£299K	£299K	n/a	LSTF/S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Maylands to town centre walking and cycling scheme	£479K	£479K	n/a	LSTF/LTP ⁷ /S106 contributions	£0	HCC
Nickey Line Access Ramp Improvements	£350K	£350K	n/a	LSTF/LTP/S106 contributions/ external funding	£0	HCC
Upgrade cycle parking, Hemel Hempstead town centre	£37,300	£37,300	n/a	LSTF	£0	HCC
Junction re-design, Hemel Hempstead	£75K	£0	£0	n/a	£75K	HCC
Change traffic priorities to favour pedestrians	£15K	£0	£0	n/a	£15K	HCC
Improve access for pedestrians and cyclists	£100K	£82K	£0	S106 contribution	£18K	HCC
Cycle parking	£36K	£6K	£0	London Midland	£30K	HCC/London Midland
Improve access to schools on foot/cycle	£40K	£0	£0	n/a	£40K	HCC
CCTV at cycle stands	£25K	£0	£0	n/a	£25K	HCC
Lighting (e.g. Briery Way)	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	HCC
Junction re-design, Hemel Hempstead	£75K	£0	£0	n/a	£75K	HCC

⁷ Local Transport Plan Fund

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Improved cycle and pedestrian access between Hemel Hempstead station and town centre	£500K	£300K	£200K	HCC/DBC/LTP/S106 contributions/external funding	£0	DBC/Hertfordshire Highways
Lighting (e.g. Plough roundabout, Fishery Lane, underpass to park, Briery Way, St Albans Hill)	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	HCC
Pelican crossings	£50K	£0	£50K	LTP/S106 contributions/external funding	£0	HCC
Improve safety of Plough roundabout for cyclists'	£500K	£0	£500K	LTP/S106 Contributions/external funding	£0	HCC
Durrants Hill footpath improvements	£3K	£0	£0	n/a	£3K	DBC
CCTV at rail stations	£250K	£0	£250K	Train Operating Companies	£0	London Midland
Improve road markings	£50K	£50K	n/a	HCC road maintenance budget	£0	HCC
Freight Travel Plans	£20K	£0	£20K	LTP	£0	HCC
Route maps for hauliers	£10K	£0	£10K	LTP, adjoining highway authorities, the Highways Agency	£0	HCC/CBC/Highways Agency
Improve junction access from Three Cherry Trees Lane to Spencers Park and master planning work	£1.5m	£0	£1.5m	Growing Places Fund (GPF), then developer	£0	Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)
Wood Lane Access Road to Maylands	£2m	£0	£2m	GPF, then developer	£0	Homes and Communities

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Gateway and utilities infrastructure						Agency (HCA)
Maylands Gateway site 2 road widening and utilities infrastructure	£2m	£0	£2m	Potential for future round of GPF allocation	£0	DBC
Road safety training	£30K	£0	£30K	LTP	£0	HCC
Signalise Kingshill Way/Durrants Road	£500K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	HCC
Junction improvements and roundabouts	£2m	£0	£0	n/a	£2m	HCC
Re-design site entrances	£500K	£90K	£0	S106 Contribution	£410K	HCC
AQMA at J8 of M1 and Plough roundabout	£80K	£0	£0	n/a	£80K	HCC/Highways Agency
Redesign road and junctions	£250K	£0	£0	n/a	£250K	HCC
High Occupancy Vehicle/Heavy Goods Vehicle Lanes	£250K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	Highways Agency
Maintain highways	£250K	£0	£250K	LTP	£0	HCC
Redesign entrances and improve access for vehicles	£2m	£0	£2m	GPF/LTP/S106 contributions/ external funding	£0	HCC
Provide new roundabouts	£500K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	HCC
Heavy Goods Vehicle park in Maylands	£200K	£0	£0	n/a	£200K	Maylands Partnership
Lorry Bans	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	HCC
Low Emission Zone	£500K	£0	£500K	LTP/S106 contributions/ external funding	£0	HCC
Designated Lorry Routes into Maylands	£500K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	HCC

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Freight transshipment facilities	£5m	£0	£0	n/a	£5m	HCC
New traffic signals	£80K	£0	£0	n/a	£80K	HCC
Install one-way system in Hemel Hempstead Old Town	£1.12m	£1.12m	n/a	DBC and HCC	£0	DBC and HCC
Designate 2Red Routes" to ban stopping and parking	£300K	£0	£0	n/a	£300K	HCC
Variable message signs	£2m	£0	£0	n/a	£2m	HCC
London Road/ Station Road junction improvements	£200K	£0	£0	n/a	£200K	Hertfordshire Highways
Provision of roundabouts	£1m	£0	£0	n/a	£1m	HCC
Business and school travel planning	£719K	£719K	n/a	LSTF/HCC	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Maylands Area Travel Plan	£151K	£151K	n/a	LSTF	£0	DBC
Leisure and destination Travel Plans	£120K	£0	£120K	HCC/DfT	£0	DBC/HCC
Maylands Car Club	£3K	£3K	n/a	LSTF	£0	DBC
Other Car Clubs	£250K	£0	£0	n/a	£250K	HCC
Travel awareness campaigns	£200K	£0	£200K	HCC/DfT	£0	HCC
Discourage pupils/parents driving to/ from school	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	HCC
Community Transport Scheme	£221K	£221K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Home to school transport	£448K	£448K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire Highways
Scots moped scheme	£583K	£583K	n/a	LSTF	£0	Hertfordshire

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
						Highways
Intelligent Transport Systems	£871K	£350K	£521K	LSTF/HCC	£0	HCC
Allow more taxis to collect at railway station	£10K	£0	£0	n/a	£10K	DBC
Expand CPZ schemes around the two railway stations	£240K	£0	£240K	DBC	£0	DBC
Provide additional parking for disabled drivers	£50K	£0	£0	n/a	£50K	DBC
Transport sub-total	£34.6m	£6.9m	£11.7m		£16m	
Education						
Hemel Hempstead NE Primary Planning Area: Re-opening of Barncroft school and expansion of existing school by 1 f.e. ⁸	£8.32m	£0	£0	n/a	£8.3m	HCC
Hemel Hempstead SE Primary Planning Area: one new 2 f.e. school	£7.64m	£0	£0	n/a	£7.64m	HCC/academy/free school
Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Primary Planning Area: one new 2 f.e. school	£7.64m	£0	£0	n/a	£7.64m	HCC/academy/free school
Hemel Hempstead W and NW Primary Planning Area: one new 2 f.e. school	£7.64m	£0	£7.64m	Developer of Local Allocation LA3	£0	HCC/academy/free school
Berkhamsted Primary Planning Area: two new 2 f.e. schools	£15.28m	£0	£0	n/a	£15.28	HCC/academy/free school
Redevelopment of West	£18m	£0	£18m	Uplift in value from	£0	West Herts

⁸ F.e.: form of entry

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Herts College – Hemel Hempstead campus				redevelopment of site		College
Additional apprenticeships in the voluntary sector	£80K	£0	£80	DBC core funding	£0	DBC
Education sub-total	£64.6m	£0	£25.72m		£38.9m	
Green Spaces						
Improvements to existing play facilities throughout borough	£260K	£260K	n/a	DBC capital budget and S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Improvements and relocation of Marlowes play area	£30K	£30K	n/a	Growth Area Funding	£0	DBC
Improvements to Lagley Meadow play area	£46K	£46K	n/a	S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Improvements to Kings Langley play area	£14K	£14K	n/a	S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Improvements to Mortimer Hill play area	£5K	£5K	n/a	Grant from Groundworks	£0	Tring Play For All
Improvements to Bunkers Lane play area	£80K	£80K	n/a	S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Improvements to Markyate play area	£40K	£0	£40K	S106 contributions	£0	DBC
Ashridge: improved green access	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	?
Improvements to open space at Two Waters: Heath Park Gardens	£140K	£140K	n/a	S106 Contributions	£0	DBC/Box Moor Trust/Canal and River Trust/
Improvements to open space at Two Waters: Environmental and accessibility improvements	£500K	£300K	£200K	Developer Contributions/ external funding sources	£0	Boxmoor and District Angling Society/Dacorum Heritage Trust/1 st Apsley Scouts
Refurbishment of Water	£3m	£0	£3m	Heritage Lottery	£0	DBC

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
Gardens				Funding		
Bunkers Park extension	£700K	£338K	£362K	S106 contributions/DBC	£0	DBC
Tring Park enhancements	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	?
Aldbury Nowers habitat restoration and enhancement	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	?
Grand Union Canal enhancement	£2m	£0	£0	n/a	£2m	?
River Valleys project	£100K	£0	£100K	Catchment Restoration funding	£0m	?
Rural villages and common links	£100K	£0	£0	n/a	£100K	?
Urban greening for Hemel Hempstead	£500K	£0	£0	n/a	£500K	?
'Green Hertfordshire' Interactive map	£50K	£0	£0	n/a	£50K	?
Green spaces sub-total	£7.87m	£1.21m	£3.7m		£2.95m	
Police						
29.5 police staff	£237K	£0	£237K	Hertfordshire Constabulary	£0	Hertfordshire Constabulary
151sqm additional police floorspace	£472K	£0	£472K	Hertfordshire Constabulary	£0	Hertfordshire Constabulary
Police sub-total	£709K	£0	£709K		£0	
Waste						
Expanded Household Waste and Recycling Centre	£2m	£0	£2m	DBC/HCC/realisation of land value from redevelopment of existing site	£0	HCC
Two additional	£1.08m	£0	£0	n/a	£1.08m	DBC

Infrastructure project	Estimated Cost	Funding Secured	Funding Identified ⁶	Source of Funding	Net Funding Gap	Delivery Body
collection rounds						
Waste sub-total	£3.08m	£0	£2m		£1.08m	
Sports facilities						
Replacement of Tring Sports Centre	£3m	£0	£3m	External funding sources/DBC/HCC/Tring School/ Tring Town Council/ Sportspace	£0	Sportspace
Refurbishment/ redevelopment of Berkhamsted Sports Centre	£5m	£0	£5m	External funding sources/DBC/HCC/ value from redeveloping existing site/ Sportspace	£0	Sportspace
Sports facilities sub-total	£8m	£0	£8m		£0	
Burial Space						
New cemetery site	£1.8m	£0	£0	n/a	£1.8m	DBC
Burial space sub-total	£1.8m	£0	£0		£1.8m	

Source: Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update (June 2012)