

Infrastructure Delivery Planning in England

Local Infrastructure Delivery Planning
results of a survey of local authorities responsible for local plans and
Local Enterprise Partnerships
June 2013

Janice Morphet
UCL, Bartlett School of Planning
j.morphet@ucl.ac.uk

background to this survey

This survey has been undertaken for two key reasons. The first is to update the survey on the extent of the take up of infrastructure delivery planning in English local authorities as part of their local planning processes undertaken in 2011. The author was centrally involved in leading the research that identified the role of infrastructure planning as part of the delivery focus of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (*Effective Practice in Spatial Planning*, 2007) and then through the Planning Advisory Service both developed the *Steps Approach* (2008) to preparing an infrastructure delivery plan (IDP) and working with local authorities to support them in this work.

This survey shows that since 2011, IDPs have become a central feature in demonstrating the deliverability of plans and in some cases the duty to cooperate. The role of infrastructure delivery planning has been further confirmed in the NPPF (2012). As the findings also demonstrate, the IDP has become a central feature of the planning process and provides vital information to potential investors, communities and individuals on the role of infrastructure needs and provision.

The second reason for undertaking this survey has been to assess how far the local planning process, including IDPs are now able to support the strategic planning, investment and commissioning roles of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). Since being established in 2010, it is clear that LEPs are now central to the delivery of infrastructure in their areas and some infrastructure provision is most suitably considered at this strategic level including sports, leisure and culture, transport and flooding. The role of LEPs in working with the local authorities with planning responsibilities for their area and their IDPs is central for delivery. It will also enable LEPs to demonstrate the EU principle of multi level governance in practice which is an important element in the EU Cohesion Funds 2014-2020 policy.

Methodology

The method used in this study was as follows:

1. identified which local authorities are in each LEP using BIS information
2. identify the Local Plan/Core Strategy progress and status on each local authority web site
3. identify whether the Core Strategy had infrastructure delivery schedules within it
4. if not, examine the local development plan evidence base to search for an IDP or equivalent as a freestanding IDP
5. where no IDP found, undertake an internal web search of local authority web site
6. where no IDP found through local authority internal web site search, undertake a Google search using the term 'infrastructure delivery plan' and the name of the local authority
7. record all findings in LEP tables
8. create % no LEP member local authorities for each category (% do not represent land area in each LEP covered by an IDP)
9. put these in rank order

The definition of an IDP does not include:

- partial infrastructure delivery plans e.g. for green infrastructure
- policy based statements that are not supported by individual schemes
- predictive or modelled assessments of requirements for new housing developments
- studies that focus solely on developer contributions, tariffs or CIL
- studies to support housing growth for part of the local authority area

Summary of Findings

IDP Progress

Since the introduction of a more systematic form of infrastructure delivery planning as part of the local planning process in 2008, the progress in the of infrastructure delivery plans (IDPs) by local authorities is significant. As the following tables demonstrate, the majority of local authorities have either prepared and published an IDP or are committed to doing so. These are described frequently as 'living' documents and a number have been revised on an annual basis. Although there was an initial concern amongst planners that IDPs would be difficult to prepare as other agencies would be unlikely to cooperate, the critical mass of extant IDPs has demonstrated that this is not the case and the relationships formed through this joint working has brought other benefits. Some local authorities have commissioned consultants to undertake all or part of the work in preparing their IDPs but the majority appear to have been prepared in-house. Some local authorities have chosen to accompany the submission drafts of their plans with partial or predictive models of infrastructure requirements without assessing the role of existing and committed provision for the future and in some cases the IDP has been strengthened through the plan hearing process. Finally, some IDPs are incomplete as they are resting entirely on the contributions associated with planning applications to meet their requirements. This approach, which does not include the investment and planning decisions of public and other agencies, does not represent a full assessment of infrastructure provision nor deliverability if it is ignoring the locational decisions of the services operating in the plan area. Despite the recent period of severe economic constraint, there has continued to be investment in public and utility services and this needs to be included if a coordinated picture of provision to support the area for which the plan is made is to be made.

In summary, the survey found that:

- the location of infrastructure, current provision and future needs remain at the heart of the local planning process
- IDPs have become a core means in the local plan to support this process
- IDPs express the current, committed and expected infrastructure provision in the near term and as such create a platform for further investment
- IDPs are regarded as 'living' documents by many local authorities
- In some LEPs, there is a very high provision of IDP coverage although no mention of this on the LEP websites nor any links to the IDPs in practice or a summary of the key elements of the IDPs as a committed investment programme for the LEP area

- In some areas there has been little recognition of the role of infrastructure through the planning process or through LEP priorities

However

- There is little evidence of the duty to cooperate with neighbouring local authorities or LEPs in the preparation of IDPs – this may occur but might be more overtly expressed
- There is little or no mention of national infrastructure proposals in IDPs; as there is a requirement in the NPPF that these are a primary element in the local planning process, it would be good practice to include them in the schedules where they have been submitted or are committed;
- IDPs are very difficult to find on local authority web sites. This is problematic when they are one of the key tools that a local authority has to demonstrate commitment to investment in the area and provide some indication of continued confidence to support communities and the local economy
- As yet few IDPs are demonstrating the commissioning and funding role of the LEPs but this will need to be included over time as the LEP/local authority strategic plans and programmes are developed during 2013 and beyond
- Overall the quality of local authority web sites which set out the position on the current local planning process is poor and needs to be addressed. Many websites do not provide basic information in plain English and for many an attempt to find even a submitted or adopted plan remains very difficult. All planning websites should undergo plain English tests. Not all viewers will be conversant with the processes of plan making or its terminology and professional and practitioner bodies could do much to standardise how plans are presented to the public in ways that are easy to understand.

Top 5 LEPs with extant IDPs (source Janice Morphet)

Rank	LEP	% IDPs 2013
1	Black Country	100
	Bucks Thames Valley	100
	Oxford City	100
4	London	88
	Dorset	88

Top 5 LEPs with extant and committed IDPs

Rank	LEP	% IDPs 2013 (including committed)
1	Black Country	100
	Bucks Thames Valley	100
	Oxford City	100
4	Liverpool	100
5	Enterprise M3	93
	Heart of South West	93

Source: Janice Morphet

Bottom 5 LEPs

Rank	LEP	% IDPs 2013
35	Gtr Lincs	33
	Cumbria	33
	Thames Valley Berks	33
38	Tees Valley	20
39	Gloucestershire	17

Source: Janice Morphet

LEPs and Infrastructure

Since their introduction, the role of LEPs has been expanding and in the future they will have a considerable role in the provision of strategic infrastructure through the devolution of budgets from Government. Further as part of their future role, LEPs will be responsible for managing EU Cohesion Funding 2014-2020 and are currently preparing strategic plans and programmes for the use of this funding for their areas. These focussed strategic plans are set within the principles set out by the EU that include the need to address the UK's commitment to converge on the Europe 2020 economic targets, the principle of territorial cohesion, integration and multi level governance. In its commitments to converge towards the achievement of the Europe 2020 targets, the UK has agreed that the highest priority is

infrastructure provision and improvement so this will need to be a core and organising feature of the strategic plans. However in support of the principles of territorial cohesion and integration principles it will be important for these strategic plans to cover more than any funding gained from the EU or through that in the UK's 2014 Spending Review. The approach taken in IDPs, through the inclusion of all infrastructure investment programmes in a combined document sets a good model to achieve this end and where there is a good coverage of IDPs this will enable LEPs to progress quickly to this provide this.

The principle of multi level governance requires that there is alignment through the governance scales and that proposals from all scales are anchored to specific places. This means that national, local and neighbourhood infrastructure plans need to be demonstrating their role in delivering the infrastructure for their areas. Proposals should be supportive of each other and not conflicting or unaware. Hence any LEP programme will need to start with the basis of the local plan and national infrastructure planning proposals as core features of their strategic plans.

In order to assess how far LEPs have moved to understand and prepare for this process, a survey was undertaken of the LEP websites. There is on the whole very little or no progress to report in this area and the survey found that:

- LEP websites hold very little information and in some cases are very difficult to navigate
- The majority of LEPs have not identified infrastructure as a priority
- The majority of LEPs have no working arrangements within their structures on infrastructure delivery
- The majority of LEP web sites do not include all their local authority members, have no weblinks to their local planning websites or their IDPs
- No LEP has a combined IDP for its area demonstrating existing infrastructure investment commitment which, it could be argued, are central to economic confidence for the area

LEP Index

	LEP	% local plans adopted	Rank order	% IDPs 2011	% IDPs 2013 ¹	Rank order 2013
1	North Eastern	14	33	0	71 (86)	14
2	Cumbria	33	21	17	33 (67)	35
3	Tees Valley	80	4	20	20	38
4	York, North Yorkshire and East Riding	22	27	0	56	26
5	Lancashire	50	12	36	43	33
6	Leeds City Region	30	24	20	70	15
7	Liverpool City Region	17	29	0	67 (100)	17
8	Gtr Manchester	50	12	60	70 (90)	15
9	Humber	25	26	0	50	29
10	Sheffield City Region	44	17	0	67 (78)	17
11	Cheshire and Warrington	0	37	0	66	21
12	D2N2	12	35	12	65	23
13	Gtr Lincs	22	27	22	33	35
14	Stoke on Trent and Staffs	33	21	44	78	9
15	Leicester and Leics	63	9	38	75	10
16	The Marches	67	7	33	67	17
17	Black Country	100	1	100	100	1
18	Gtr B'ham and	11	36	22	56	25

¹ figures in brackets include las committed to an IDP but not yet prepared

	Solihull					
19	Northants	57	11	43	43	33
20	Gtr Cambridge and Gtr P'boro	58	10	42	75	10
21	New Anglia	79	5	64	86	6
22	Cov and Warwickshire	17	29	33	50	29
23	Worcs	17	29	17	83	8
24	SE Midlands	33	21	50	67	17
25	Gloucs	17	29	17	17 (83)	39
26	Herts	30	24	30	60 (80)	25
27	Bucks Thames Valley	75	6	50	100	1
28	Oxfordshire	40	18	60	100	1
29	London	91	2	79	88	4
30	Thames Valley Berks	83	3	33	33	35
31	West of England	50	12	75	75	10
32	Swindon and Wilts	0	37	50	50	29
33	Enterprise M3	36	20	29	86 (93)	6
34	South East	14	33	25	52 (75)	28
35	Coast to Capital	50	12	42	66 (80)	21
36	Solent	64	8	55	73	13
37	Dorset	38	19	0	88	4
38	Heart of the South West	50	12	36	64 (93)	24
39	Cornwall and Isles of Scilly	0	37	0	50	29

Source: Janice Morphet

1. North East LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
no	yes	no	no	no	no

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Durham	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Gateshead	yes	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Newcastle	yes	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
North Tyneside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northumberland	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
South Tyneside	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Sunderland	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
7	1	1	0	0	5/6	7	5/6
%	14	14	0	0	71 (86)	0	71 (86)

- In preparation

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

2. Cumbria LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
Specific fund	yes	0	0	0 ¹	Yes ²

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Allerdale	0	0	0	0	0 ³	0	0
Barrow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carlisle	0	0	0	0	0 ⁴	0	0
Copeland	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Eden	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
South Lakeland	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Number 6	2	2	3	1	2(4)	0	2
%	33	33	50	17	33 (67)	0	33

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Have a special planning and housing group

² Nuclear fuels

³ Being prepared

⁴ Being prepared

3. Tees Valley LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Darlington	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Hartlepool	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Middlesbrough	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Redcar and Cleveland	yes	Yes	yes	0	0 ¹	0	0
Stockton	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Number: 5	4	4	5	1	1	0	1
%	80	80	100	20	20	0	20

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

¹ Commitment to prepare

4. York and North Yorkshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Craven	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Riding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hambleton	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Harrogate	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Richmondshire	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Ryedale	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Scarborough	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Selby	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
York	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 9	2	2	5	0	5	0	5
%	22	22	56	0	56	0	56

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

5. Lancashire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Blackburn with Darwen	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Blackpool	0	0	0	yes	0	0	0
Burnley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chorley	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Fylde	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hyndburn	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Lancaster	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Pendle	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Preston	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Ribble Valley	0	0	yes	0	0"	0	0
Rossendale	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
South Ribble	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
West Lancs	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Wyre	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 14	2	7	8	5	6	0	6
%	14	50	57	36	43	0	43

"descriptive document but 0 schedules

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

6. Leeds City Region LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes ¹

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Barnsley	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Bradford	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Calderdale	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Craven	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harrogate	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Kirklees	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Leeds	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Selby	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Wakefield	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
York	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	0
Number: 10	2	3	5	2	7	1	6
%	20	30	50	20	70	10	60s

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ High Speed Rail

² Commitment to prepare an IDP

7. Liverpool City Region LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	Yes (ports)	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Halton	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Knowsley	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Liverpool	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
St Helens	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Sefton	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	0
Wirral	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
0 (6)	0	1	2	0	4 (2)	1	3
%	0	17	33	0	67 (100)	17	50

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Intention to prepare

² Work commenced

8. Greater Manchester LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Bolton	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Bury	0	0	0	yes	0 ¹	0	yes
Manchester	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Oldham	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Rochdale	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	yes
Salford	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Stockport	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Tameside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trafford	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Wigan	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 10	0	5	6	6	7 (2)	0	7 (2)
%	0	50	60	60	70 (90)	0	70 (90)

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Work underway but schedules awaited

² Work underway but no schedules

9. Humber LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
East Riding	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hull	0	0	0	yes	yes	0	yes
NE Lincs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N Lincs	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 4	0	1	1	2	2	1	2
%	0	25	25	50	30	25	50

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: May 2013

10. Sheffield City Region LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Barnsley	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Bassetlaw	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Bolsover	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Chesterfield	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	yes
Derbyshire Dales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Doncaster	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NE Derbyshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rotherham	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Sheffield	yes	yes	yes	0	0 ¹	0	0
Number: 9	1	4	5	0	6 (7)	2	6
%	11	44	56	0	67 (78)	22	67

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: May 2013

¹ Commitment to publish Sept 2013

11. Cheshire and Warrington LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	yes ¹

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cheshire East	0	0	0	0	Yes		yes
Cheshire West and Chester	0	0	0	0	0		
Warrington	0	0	yes	0	yes		yes
Number: 3	0	0	1	0	2		2
%	0	0	33	0	66	0	66

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ HS2

12. D2N2

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Board: 9 women 1

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Amber Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ashfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bassetlaw	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Bolsover	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Broxtowe	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Chesterfield	0	0	yes	0	yes	0 ⁱ	yes
Derby City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Derbyshire Dales	0	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0
Erewash	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Gedling	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
High Peak	0	0	0	yes	yes	0	yes
Mansfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newark and Sherwood	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Nottingham	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
NE Derbyshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rushcliffe	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
South Derbyshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 17	0	2		2	11	1	10
%	0	12					

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

13. Greater Lincolnshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes ¹	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Lindsey	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Lincoln	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Lincs	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
North East Lincs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Kesteven	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Holland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Kesteven	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
West Lindsey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 9	1	2	2	2	3	1	3
%	11	22	22	22	33	11	33

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Ports and logistics

14. Stoke-on-Trent & Staffordshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cannock Chase	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
East Staffs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lichfield	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Newcastle under Lyme	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
South Staffs	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Stafford	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Staffordshire Moorlands	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Stoke on Trent	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Tamworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 9	2	3	6	4	7		7
%	22	33	67	44	78	0	78

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

15. Leicester and Leicestershire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Blaby	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Charnwood	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Harborough	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Hinkley and Bosworth	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Leicester	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Melton	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	0
NW Leics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oadby and Wigston	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 8	3	5	6	3	6	5	2
%	38	63	75	38	75	63	25

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

16. The Marches LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Herefordshire	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Shropshire	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Telford and Wrekin	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Number (3)	0	2	2	1	2	0	2
%	0	67	67	33	66	0	66

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

17. Black Country

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0 ¹	0

Local authority	LP 2011	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Dudley	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Sandwell	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Walsall	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Wolverhampton	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Number: 4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4
%	100	100	100	100	100	0	100

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ LEP has a planning charter and reports performance <http://www.the-blackcountry.com/default.asp?PageID=336&n=Planning>

18. Greater Birmingham and Solihull

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Birmingham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bromsgrove	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cannock Chase	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
East Staffs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lichfield	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Redditch	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Solihull	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Tamworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyre Forest	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 9	1	1	4	2	5	1	5
%	11	11	44	22	56	11	56

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

19. Northamptonshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Corby	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Daventry	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
East Northants	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Kettering	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Northampton	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
South Northants	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wellingborough	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Number 7	4	4	7	3	3	3	3
%	57	57	100	43	43	43	43

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

20. Gt Cambridge and Gtr Peterborough LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	yes ¹

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cambridge	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
East Cambridgeshire	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Fenland	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Forest Heath	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Huntingdonshire	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Kings Lynn and West Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Hertfordshire	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Peterborough	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Rutland	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
St Edmundsbury	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
South Cambridgeshire	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Uttlesford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number (12)	6	7	7	5	9	2	7
%	50	58	58	42	75	17	58

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ A14 is an EU TEN-T project

21. New Anglia LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0

Board members 14 women 4

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Babergh	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Breckland	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Broadland	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Forest Heath	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Gt Yarmouth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ipswich	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Kings Lynn	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Mid Suffolk	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
North Norfolk	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Norwich	0	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
St Edmundsbury	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
South Norfolk	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Suffolk Coastal	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Waveney	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Number: 14	6	11	13	9	12	8	7
%	43	79	93	64	86	57	50

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

¹ Rail strategy developed with partners

22. Coventry and Warwickshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	yes	0 ¹	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Coventry	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Nuneaton and Bedworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Warwickshire	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Rugby	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Stratford upon Avon	0	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0
Warwick	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 6	0	1	3	2	3	1	2
%	0	17	50	33	50	17	33

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Have adopted a planning protocol

23. Worcestershire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Bromsgrove	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malvern Hills	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	yes
Redditch	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Worcester	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	yes
Wychavon	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	yes
Wyre Forest	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 6	1	1	4	1	5	4	5
%	17	17	67	17	83	67	83

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

24. S.E. Midlands

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	In preparation	In preparation	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Aylesbury Vale	0	0	0		yes	0	yes
Bedford	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Central Bedfordshire	Yes (part)	Yes (part)	Yes (part)	yes	yes	0	yes
Cherwell	0	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0
Corby	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Dacorum	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Daventry	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Kettering	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Luton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Milton Keynes	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Northampton	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
South Northants	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 12	4	4	8	6	8	4	7
%	33	33	67	50	67	50	58

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: May 2013

25. Gloucestershire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cheltenham	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Cotswold	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	0
Forest of Dean	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Gloucester	0	0	0	0	0 ³	0	0
Stroud	0	0	0	0	0 ⁴	0	0
Tewkesbury	0	0	0	0	0 ⁵	0	0
Number: 6	0	1	1	1	1 (5)	0	1
%	0	17	17	17	17 (83)	0	17

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ commissioned

² Commissioned

³ Commissioned

⁴ commissioned

⁵ Commissioned

26. Hertfordshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes ¹	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Broxbourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dacorum	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
East Herts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hertsmere	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
North Herts	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
St Albans	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Stevenage	0	0	0	yes	0 ²	0	0
Three Rivers	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Watford	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Welwyn	0	0	0	0	0 ³	0	0
Number: 10	0	3	4	3	6 (2)	0	6
%	0	30	40	30	60 (80)	0	60

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Preparing an infrastructure plan for Hertfordshire

² Committed to preparing an IDP

³ IDP but as yet no schedules

27. Buckinghamshire Thames Valley LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Aylesbury Vale	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Chiltern	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
South Bucks	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wycombe	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 4	1	3	3	2	4	2	4
%	25	75	75	50	100	50	100

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey: June 2013

28. Oxfordshire City Region LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	yes ¹	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cherwell	0	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0
Oxford City	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
South Oxfordshire	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Vale of White Horse	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
West Oxfordshire	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 5	0	2	2	3	5	2	3
%	0	40	40	60	100	40	60

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Link broken on day viewed

29. Pan London LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Barking and Dagenham	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Barnet	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Bexley	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Brent	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Bromley	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Camden	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
City of London	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Croydon	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Ealing	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Enfield	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Greenwich	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Hackney	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Hammersmith and Fulham	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Haringey	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Harrow	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Havering	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Hillingdon	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Hounslow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Islington	yes	yes	yes	yes	Yes	yes	yes
Kensington and Chelsea	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Kingston	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

¹ Commitment to prepare on website

Lambeth	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Lewisham	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Merton	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Newham	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Redbridge	yes	yes	yes	0	0 ¹	0	0
Richmond	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Southwark	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sutton	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tower Hamlets	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Waltham Forest	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wandsworth	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Westminster	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Number: 33	15	30	30	26	29	18	20
%	45	91	91	79	88	55	61

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: May 2013

¹ Study but no schedules

30. Thames Valley Berkshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Bracknell Forest	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Reading	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Slough	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
West Berkshire	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Windsor and Maidenhead	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Wokingham	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0
Number: 6	4	5	5	2	2	0	2
%	67	83	88	33	33	0	33

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

¹ Commitment to prepare

31. West of England LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Bath and NE Somerset	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bristol	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
North Somerset	0	yes	yes	0	0 ¹	0	0
South Gloucestershire	0	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number: 4	0	2	4	3	3	2	3
%	0	50	100	75	75	50	75

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

¹ IDP shown on website but only accessible to registered users of the Council's site

32. Swindon and Wiltshire LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	0	0	0	0	0

Board 14 2 women

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Swindon	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Wiltshire	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Number: 2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
%	0	0	50	0	50	0	50

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey: June 2013

33. Enterprise M3 LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	0	0 ¹	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Basingstoke and Deane	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
East Hants	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Elmbridge	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Guildford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hart	0	0	yes	0	yes ²	0	yes
New Forest	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Runnymede	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Rushmoor	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Spelthorne	yes	yes	yes	0	0 ³	0	0
Surrey Heath	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Test Valley	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Waverley	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Winchester	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Woking	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 14	2	5	10	4	12 (1)	0	12
%	14	36	72	29	86 (93)	0	86

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ Planning red tape group established

² Prepared but not yet published

³ In preparation

34. South East LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	0	0	yes	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2012?	In LP	Outside LP
Ashford	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Basildon	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
Braintree	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Brentwood	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
Canterbury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Castle Point	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chelmsford	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Colchester	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Dartford	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Dover	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Eastbourne	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Epping Forest	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
Gravesham	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Harlow	0	0	0	yes	yes	0	yes
Hastings	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Lewes	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Maidstone	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
Maldon	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Medway	0	0	yes	0	0	0	0
Rochford	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Rother	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Sevenoaks	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Shepway	0	0	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Southend on Sea	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Swale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tendring	0	0	0	yes	yes	0	yes
Thanet	0	0	0	0	0*	0	0
Thurrock	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	yes
Tonbridge	yes	yes	yes	0	0*	0	0
Tunbridge Wells	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Uttlesford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wealden	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 32	8	14	19	8	18 (6)	7	13
%	25	44	60	25	52 (75)	22	41

* commitment to prepare an IDP

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey June 2013

35. Coast to Capital LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Adur	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Arun	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	0
Brighton and Hove	0	0	0	yes	yes	yes	0
Chichester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crawley	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
Croydon	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Horsham	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Mid Sussex	0	0	0	yes	yes	0	yes
Mole Valley	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Reigate and Banstead	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Tandridge	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Worthing	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
12	4	6	7	5	8 (+2)	1	7
%	33	50	58	42	67 (83)	8	58

** committed to prepare IDP

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ In preparation

² In preparation

36. Solent LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
yes	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
East Hants	0	0	yes ¹	0	yes	0	yes
Eastleigh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fareham	0	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0
Gosport	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Havant	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0
Isle of Wight	0	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
New Forest	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Portsmouth	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Southampton	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Test Valley	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Winchester	0	yes ²	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Number: 11	3	7	8	6	8	3	7
%	27	64	73	55	73	27	64

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: May 2013

¹ It with South Downs National Park

² It with South Downs National Park

37. Dorset LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Bournemouth	0	yes	yes	0	yes	yes	0
Christchurch	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
East Dorset	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
North Dorset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poole	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Purbeck	0	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
West Dorset	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Weymouth and Portland	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Number: 8	1	3	5	0	7	1	6
%	13	38	63	0	88	13	75

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: June 2013

38. Heart of the South West LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	0	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
East Devon	0	0	0	0	0 ¹	0	0
Exeter City	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
Mendip	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Mid Devon	yes	yes	yes	0	0	0	0
North Devon	0	0	0	0	0 ²	0	0
Plymouth	yes	yes	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Sedgemoor	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
South Hams	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
South Somerset	0	0	yes	0	yes	0	yes
Taunton Deane	0	yes	yes	yes	0 ³	0	0
Teinbridge	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Torbay	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Torrige	0	0	0	0	0 ⁴	0	0
West Devon	0	yes	yes	yes	yes	0	yes
West Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 14	2	7	8	5	9 (4)	0	9
%	14	50	57	36	64 (93)	0	64

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

¹ IDP currently being prepared

² Commitment to prepare

³ Commitment in Core strategy; current 2011 IDP no schedules

⁴ Commitment to prepare

39. Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly LEP

LEP infrastructure committee/working group?	Infrastructure priority?	IDP on website?	Transport programme on website?	Links to Local Plans?	National Planning issues identified?
0	yes	0	part	0	0

Local authority	LP 2011?	Local plan adopted 2013?	Local plan submitted?	IDP 2011?	IDP 2013?	In LP	Outside LP
Cornwall	0	0	0	0	yes	0	yes
Isles of Scilly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number: 2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
%	0	0	0	0	50	0	50

Source: Janice Morphet

Survey date: April 2013

ⁱ Have an infrastructure study but focuses on projects to be funded from developer contributions and regeneration agencies