Dear Ms Dower,

**Chichester Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Examination**

I have now reviewed the post-hearing evidence submitted by the Council in response to my letter of 11 June 2015 and the response to the consultation on that evidence.

At this stage, I would be grateful for the Council’s response to the following specific matters contained in the response statement submitted by Turley on behalf of Martin Grant Homes dated August 2015:

**Sales Values – Transactional evidence**
The analysis of Land Registry data presented in table 1.1 and paragraphs 1.16-1.18 of the statement which provides evidence to suggest that the average sales values from recently transacted sales of new build properties in Chichester are less than the figure of £3,400psm used in the revised viability appraisals presented by the Council in CDC-CIL-PH-1.

**Affordable housing sales values**
The evidence presented in Table 1.2 and paragraphs 1.21-1.33 of the statement which indicates that affordable housing values are 7.5-10.4% lower than those assumed in the Council’s revised viability appraisals.

**Build costs**
The evidence presented in paragraphs 1.35-1.65 of the statement indicating that the BCIS figures for the second quarter of 2015 record current average base build costs for West Sussex at £1,080psm for 2-storey houses and £1,366psm for 3-5 storey flats, which is around 5% higher for houses and 15% higher for flats than the figures for base build costs assumed in the Council’s revised viability appraisals.

In particular, I would be grateful for the Council’s response to the following questions:

1. What implications does this new evidence have for the assumptions for sales values and build costs made in the Council’s revised viability appraisals?
2. What effect, if any, does this evidence have on the ability of residential development in Chichester district across the range of typologies tested by the Council, including the strategic sites, to viably support the proposed CIL charges? Where appropriate the residential appraisals should be re-run across the full range of scheme scenarios and typologies, including the strategic sites, to demonstrate the effect on the maximum viable CIL rates.

With regard to the other representations on the post-hearing further work, I will not be inviting the Council to respond further on these at this stage.

I would be grateful for the Council’s response to these questions via the Programme Officer by **12 noon on Friday 11 September 2015**.

It is likely that I will need to provide an opportunity for interested parties to comment on the Council’s response to these questions. Accordingly, I will ask the Programme Officer to copy this letter to all other interested parties for information. It should also be made available on the website as part of the examination library.

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours sincerely,

*Mike Hayden*

EXAMINER