

Comment

Consultee	Mr Alex Medhurst (841435)
Email Address	alex@medhursts.com
Company / Organization	Chichester City Centre Partnership
Address	4 Northgate Chichester PO19 1BA
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Chichester City Centre Partnership (Mr Alex Medhurst)
Comment ID	1
Response Date	11/21/14 9:12 AM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	7.2
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The Business category is not shown to include Class B1a (offices) which should also qualify for a £0 per m2 charge as they are currently unviable and unable to support additional costs.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Amend the schedule to include B1a in the Business category or just refer to B1 without sub-categories.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for

transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Alistair Impey (755555)
Email Address	alistair.impey@yahoo.co.uk
Address	Church Gate Itchenor PO20 7DL
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Alistair Impey
Comment ID	2
Response Date	11/21/14 6:17 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	7 Draft Charging Schedule
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The amount of the proposed levy is totally inadequate to finance the required developments to enable any sustainable development of housing on the Manhood Peninsular.

The levy will raise less than £15,000 for each average housing unit of, say, 100msq. Assuming that 1000 houses are built this will only raise £ 15,000,000. If an extra 1000 houses (or even 500) are to be built traffic congestion will become intolerable without North/ South and East/West separation of A27 traffic from local traffic travelling to and from Chichester (the main centre for employment, education, leisure and commerce). Current drainage and sewerage does not meet existing needs and a totally new system will need to be installed to provide adequate resources. All schools are heavily oversubscribed and will need to be expanded or new schools built. Surely the CIL should cover such vital infrastructure, which might not be needed if no further development occurs. £ 15,000,000 will not enable any of the increased infrastructure to be installed.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

The levy should be increased by a factor of at least 10, if not more, so that significant sums can be made available to finance the additional infrastructure required to make the new developments sustainable.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? No, I wish to communicate through written representations
(Tick as appropriate)

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

Comment

Consultee	Mr Alistair Impey (755555)
Email Address	alistair.impey@yahoo.co.uk
Address	Church Gate Itchenor PO20 7DL
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Alistair Impey
Comment ID	3
Response Date	11/21/14 6:28 PM
Consultation Point	4 How will the levy be collected? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6
Paragraph Number	\$ Levy collection
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

There are already significant shortfalls in existing infrastructure in the Manhood Peninsular. No new development should take place until the increased infrastructure is available. The CIL is supposed to partly fund this improved infrastructure so surely no development should be approved until all the required CIL has been collected and the improved infrastructure installed.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Builders wishing to develop housing on the Manhood Peninsular should be allocated their entitlement for development over the period covered by the development plan and pay the full CIL in advance. Any developer who is not prepared to prefinance the required infrastructure should not be given planning permission over the life of the plan. No actual development should be authorised to commence until the CIL has been collected from all participating developers and the improved infrastructure installed.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? No, I wish to communicate through written representations
(Tick as appropriate)

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

Comment

Consultee	Mr Alistair Tait (558808)
Email Address	patricia.tait@btinternet.com
Address	16 The Horsehoe Selsey PO20 9ES
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Alistair Tait
Comment ID	4
Response Date	11/27/14 6:11 PM
Consultation Point	1 Introduction (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	1.2
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

1.2 A distinction needs to be made between charges meant to upgrade existing infrastructure and charges that cannot be raised in order to cover the cost of existing deficiencies. Surely there are many existing deficiencies that need upgrading rather than just making good?

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	No, I wish to communicate through written representations
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

Comment

Consultee	Mr Edward Rees (870455)
Email Address	ed@domusea.com
Company / Organization	Domusea
Address	St Johns House St Johns Street CHICHESTER Po19 1UU
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Domusea (Mr Edward Rees)
Comment ID	5
Response Date	12/8/14 1:48 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	2.2
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

We are a small speculative residential developer whose focus is sites ranging from 1-10 units. It should be noted that with small sites there is very rarely a large discrepancy between the existing land value and the value of the land with the benefit of a planning consent. We welcome the recent changes to affordable housing thresholds, but it remains a concern that CIL will simply make some small sites unviable. We understand small windfall sites are intended to play an important role in housing supply over the next plan period; therefore, it would seem sensible to allow for further flexibility within this policy.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

We support and welcome the introduction of CIL, but we feel it is imperative that small sites have the ability to negotiate on CIL if viability dictates. We note that currently it is proposed it should be entirely non-negotiable save exceptional circumstances. We suggest if viability can genuinely be demonstrated there should be no requirement to demonstrate exceptional circumstances.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Small operators rarely have the means to ensure they are being fairly represented.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Ellie Henderson (375072)
Email Address	elliehenderson@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Company / Organization	Woodland Trust
Address	Kempton Way Grantham NG31 6LL
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Woodland Trust (Mrs Ellie Henderson)
Comment ID	8
Response Date	12/17/14 9:42 AM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.2
Paragraph Number	Annex B Draft Regulation 123 list
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

We are pleased to see woodland creation in the draft Regulation 123 list.

We believe this is important because:

Tree planting can deliver a wide range of benefits for local communities, in both a rural and urban setting, and this is strongly supported by current national planning policy. The Woodland Trust believes that woodland creation is especially important because of the unique ability of woodland to deliver across a wide range of benefits – see our publication **Woodland Creation – why it matters** <http://centrallobby.politicshome.com/fileadmin/epolitix/stakeholders/4117WoodandCreationbro.pdf>. These include for both landscape and biodiversity (helping habitats become more robust to adapt to climate change, buffering and extending fragmented ancient woodland), for quality of life and climate change (amenity & recreation, public health, flood amelioration, urban cooling) and for the local economy (timber and woodfuel markets).

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Ms Lucy Seymour-Bowdery (376056)
Email Address	Lucy.Seymour-Bowdery@westsussex.gov.uk
Company / Organization	West Sussex County Council
Address	1st Floor Northleigh Chichester PO19 1RH
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	West Sussex County Council (Ms Lucy Seymour-Bowdery)
Comment ID	9
Response Date	12/17/14 10:36 AM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 list
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Chichester District Council (CDC) is preparing to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which will allow funds to be raised from developers to pay for infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. The monies collected will be used to help fund a range of infrastructure including projects that will support the provision of county council services. When a charging authority introduces CIL, section 106 requirements will be scaled back to those matters that are directly related to a specific site.

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

CDC has prepared a Draft Charging Schedule, which sets out the proposed charges for the CIL across the District (excluding the area of Chichester that falls within the South Downs National Park). This is the final stage of stakeholder engagement before CDC submits the Draft Charging Schedule for examination. The County Council has been working with CDC to identify infrastructure requirements to support development identified in the Local Plan. A draft Strategic Infrastructure Package has been prepared to set out the improvements required to enable the provision of county council services to

meet the needs of new strategic development. This package has informed the supporting evidence for the Draft Charging Schedule and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP, version 2 October 2014).

The Draft Charging Schedule highlights that with the anticipated CIL receipts in excess of £30m, there is still likely to be an estimated infrastructure funding gap of £18.5m. In order to manage this shortfall, the County Council is working with CDC to develop a methodology for the prioritisation of infrastructure. In considering the processes required to support the allocation of CIL funds, the County Council is keen to ensure that there is an appropriate level of local member involvement in the decision-making process. The County Council is supportive of the proposed CIL governance arrangements that CDC is developing and will continue to help shape this process. The preparation of a rolling five year Infrastructure Business Plan (IBP) is also supported.

Annexe B: Draft Regulation 123 List

The County Council has worked with CDC to develop the Draft Regulation 123 list and supports the changes made based on comments provided as part of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Ms Heidi Clarke (375349)
Email Address	planning.southeast@sportengland.org
Company / Organisation	Sport England
Address	SportPark 3 Oakwood Drive Loughborough LE11 3QF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Sport England (Ms Heidi Clarke)
Comment ID	10
Response Date	17/12/14 17:49
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Paragraph Number Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 list

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on Chichester District Council's Community Infrastructure Levy- Draft Charging Schedule. Sport England recently commented on the Council's Draft Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. In the comments provided Sport England was supportive of the approach taken by Chichester Council, in particular the table which sets out how open space, sport and recreation facilities will be delivered whether it's through S.106 agreements or via CIL.

In order to provide an informed response Sport England has considered the following documents which will be referenced in the response: Draft Charging Schedule, Draft Regulation 123 List, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014) and the Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study (2013-2029)

The IDP (Oct 2014) identifies the following as key issues for Sports, Leisure and Heritage Facilities and Green Infrastructure:

- 1 *CDC needs to ensure that it has sufficient indoor and outdoor leisure activities and premises to cater for both residents and visitor requirements in the future. It is likely that demand for leisure facilities will increase in the future so it is key that this demand is met.*

- 2 *It is proposed through the Local Plan that developers will be required to contribute towards the provision of open space, sports and recreation facilities and provide facilities on larger development sites. The District Council will work with towns and parishes preparing Neighbourhood Plans to identify suitable sites for the provision of health and leisure facilities where particular deficiencies and local needs have been identified.*
- 3 *The requirement for open space, sport and recreation facilities is likely to be maintained, not least because the need to build at higher densities will require the continued provision of high quality open space.*
- 4 *The Local Plan is the delivery mechanism for ensuring GI is provided as part of development, linking with existing GI, enhancing or improving other areas and ensuring mitigation for those areas that where GI will be lost through development.*
- 5 *A Green Infrastructure strategy will be produced in order to provide a detailed strategy for implementing the delivery of an integrated green infrastructure network.*

The IDP also advises of Plan Area Wide Green Infrastructure requirements in particular numerous cycling routes which are to be funded by developer contributions. It is unclear if a Green Infrastructure Strategy has been developed yet. Other than the cycle routes, the IDP does not identify the specific sports infrastructure needed in the plan period.

The Council undertook an Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study in 2013. Sport England is not commenting at this stage on the robustness of the studies, but it would appear neither studies involved consultation with National Governing Bodies for Sport, local Sport Clubs or Sport England. Therefore Sport England has concerns and would not want to depend on it for an understanding of the needs for sport. Notwithstanding Sport England's concerns, the Study identifies a shortfall of all types of open space with the exception of natural and semi natural green space. The district has a deficit of 21.57 hectares of parks, sport and recreation grounds according to the study. The built facilities aspect of the study is considerably brief and identifies a need for the provision of an athletics track (university), a full-size 3G pitch, a swimming pool (Manhood Peninsula) and a sports hall east of Chichester. These identified needs have not been carried across into either the IDP or the CIL Reg 123 List therefore it is not clear how they could be delivered.

The Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study in 2013 sets out quantity and access standards for open space and built facilities in Table 1 and Table 2. Sport England does not recommend the use of standards because it undermines the evidence base which should clearly set out the needs. Furthermore the use of standards is not considered to accord with Paragraph 73 of the NPPF which states:

Planning policies should be based on robust and up - to - date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.

The Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study should make clear what the need for Playing Pitches/ built sports facilities is in the district based on the predicted population increase over the plan period. The assessments should make recommendations on how this need can be met. Sport England would highly recommend that the Council undertake a playing pitch strategy (PPS) as well as assessing the needs and opportunities for sporting provision (built facilities). Sport England provides comprehensive guidance on how to undertake both pieces of work. The Strategies should make recommendations about how strategic housing sites can help meet predicted Playing Pitch needs as well as the need for built facilities.

Guidance:

Playing Pitch Strategy : <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/>

This guidance document provides a recommended step by step approach to developing and delivering a playing pitch strategy (PPS). It covers both natural and artificial grass pitches. Sport England believes that to ensure there is a good supply of high quality playing pitches and playing fields to meet the sporting needs of local communities, all local authorities should have an up to date PPS. By providing valuable evidence and direction a PPS can be of significant benefit to a wide variety of parties and agendas.

Assessing needs and opportunity for sports provision (Indoor and Outdoor):
[http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/
planning-tools-and-guidance/assessing-needs-and-opportunities-guidance/](http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/assessing-needs-and-opportunities-guidance/)

This guide is complimentary with the PPS guidance providing the recommended approach for assessing the need for pitch provision. Sport England believes that providing the right facilities in the right place is central to enabling people to play sport and maintain and grow participation. An assessment of need will provide a clear understanding of what is required in an area, providing a sound basis on which to develop policy, and make informed decisions for sports development and investment in facilities.

The CIL Reg 123 list set out what CIL will be spent on. With regards Sports provision it advises CIL will fund *Playing Fields, Sports Pitches and related built facilities, and children's play areas other than site-specific requirements*. It also advises that the provision of green infrastructure necessary to make a development acceptable will be collected via S106 contributions. Sport England supports the latter clarification, however whilst it is good that the Council are seeking CIL to fund *Playing Fields, Sports Pitches and related built facilities*, Sport England would recommend that the CIL Reg 123 list should state specifically what is needed. It would appear that the Reg 123 List does not specific any of the needs set out in the Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study.

Sport England would recommend the Council first assess the needs for sports (outdoor and indoor) and then only seek CIL to fund 'big ticket', items which are high priority strategic facilities or improvements to existing strategic facilities. Such will in increase the likelihood of delivery. Other 'small scale sport provision' (e.g new pitches) may better be funded by S106 contributions. At present the wording is considered very generic and as there is not a robust assessment of the need for outdoor sports pitches or indoor leisure facilities and centres, it is very unlikely any *Playing Fields, Sports Pitches and related built facilities will be delivered*.

If you wish to discuss either doing a playing pitch strategy or assessment of built sports facilities, please do not hesitate to contact me.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Sport England would recommend that the CIL Reg 123 list should state specifically what is needed. It would appear that the Reg 123 List does not specific any of the needs set out in the Open Space Assessment and Built Facilities Study.

Sport England would recommend the Council first assess the needs for sports (outdoor and indoor) and then only seek CIL to fund 'big ticket', items which are high priority strategic facilities or improvements to existing strategic facilities. Such will in increase the likelihood of delivery. Other 'small scale sport provision' (e.g new pitches) may better be funded by S106 contributions. At present the wording is considered very generic and as there is not a robust assessment of the need for outdoor sports pitches or indoor leisure facilities and centres, it is very unlikely any *Playing Fields, Sports Pitches and related built facilities will be delivered*.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Martin Small (375142)
Email Address	e-seast@english-heritage.org.uk
Company / Organization	English Heritage
Address	Eastgate Court 195-205 High Street Guildford GU1 3EH
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	English Heritage (Mr Martin Small)
Comment ID	11
Response Date	12/19/14 1:47 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5
Paragraph Number	2.5

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The Council should be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on the viability and effective conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals. For example, there could be circumstances where the viability of a scheme designed to respect the setting of a heritage asset in terms of its quantum of development could be threatened by the application of CIL. There could equally be issues for schemes which are designed to secure the long term viability of the historic environment (either through re-using a heritage asset or through enabling development).

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities set out, in their Local Plan, a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In relation to CIL, this means ensuring that the conservation of its heritage assets is taken into account when considering the level of the CIL to be imposed so as to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment.

We consider it essential, therefore, that the rates proposed in areas where there are groups of heritage assets at risk are not such as would be likely to discourage schemes being put forward for their re-use

or associated heritage-led regeneration. In such areas, there may be a case for lowering the rates charged.

In addition, we are encouraging local authorities to assert in their CIL Charging Schedules their right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances e.g. where development which benefits heritage assets and their settings may become unviable if it was subject to CIL. We also urge local authorities to then offer CIL relief where these circumstances apply. We welcome the reference to discretionary relief in the Draft Charging Schedule and note that the Council does not intend to offer such relief at this time. We trust that the Council will bear our comments in mind in deciding whether or not to offer discretionary relief in the future.

We would recommend that if the Council does decide to offer discretionary relief in the future, the conditions and procedures for CIL relief be set out within a separate statement. The statement could set out the criteria to define exceptional circumstances and provide a clear rationale for their use, including the justification in terms of the public benefit (for example, where CIL relief would enable the restoration of heritage assets identified on English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register). For clarity the statement could also reiterate the necessary requirements and procedures which would be followed in such cases, including the need for appropriate notification and consultation.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

None at this stage, but we will expect the Council to consider a discretionary relief policy if it is found that charging CIL has adverse implications for the viability and effective conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Martin Small (375142)
Email Address	e-seast@english-heritage.org.uk
Company / Organization	English Heritage
Address	Eastgate Court 195-205 High Street Guildford GU1 3EH
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	English Heritage (Mr Martin Small)
Comment ID	12
Response Date	12/19/14 1:53 PM
Consultation Point	3 What will CIL be spent on? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	3.1

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

English Heritage advises that CIL charging authorities identify the ways in which CIL, planning obligations and other funding streams can be used to implement the policies within the Local Plan aimed at and achieving the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting.

The Community Infrastructure Levy covers a wide definition of infrastructure in terms of what can be funded by the levy and is needed for supporting the development of an area. This can include:

- 1 Open space: as well as parks and green spaces, this might also include wider public realm improvements, possibly linked to a Heritage Lottery Fund scheme, conservation area appraisals and management plans, and green infrastructure;
 - 2 'In kind' payments, including land transfers: this could include the transfer of an 'at risk' building;
 - 3 Repairs and improvements to and the maintenance of heritage assets where they are an infrastructure item as defined by the Planning Act 2008, such as cultural or recreational facilities.
- The Localism Act 2011 also allows CIL to be used for maintenance and ongoing costs, which may be relevant for a range of heritage assets, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges

or green and social infrastructure such as parks and gardens.

Historic buildings may offer opportunities for business or employment use – infrastructure to support economic development. Investment in heritage assets (e.g. listed buildings at risk) and the wider historic character of a place (e.g. conservation areas at risk) may also serve to stimulate and support the tourism offer and attractiveness of a place to retain and attract economic development, which may be particularly important in supporting the viability of town centres. Conversely, vacant or underused heritage assets not only fail to make a full contribution to the economy of the area but they also give rise to negative perceptions about an area and discourage inward investment.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

We suggest that the District Council should consider whether any heritage-related projects within Chichester District would be appropriate for CIL funding. The Local Plan's evidence base may demonstrate the specific opportunities for CIL to help deliver growth and in so doing meet the Plan's objectives for the historic environment.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	No, I wish to communicate through written representations
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Consultee	Mr Martin Small (375142)
Email Address	e-seast@english-heritage.org.uk
Company / Organization	English Heritage
Address	Eastgate Court 195-205 High Street Guildford GU1 3EH
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	English Heritage (Mr Martin Small)
Comment ID	13
Response Date	12/19/14 1:56 PM
Consultation Point	8 Next Steps (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	8.2
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

It should be remembered that development-specific planning obligations may still continue to offer further opportunities for funding improvements to and the mitigation of adverse impacts on the historic environment, such as archaeological investigations, access and interpretation, and the repair and reuse of buildings or other heritage assets.

English Heritage strongly advises that the District Council's conservation staff are involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the Draft Charging Schedule as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will

however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Ross Anthony (856633)
Email Address	ross.anthony@theatrestrust.org.uk
Company / Organization	The Theatres Trust
Address	22 CharingCross Road London WC2H 0QL
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony)
Comment ID	15
Response Date	12/19/14 6:02 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The Theatres trust supports the nil rate for 'Standard Charge' development in Table 7.1. The provision of D1, D2 and some sui generis types of community facilities usually depend on public investment or subsidy in one form or another in order to be delivered, even when privately operated. They are therefore inherently unviable in developer terms, even without the imposition of CIL. Rather than helping fund CIL, these developments are funded by CIL.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Alison Giacomelli (379651)
Email Address	alison.giacomelli@rspb.org.uk
Company / Organization	RSPB
Address	1st Floor Pavilion View 19 New Road Brighton BN1 1UF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	RSPB (Mrs Alison Giacomelli)
Comment ID	16
Response Date	12/22/14 2:55 PM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 list
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The RSPB would like to make the comment that Alternative Natural Greenspace is not being included in the list of Habitats Regulations mitigation measures funded through the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP), which provides for mitigation measures relating to Chichester Harbour Special Protection Area. This is because it was felt that as it is not possible to recreate the coast elsewhere, alternative sites would be less effective at drawing people away from the Harbours, though to test this, a country park-style alternative site is being trialled in one authority area. However, the SRMP includes other measures in the interim strategy (<https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/community-and-environment/environment/solent-recreation-mitigation-strategy.aspx>), for example, a Coastal Dog Project, which go beyond a 'Financial contribution towards management of Natura 2000 sites.' Therefore, the RSPB's view is that the list of exclusions in the Reg 123 list is not sufficiently clear about what the likely Habitats Regulations mitigation measures will be.

The RSPB would also like to point out that the suite of sites covered by the Habitats Regulations are called Natura 2000 sites (not Europa).

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

The RSPB suggests replacing the two clauses under 'Habitat Regulations Assessment Mitigation' with:

Financial contribution to the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, or to measures to mitigate recreational disturbance to Natura 2000 sites (which may include access management or green infrastructure), as appropriate.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination?
(Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Ms Elizabeth Cleaver (781429)
Email Address	Elizabeth.Cleaver@highways.gsi.gov.uk
Company / Organization	Highways Agency
Address	Federated House London Road Dorking RH4 1SZ
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Highways Agency (Ms Elizabeth Cleaver)
Comment ID	17
Response Date	1/2/15 9:58 AM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.3
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Thank you for consulting the Highways Agency on the Draft Charging Schedule for the Chichester District Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). As you are aware, the Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of Chichester District our interest relates to the A27 Trunk Road. We have worked with Chichester District Council, West Sussex County Council and developers to agree a package of mitigation measures for the A27 Chichester Bypass to deliver the development in the Submitted Local Plan. Although we had anticipated that CIL funding would be provided for these improvements to the A27, your Council has decided to use Section 106 agreements. We are generally content with this approach, however we do need a clearer understanding of how this will work including trigger points for improvements, how much and when money will be provided from each of the major development sites, and the process for forward funding if there is not sufficient money when the improvements need to be in place. I hope these comments are helpful. We look forward to continuing to work with your Council and West Sussex County Council.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Robinson (374911)
Email Address	david@bilshamlane.plus.com
Address	Bilsham Manor Bilsham Lane Yapton BN18 0JX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr David Robinson
Comment ID	18
Response Date	12/30/14 12:16 PM
Consultation Point	5 Evidence Base (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	5.3

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

In para 7.1 it is stated that “*Informed by the relevant background evidence the Council proposes to set differential rates of CIL for different intended uses of development **and different geographical areas based on economic viability** .” However, the Peter Brett Associates report only identifies 200 new dwellings being provided on identifies sites within the northern part of the district compared to 3,550 in the southern part (5.3%/94.7% respectively). The report also states that there are areas within the south of the district where property/land values substantially exceed those in other parts of the south. For these reasons it is not believed that there is adequate justification for introducing different rates of CIL between the north and south unless the higher rate will also apply to those areas within the south where higher values exist. To do so would add undue complication. Consequently, it is believed that a single rate should apply to all housing developments throughout the district.*

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Para 7.1 and table 7.1 should be amended to apply a single rate of CIL of not more than £120 per m² throughout the whole of the district and other consequential amendments will be required elsewhere to reflect this change.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Robinson (374911)
Email Address	david@bilshamlane.plus.com
Address	Bilsham Manor Bilsham Lane Yapton BN18 0JX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr David Robinson
Comment ID	19
Response Date	12/30/14 12:22 PM
Consultation Point	4 How will the levy be collected? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	4.7
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

In para 4.7 the phrase “ *Payments in kind will normally only be considered for land or provision of infrastructure in excess of that needed to deliver the infrastructure required by the development*” is not understood as only the delivery of infrastructure required by the development is properly chargeable.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Delete the relevant text.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Robinson (374911)
Email Address	david@bilshamlane.plus.com
Address	Bilsham Manor Bilsham Lane Yapton BN18 0JX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr David Robinson
Comment ID	20
Response Date	12/30/14 12:25 PM
Consultation Point	5 Evidence Base (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	5.3

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

In para 5.3 it is stated that “ *The Chichester District Council Plan Viability study update (September 2014) estimated that for the Local Plan period the total Infrastructure Funding Deficit (for items where costs are known) without CIL stands at approximately £52m. With the anticipated CIL receipts the gap narrows to approximately £18.5 million.*” This implies that CIL will deliver £33.5m of infrastructure (64.4% of the total). It is not believed that the development that is to be provided within the Plan period will necessitate total contributions representing 64.4% of the total existing and future infrastructure deficiencies within West Sussex (excluding the National Park). Consequently, it is clear that part of the monies to be generated through CIL will be to make up for pre-development existing infrastructure deficiencies which is contrary to the principles of the CIL Regulations.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

The data base needs to be reviewed and the amount to be raised through CIL should be reduced so that it only provides for the cost of infrastructure improvements that will actually be generated by the new development.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Robinson (374911)
Email Address	david@bilshamlane.plus.com
Address	Bilsham Manor Bilsham Lane Yapton BN18 0JX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr David Robinson
Comment ID	21
Response Date	12/30/14 12:29 PM
Consultation Point	4 How will the levy be collected? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	4.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

This should refer to the Royal **Institution** of Chartered Surveyors.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Amend the text.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Simon Tofts (788036)
Email Address	simon.tofts@bluecedarhomes.co.uk
Address	3 Richmond Hill Clifton Bristol BS8 1AT
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Simon Tofts
Comment ID	22
Response Date	1/5/15 9:58 AM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

I refer to the Chichester District Council Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule and wish to make a number of representations. These Submissions are made on behalf of Blue Cedar Homes, a private retirement homes specialist operating in the South West of England. As such, this representation is made in respect of the residential development element of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

You may recall that i made representations tot eh Chichester District Council Draft Planning Obligations and Affordable Hpousing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), dated 29 October 2014. A number of the comments previously raised are reiterated in this representations as the documents are very closely related.

Housing for the elderly is being more positively recognised throughout the country, especially from Central Government. I note that within the Draft CIL Charging Schedule set out on page 12, the CIL rate for all residential development in the District, with the exception of residential institutions (C2), is either £120sqm (South of the District) or £200sqm (North of the District). Viability testing in other Authorities in the South and South West demonstrates that sheltered retirement housing, which is classified as use class C3, is very challenging. it is my firm belief that applying a CIL rate on retirement

developments will be to constrain the delivery of schemes. i therefore hope that any adopted CIL schedule can be adapted in a way that does not constrain this much needed form of development.

I stongly believe that specialist accommodation, such as retirement housing, should also have its own separate development scenario and not be amalgamated into a general residential levy rate. Moreover, specialist accommodation is not like conventional housing and a uniform CIL rate applied to all forms of residential development could potentially render all development of this type unviable in the Authority. I suggest C3 sheltered/retirement housing is subject to an Authority wide zero/nil rate of CIL

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

I suggest C3 sheltered/retirement housing is subject to an Authority wide zero/nil rate of CIL

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	No, I wish to communicate through written representations
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Consultee	Mr Simon Tofts (788036)
Email Address	simon.tofts@bluecedarhomes.co.uk
Address	3 Richmond Hill Clifton Bristol BS8 1AT
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Simon Tofts
Comment ID	23
Response Date	12/22/14 3:23 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	2.2
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Factors such as higher build costs and a longer selling period for our properties make retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. Therefore, it is imperative that when determining CIL rates, the charging authority completes an accurate development scenario for specialist accommodation for the elderly to ascertain whether it can support the same level of CIL. As such, I consider that 'C3 sheltered/retirement housing' should be explicitly exempt from these categories and instead, should be added to the list of 'Exemptions' set out in Section 2, para 2.2, page 7.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

I consider that 'C3 sheltered/retirement housing' should be explicitly exempt from these categories and instead, should be added to the list of 'Exemptions' set out in Section 2, para 2.2, page 7.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of

the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Simon Tofts (788036)
Email Address	simon.tofts@bluecedarhomes.co.uk
Address	3 Richmond Hill Clifton Bristol BS8 1AT
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Simon Tofts
Comment ID	24
Response Date	12/22/14 3:23 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	2.2

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

During the consultation period of this document, the Government have issued guidance, set out in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) document, dated 28 November 2014. In the guidance the Government state that;

"There are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development (including)

- 1 contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm
- 2 in designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty".

As such, this very recent guidance should be taken into account in the Council's CIL Charging Schedule and be added to the list of 'Exemptions' set out in Section 2, para 2.2, page 7

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Simon Tofts (756390)
Email Address	simon.tofts@bluecedarhomes.co.uk
Company / Organization	Blue Cedar Homes
Address	3 Richmond Hill Clifton Bristol BS8 1AT
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Blue Cedar Homes (Mr Simon Tofts)
Comment ID	25
Response Date	12/22/14 3:23 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

I note that in the report on the Examination of the Draft Hertsmere Borough Council Community Infrastructure levy Charging Schedule, December 2013 (PINS/N1920/429/12), developers of specialist retirement housing, McCarthy and Stone and Churchill retirement Living, and Hertsmere Borough Council recognised the important difference between retirement housing and general needs housing in their charging schedule. The same approach should be considered and taken by Chichester District Council in its CIL Charging Schedule. Currently, i believe there is no reasonable justification for a CIL charge on retirement housing at the same level as general needs housing.

The Retirement Housing Study prepared by Knight Frank in October 2014 recognises the hurdle retirement housing faces in the planning system. I believe Chichester District Council should take heed of this Study. As a minimum, the Local Authority should look at the contributions a C2 use class (residential institutions/nursing/care homes) provides. The 'C2' classification means that developers do not have any obligations to provide affordable housing. According to Table 7.1 on page 12, CIL reliefs or waivers are also applicable to C2 uses. I beleive that a housing scheme which provides a real need for specialist housing, such as retirement dwellings, should be exempt, similar to the C2 use

class. it should also be recognised that by providing this type of housing for the elderly to downsize, larger family homes would become vacant.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	No, I wish to communicate through written representations
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Consultee	Mr Robert Edwards (706796)
Email Address	ironbridge40@gmail.com
Address	2 Wealden Drive Westhampnett PO18 0SF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Mr Robert Edwards
Comment ID	26
Response Date	12/18/14 5:34 PM
Consultation Point	1 Introduction (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	1.7

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Support

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

I am firmly in favour of developers contributing substantial sums towards the infrastructure costs associated with building developments and therefore support this levy. However, I think that there are two dangers:

1 The Planning Authority may feel free to agree to developments where the existing circumstances in an area already make it clear that further building should not be considered (eg where there is already unacceptable traffic congestion, where schools are already oversubscribed, where there are already inadequate medical facilities) The Levy may well be used as an excuse (not a reason) for granting planning permission on the grounds that it will pay for any shortfall in these areas.This will not be the case because we will always be playing catchup.The amount of the levy might help towards existing problems but will not make any impact on the increased demands created by the new development.

2 We will continue to see the same failure in infrastructure development as under the existing Section 106 arrangements.That is that all sorts of promises and agreements about the infrastructure will be made but there will of course be insufficient public money available to get infrastructure improvements underway before house building starts.The only money available will be that borrowed by developers for house building- easily repayable as houses are sold.Therefore the houses will continue to be built and the demand for additional services created with no hope of meeting that demand.More catchup!

Until Planning Authorities can withhold planning permission until the necessary infrastructure improvements have been made we will simply fall further and further behind.

I still clearly remember attending several meetings before the Graylingwell Development started to hear of the wonderful plans for a Medical Centre, a School, cycle tracks and a restaurant. What has been built? The houses.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr David Wilson (755330)
Email Address	drwilson@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills UK
Address	c/o Thames Water Utilities Ltd Clearwater Road Reading RG31 4EL
Consultee	Ms Carmelle Bell (375129)
Email Address	thameswaterplanningpolicy@savills.com
Company / Organization	Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Address	Clearwater Court Vastern Road Reading RG1 8DB
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Ms Carmelle Bell)
Comment ID	27
Response Date	1/5/15 11:19 AM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	Annexe B. Draft Regulation 123 list
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.

Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for a small part of the northern area of the District and are hence a “**specific consultation body**” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning

(Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We have the following comments on the CIL Draft Charging Schedule:

Thames Water provide essential water and wastewater infrastructure in order to support growth and deliver environmental improvements. That infrastructure provision can incorporate the provision of buildings such as a new sewage pumping station or a new sewage treatment building for example. The nature of such infrastructure buildings means that there is no impact on other forms of infrastructure requirements such as schools, open space and libraries. Thames Water therefore consider that water and wastewater infrastructure buildings should be exempt from payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy and this appears to be the case in the draft schedule where "All development not separately defined" have a Nil charge which is supported by Thames Water.

The Council may however wish to consider using CIL contributions for enhancements to the sewerage network beyond that covered by the Water Industry Act and sewerage undertakers, for example by providing greater levels of protection for surface water flooding schemes. Sewerage undertakers are currently only funded to a circa 1:30 flood event.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Neil Crowther (584563)
Email Address	neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk
Company / Organization	Arun District Council
Address	Maltravers Street Littlehampton BN17 5LF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Arun District Council (Mr Neil Crowther)
Comment ID	28
Response Date	1/5/15 3:06 PM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	6.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

- 1 It is noted that paragraph 9 of the Viability Assessment sets out that the Build Cost assumptions take into account the cost of building to Code Level 5. However, it should be noted that the Government's Housing Standards Review Technical Consultation (September 2014) sets out that, as part of the incorporation of Code for Sustainable Homes into Building Regulations, energy efficiency requirements will not be set over Code Level 4.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Neil Crowther (584563)
Email Address	neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk
Company / Organization	Arun District Council
Address	Maltravers Street Littlehampton BN17 5LF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Arun District Council (Mr Neil Crowther)
Comment ID	29
Response Date	1/5/15 3:06 PM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	6.3
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

- 1 It is understood that there is better understanding of servicing and infrastructure costs relating to the development of strategic sites. Therefore a benchmark land value (defined as: "the estimated minimum a developer would typically need to pay to secure a site of this kind") approach has been used for the assessment of these sites instead of the threshold land value approach (defined as "the amount of money a landowner will need in order to sell his or her land"), which has been used for the generic residential viability assessments. It is not clear why an overall assumption of servicing and infrastructure costs (the use of Benchmark Land Value) cannot be applied to the generic appraisals to allow for a more consistent land value/viability appraisal approach.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will

however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Neil Crowther (584563)
Email Address	neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk
Company / Organization	Arun District Council
Address	Maltravers Street Littlehampton BN17 5LF
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Arun District Council (Mr Neil Crowther)
Comment ID	30
Response Date	1/5/15 3:06 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Map 1.1 and Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

It has been noted that Map 1.1 of the Draft Charging Schedule is not consistent with Table 7.1 Proposed CIL Charges. The map shows areas 'north and south of the National Park' but the proposed CIL charges refer to a geographical variation based on "South of the District" and "North of the District". Although it should be clear where the different charges apply, it may be helpful for the wording used for the map and proposed rates to be the same. This may avoid confusion in the application of the charge once implemented.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Consultee	Ms Kate McBride (803865)
Email Address	Kate.McBride@hca.gsi.gov.uk
Company / Organization	Home and Communities Agency (HCA)
Address	Bridge House 1 Walnut Tree Close Guildford GU1 4GA
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Home and Communities Agency (HCA) (Ms Kate McBride)
Comment ID	31
Response Date	1/5/15 1:58 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	2.5
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Para 2.5 currently states that CIL is non-negotiable and that at this stage Chichester District Council does not intend to adopt an Exceptional Circumstances Policy. The Homes and Communities Agency comments as follows;

On brownfield sites particularly, viability is often more of an issue, and to ensure that Chichester District Council achieve their housing supply targets, some flexibility on CIL (or perhaps greater scope to negotiate S106) should be built in. An Exceptional Circumstances Policy should be included to cover the less viable sites.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

An Exceptional Circumstances Policy should be included to respond to the issues relating to less viable sites particularly brownfield sites.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	32
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8
Files	832429.PDF
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1 Proposed CIL Charges
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The representor does not believe that the CDC's proposed approach to residential CIL charging rates as set out in the CIL DCS has been prepared in accordance with, or meets the requirements of, either the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) or the CIL Guidance (2014) contained within PPG.

Despite representations being made by Martin Grant Homes and other industry stakeholders to the CIL PDCS consultation, CDC has continued to proceed with the approach proposed in the PDCS.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	33
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	6.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	<input type="radio"/> Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Benchmark Land Values

It is unclear as to what evidence has been utilised to arrive at the benchmark land values within the PBA (October 2014) Chichester CIL Viability Study2 ('the Viability study').

The following single sentence is cited within the Viability Study: "Local agents suggested that residential land values (with respect to cleared and serviced sites) range from £1m - £1.2m /acre. Land values to the south of the District are in the region of £1m /acre (equivalent to £2,470,000/ha) with the higher value areas to the North East area."

Martin Grant Homes is concerned that this does not form a robust and evidenced basis upon which to set benchmark land values for viability assessment. The degree to which these land values are realistic is critical – for the benchmark land value forms the ‘tipping point’ at which CIL ‘overage’ can be levied. If this is misrepresentative of the market for land, it completely undermines the validity of the viability evidence base.

Making reference to engagement with local agents simply does not provide a robust basis upon which to formulate a CIL Charging Schedule.

Moreover, the benchmark land values used in viability summary Table 8.1 appear to differ to that referenced in paragraph 8.8 of the Viability Study. The link between evidence and viability assessment is opaque and requires the provision of further explanation from PBA and CDC. At present, the benchmark land values appear arbitrary and are not underpinned by any local transactional or other market evidence.

Given that the approach taken by PBA uses land value thresholds as a fundamental viability consideration (including reference to a ‘buffer’ which is discussed in more detail in subsequent sections); the benchmark land values must be based on robust local evidence.

How can CDC demonstrate that an ‘appropriate balance’ has been struck under CIL Regulation 14, if the evidence underpinning the generation of the point of balance (i.e. the point at which sites are judged to be viable or unviable) is either absent and based on pure opinion, or based on undisclosed second hand evidence?

It is the express view of Martin Grant Homes that the land value benchmarks utilised are artificially low, and hence overstate viability. It is an absolute necessity for CDC to substantiate the benchmarks used drawing on market evidence as is required by both PPG and NPPF prior to submitting the CDC CIL DCS to PINS for Examination.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	34
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Residential Value Points & CIL Charging Zones

Martin Grant Homes submitted its concerns, regarding the CIL rate of £120 per square meter for residential development in the South of the District, within representations made to the CDC CIL PDCS consultation.

Specifically, Martin Grant Homes highlighted the following deficiencies with the PBA Plan Viability (November 2013) report⁴, which formed the CIL viability evidence base: • Residential value evidence failed to represent comparable market information from new build development and therefore is not sufficient to support the approach to zoning proposed. • Residential value evidence presented lacks

consistency with the approach to zoning proposed, for it actually supports the introduction of several CIL charging zones across the South of the District. • It is unclear how the residential sales value evidence has been translated into the £ per sqm values set out within Table 5.2 and used to underpin the viability assessment for CIL charging. It was requested that further explanation was provided by PBA and CDC.

Martin Grant Homes submitted more 'fine grained' transactional evidence from Land Registry that demonstrated that the residential sales market across the South of the District shows significant differentiation in the values achievable. Specifically, the values in Selsey, Chichester (and surrounds), East Wittering and Southborne are significantly below those achievable in Bosham and West Wittering. Analysis of new build asking prices on Rightmove.co.uk supported this. Supplementary engagement was undertaken with local agents, which also verified the conclusions reached. This evidence is presented within Appendix 1 and should be read in conjunction with this representation.

Despite the representations made, the CDC CIL DCS has proceeded to retain the same approach set out within the PDCS. PBA has prepared additional supporting viability evidence within the PBA (October 2014) Chichester CIL Viability Study5 ('the Viability Study'). However, Martin Grant Homes' concerns have not been addressed.

In fact, Table 6-2 of the PBA Viability Study actually proposes an increase in the value of residential houses in the South of the District from £3,200 per square meter to £3,300 per square meter for the purposes of viability assessment.

Again, reference is made to Land Registry, but the evidence has not been published and nor has any specific evidence of new build asking prices or sales values local to the area been presented.

The PBA Viability Study states within Table 6-2: "This data is then supplemented following conversations with agents and house builders' sales representatives, which allows us to form a view on new build sales values."

However, no record of the conversations or details of stakeholders consulted is presented within the PBA Viability Study to demonstrate the link between this process and the end-values utilised to inform viability assessment. It is the continued view of Martin Grant Homes that this fails to constitute the use of 'appropriate available evidence' and demonstrates an opaque and overly simplistic process.

Paragraphs 8.6 – 8.7 of the PBA Viability Study elaborate on this. This suggests that the price increase applied reflects the generic rate of sales price increase across the District. However, it does not confirm what actually constitutes 'the area' or the 'relevant period' or the data source used to justify this uplift from £3,200 to £3,300 per square meter: "...we updated sales values in our model by the average rate of sales price increase for the area over the relevant period."

Martin Grant Homes therefore requests that the above queries are clarified and supported by the appropriate evidence.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following: (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;

- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	35
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	6.4
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	<input type="radio"/> Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Undefined Buffer

Martin Grant Homes set out a major concern that the scale of 'buffer', setting CIL back from the margins of viability, had not been defined in any documentation published within the CDC CIL PDCS.

PPG requires that such a 'buffer' is introduced and that the Charging Authority should be able to explain the approach to this clearly at Examination in order to enable consideration within the Regulation 14 'balance' test.

CDC has not provided any response to this issue within the PDCS Consultation Statement, nor has the PBA Viability Study provided clear explanation.

The PBA Viability Study shows varying scales of 'overage', which are claimed to represent a buffer drawing back from the margins of viability, but it is unclear as to which table sets out the final buffer for consideration.

For example, Table 8-1 on page 44, suggests a buffer of circa £40 per square meter for residential development with 30% affordable housing in the area to the south of the National Park.

However, given the concerns Martin Grant Homes has set out with regards to both the understating of land values, and over-estimation of residential sales values, this margin is anticipated to be far smaller for sites to the south of the National Park.

Analysis has been undertaken of current CIL DCS documents prepared by neighbouring Local Authorities to CDC, as well as consideration of recent CIL Examiner's Reports, to establish the acceptable scale of 'buffer'.

It is evident that the scale of 'buffer' is variable between Charging Authorities, and is an issue that continues to be taken very seriously by CIL Examiners⁶. The scale of buffer ranges from a minimum of 25% (e.g. Havant), 30% in Horsham, to 30%-32% in East Hampshire (following an increase from 20% following consultation on the CIL PDCS).

Given the relatively high proposed CIL rates for residential development it is strongly advised that a minimum buffer of 30% across all locations and scenarios is demonstrable by CDC and PBA.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	No, I wish to communicate through written representations
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	36
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	Annexe A CIL Draft Payments by Instalments Policy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Annexe A. CIL Draft Payments by Instalments Policy
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Payment by Instalments

Martin Grant Homes made representations to the CDC CIL PDCS, which requested a series of amendments to the proposed draft Instalment Policy.

Specifically, the representor proposed modifications to the Instalment Policy with the specific objective of improving its functionality subsequent to adoption of a CIL charging regime. The requests included:

- Removing reference to requirement for payment of the full balance of CIL liability at first occupation

/ opening of the development if this is earlier than the due instalment dates; and • Proposing amended instalment dates and thresholds to assist with scheme cash flow and hence viability of development.

Martin Grant Homes continues to uphold the concerns presented in the CDC CIL PDCS consultation and reiterates that it is essential that CDC prepares and adopts a robust and effective Instalment Policy if CIL is to not adversely impact upon the viability of residential development projects.

The representor remains firmly of the view that, as drafted, the Instalment Policy is selfdefeating and unclear. It presently suggests that first occupation / opening triggers a requirement for payment of full CIL liability. Yet, this point is likely to represent only the commencement of revenue generation on a development site. There is no clear viability rationale for retaining this approach and it is not an approach that the representor has encountered in any other Charging Authority nationally.

Crucially, CDC has published the draft Instalment Policy for consultation without any acknowledgement of the recommendations provided by the representor or any justification for the retention of the present approach. This is deemed wholly inadequate and poor consultation practice.

It is Martin Grant Homes' position that the proposed Instalments Policy remains inadequate as drafted. It is therefore requested that the Instalment Policy proposed within representations made to the CDC CIL PDCS Consultation is utilised by CDC. This is contained within in Appendix 1 for reference.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Spilsbury (832428)
Email Address	matthew.spilsbury@turley.co.uk
Company / Organization	Turley
Address	1 New York Street Manchester M1 4HD
Consultee	Mr Haydn Payne (832429)
Company / Organization	Martin Grant Homes
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Martin Grant Homes (Mr Haydn Payne)
Comment ID	37
Response Date	1/5/15 2:44 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	2.5
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	<input type="radio"/> Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Relief for Exceptional Circumstances

Despite the representations made to the CDC CIL PDCS, which advocated the introduction of discretionary relief from CIL in exceptional circumstances, CDC has stated at paragraph 2.5 within the published CIL DCS that it does not intend to introduce discretionary exemptions.

The representors are both surprised and disappointed that CDC has adopted this stance, despite CDC's own recognition within the CIL DCS that: 'Offering exceptional circumstances relief would provide the Council with some limited flexibility to deal with individual sites where development is

desirable, but which are proved to have truly exceptional costs or other requirements which make them unviable”

CDC has failed to substantiate the grounds for adopting this stance. The representor sees this as inadequate and would request that CDC appropriately justifies the position adopted. If this is not possible, CDC should reverse this decision.

It is the view of the representor that failure to introduce discretionary exemptions will result in CDC being forced to accept reductions in the provision of affordable housing on sites with demonstrable viability challenges. This is clearly not an acceptable position for a local authority with a high backlog and demonstrable need for the provision of an increased supply of affordable housing.

It is critical for CDC to boost housing supply to meet the need for market and affordable housing, rather than placing this at further risk by introducing an overly ambitious CIL regime.

Further details, with regards to the representor’s views on the necessity for the introduction of discretionary relief from CIL in exceptional circumstances, are contained within representations made to the CDC CIL PDCS. These should be read in conjunction with the above points, and are contained in Appendix 1.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

No, I wish to communicate through written representations

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mrs Nicola Furlonger (833166)
Email Address	nfurlonger@nlpplanning.com
Company / Organization	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Address	14 Regents Wharf All Saints Street London N1 9RL
Consultee	(833168)
Company / Organization	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited ()
Comment ID	38
Response Date	1/5/15 4:07 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6
Files	833168 Chichester Representation Form s7 Proposed Charges.DOC
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1 Proposed CIL Charges
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	<input type="radio"/> Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The Draft Charging Schedule proposes a CIL rate of £120/m² for residential development in the south of the District, which incorporates the Chichester urban area and surroundings, and would consequently

include CEG's interest in Westhampnett / North East Chichester Strategic Development Location (which is also one of the emerging Local Plan's strategic housing allocations).

CEG is clear that the delivery of strategic sites is dependent on the provision of necessary infrastructure, whether that is transport, social or community infrastructure. Each of these is part and parcel of the development costs that CEG, as promoter of the development at Westhampnett / North East Chichester Strategic Development Location, is committed to funding.

CEG acknowledges that some further attention has been given to strategic sites within the updated viability assessment by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) (September 2014), which is necessary given the strategic importance of these sites in delivering the development envisaged in the emerging Local Plan and in meeting the housing need in the District.

CEG, however, considers that the proposed £120/m² CIL charge for residential development is unacceptably high and unrealistic. The evidence is not yet sufficiently robust to derive the proposed figure for a residential CIL rate, either on strategic sites or on housing sites generally. The underlying viability evidence continues to ignore the complexity of large sites, with modelling based on smaller schemes, and CEG contends that a properly tested 300 to 500 dwelling scheme scenario would show a £120/m² charge is not viable.

The proposed level of CIL appears to be set at a commercially unachievable level due to certain unhelpful assumptions used in the PBA viability report. CEG, informed by their cost advisors Brookbanks, has highlighted numerous examples of where this occurs, as set out below:

1 Certain updates to the PBA previous report appear to now be outdated. For example, in dealing with revised assumptions made for the purpose of the Draft Charging Schedule, the PBA viability assessment reports (at page 5) on recent strong house price inflation and then applies this rate to the future years' calculations. It fails, however, to take into account the industry expectation that the market will subside (recent indicators suggest that this is happening) and will not, therefore, continue at its current rate of increase.

2 The PBA report does recognise that input costs have increased recently and has adopted recent cost information; but it is likely that the rate of these increases will continue to grow as the economy

1 strengthens. These cost increases are likely to arise, in particular, due to the pent up demand of limited suppliers' cost increases and below inflation wage rises for the past 7 or so years.

The PBA report states at page 26 that future changes in relation to residential build costs have not been incorporated "*because CIL should deal with current market conditions.*" The Planning Practice Guidance is clear that the "*assessment of costs should be based on robust evidence which is reflective of market conditions*" (Reference ID: 10-022-20140306).

In this regard, it must be appropriate to give consideration to future market trends in setting out cost assumptions. Indeed, this is exactly the approach that PBA has taken in considering house price rises, which are projected forward. It is contradictory to suggest that cost assumptions should not be similarly projected forward based on market intelligence.

3 At paragraph 5.15, the PBA reports states that, "*In real terms, abnormal development costs or site servicing costs will be met by developers when the land is purchased.*" This is incorrect – the cost of dealing with abnormal development conditions and servicing is set against the land value and is ultimately borne by the land owners in receiving reduced sales receipts. The result of this assertion is that costs will be substantially understated.

4 Further, the PBA view on the cost of servicing the strategic sites (paragraph 8.60 and appendix A.2) is a generic rate of £600,000 per hectare, which does not take account of the site specific servicing requirements. These may result in servicing costs substantially in excess of this figure.

5 The viability sampling scenarios at para 6.1 sample up to a maximum of 100 units for housing and 24 units for flats. Paragraph 8.33 then states that viability testing for strategic sites is based on the 100-unit scenario. This is not representative of the way in which large-scale strategic schemes are delivered.

6 The residential sales values at Table 6.2 appear optimistic as a starting point, notwithstanding the flawed inflation assumptions referred to above.

7 Average housing densities of 35 dwellings per hectare in Table 6.2 would not support the values detailed in the same table. In order to achieve the high values modelled, a significantly less dense layout would be required.

8 The evidence does not take full account of the financing cost. For example, house-builders are typically looking for higher returns than the 20% indicated in table 6.3. More typically, a developer would expect 20% GDV profit, plus interest cover and marketing cost. This means that a 24% developers' profit should be accounted for.

9 In addition, the phasing of CIL receipt means that a significant proportion would be payable while development is cash-flow negative, even taking account of an instalment policy. Therefore, the CIL charge will attract a financing charge which is not taken into account.

10 The assumed professional fees of 8% and a contingency of 5%, as incorporated in the cost assumption in table 6.3, are both low; Brookbanks advises that 10-12% and 10% respectively would be appropriate.

11 The recent changes to Stamp Duty announced in the December 2014 Autumn Statement have rendered this section of Table 6.3 out of date.

All of the foregoing comments suppress the true costs that a development will have to carry before the CIL calculation is undertaken, and raise serious questions over whether the proposed CIL rates are appropriate.

In terms of the strategic sites, we note that CEG made a planning application for the development of the first 300 homes on the Westhampnett site in April, and that delivery is planned within the period 2015-2019 (not beyond 2019 as suggested in the PBA report, albeit we note that this timing is drawn from the emerging Local Plan). The revised viability study fails to acknowledge the submission of an application on

this site, the fact that (subject to planning permission) it will be delivered in the 0-5 year period, and the additional evidence on viability that this scheme might provide.

The planning application scheme, and CEG's knowledge of the site and associated costs, provides additional insight into the accuracy of the PBA assumptions for strategic sites, which all indicate that the proposed CIL charge is inappropriate.

As examined in more detail in CEG's response to Paragraph 3.1 and Annexe B of the Draft Charging Schedule, we would also cross-refer to the draft Regulation 123 list, which excludes the £12.8 million planned improvements to the A27 Chichester by-pass from being funded via CIL. Instead, it is proposed to be funded via planning obligations and/or highway agreements. Given the assertion in the PBA report that planning/highways obligations will be scaled back, it is understood that the assumed level of residual s106/s278 contribution in the viability assessment has not taken account of this item of strategic infrastructure investment, which would be a significant omission in the cost assumptions, with implications for the level of CIL that could be borne by residential development. [NB. As argued below, the proposal to fund the A27 improvements by s106 is inappropriate, with CIL being the correct mechanism by which to secure the single biggest item of planned strategic transport infrastructure works in the District. The mechanism for funding must, however, be fully incorporated into the viability assumptions].

Finally, the PBA assessment in Section 8 shows that strategic sites in Chichester have historically achieved an average £8,000 per unit for s106, with 40% affordable housing. The proposed £120/m² CIL charge, alongside the assumed £8,000 per unit residual s106 contribution on strategic sites, suggests an overall 'policy cost' (applied to the 90m² 3-bed unit in the PBA report at para. 8.41) of £18,800. Even with the reduced affordable housing rate of 30%, this is a substantial additional cost to be borne by strategic sites. Working on the understanding that the average £8,000 per unit s106 contribution have been negotiated taking account of what a particular scheme can afford to pay, the application of a substantial additional CIL charge – in addition to residual s106 costs – is likely to have an unacceptable impact on viability.

Overall, CEG considers that the proposed residential CIL rate of £120/m² in the south of the District and applied to strategic sites is unrealistically high, and that the evidence is not sufficiently robust to demonstrate that the Council has struck the appropriate balance between —

“... (a) 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

(b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.” (Regulation 14, Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended).”

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

CEG suggests that the proposed CIL Charge for residential development should be reduced in the context of further revisions to the viability evidence.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

CEG considers it would be helpful to discuss the implications of the proposed CIL rate, in the context of the viability evidence, in person with the Examiner.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mrs Nicola Furlonger (833166)
Email Address	nfurlonger@nlpplanning.com
Company / Organization	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Address	14 Regents Wharf All Saints Street London N1 9RL
Consultee	(833168)
Company / Organization	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited ()
Comment ID	39
Response Date	1/5/15 4:07 PM
Consultation Point	2 Who will pay CIL? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6
Files	833168 Chichester Representation Form p2.5 Exceptional Circumstances.DOC
Paragraph Number	2.5
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Paragraph 2.5 of the Draft Charging Schedule confirms, as did the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, that CDC does not intend to adopt an exceptional circumstances policy, which would allow discretionary

relief to be offered where the CIL charge would have unacceptable impacts on a development's economic viability. It is not clear why CDC has decided not to operate such relief from the outset.

The NPPF stresses that the sites and the scale of development identified in the Local Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Whilst CIL charging rates should be set at a rate that maintains viability across a charging area, it cannot always account for development sites that are subject to abnormal and/or unforeseen costs. By adopting an exceptional circumstances policy, the Council will have the flexibility to ensure these 'exceptional' costs do not undermine the delivery of key housing sites. As set out in the CIL Guidance, *"use of an exceptions policy enables charging authorities to avoid rendering sites with specific and exceptional cost burdens unviable."*

It is also worth noting that Section 55 of the CIL Regulations ensures that, even where a charging authority offers exceptional circumstance relief, that authority has the discretion to apply relief in individual cases – or indeed to refuse to apply relief.

As set out in CEG's previous representations, there is no apparent reason not to offer exceptional circumstance relief in the CDC area from the outset. CEG would urge the Council to do so.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

CEG requests that Chichester District Council adopts an exceptional circumstances policy.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.
--	---

If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

CEG considers it would be helpful to discuss the implications of the proposed CIL rate, in the context of the viability evidence, in person with the Examiner.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mrs Nicola Furlonger (833166)
Email Address	nfurlonger@nlplanning.com
Company / Organization	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Address	14 Regents Wharf All Saints Street London N1 9RL
Consultee	(833168)
Company / Organization	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Commercial Estates Group and D C Heaver and Eurequity Limited ()
Comment ID	40
Response Date	1/5/15 4:07 PM
Consultation Point	3 What will CIL be spent on? (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9
Files	833168 Chichester Representation Form Regulation 123 list.DOC
Paragraph Number	3.1 and Annexe B: Draft Regulation 123 List
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The draft Regulation 123 list identifies infrastructure to be funded at least in part by CIL, but also confirms the infrastructure that would be excluded from being funded by CIL and so secured through s106 planning obligations and/or s278 highway agreements.

CEG notes that the planned Strategic Road Network improvements to the A27 Chichester Bypass junctions are excluded from funding by CIL. This seems to be a wholly unjustified position when this is exactly the type of strategic 'off-site' infrastructure that CIL is intended to support.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2014-2029, provided as background evidence to the Draft Charging Schedule, identifies the A27 Junction improvements as infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of development envisaged in the Local Plan. With a cost of £12.8 million, it is the largest item of planned transport infrastructure improvements by some considerable margin, and amounts to some 18% of the total identified cost of infrastructure needed in the District.

Given the scale of this infrastructure requirement and the fact that it will serve the District as a whole, we would not regard this as infrastructure that should be funded through individual planning obligations. The latter should, as required by Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and explained in the Planning Practice Guidance, be scaled back to those matters that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Furthermore, given the limitations placed on the pooling of planning obligations in place from April 2015, it would not seem possible or practical to fund the A27 improvements via s106/s278.

We are concerned that, in seeking to do so, it would create an undue financial burden on individual sites that are required to pay both the proposed high CIL charge and contribute to financing this strategic infrastructure. It is notable also that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not identify any developments that would be required to pay for the A27 improvements (whereas other necessary infrastructure is listed against the strategic sites).

CDC's Draft Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document of September 2014 states that *"Funding for transport infrastructure required as a result of incremental growth will normally be required by the Council as part of the CIL and other mainstream funding programmes."* This appears to support the inclusion on the A27 strategic network improvements through CIL.

CEG therefore requests this item of strategic infrastructure provision be incorporated in the list of projects to be funded by CIL within the Regulation 123 list. If not, and as set out above, the viability analysis must be undertaken again to take into account this significant additional cost.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

CEG suggests that the planned Strategic Road Network improvements to the A27 Chichester Bypass junctions are incorporated in the list of projects to be funded by CIL within the Regulation 123 list. The viability assessment must reflect the mechanism for funding this infrastructure improvement within its cost assumptions.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

CEG considers it would be helpful to discuss the implications of the proposed CIL rate, in the context of the viability evidence, in person with the Examiner.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	41
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	1 Introduction (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8
Files	833041.pdf
Paragraph Number	1.4
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The interrelationship of CIL and site specific S106 is critical to the commercial viability of larger development and regeneration projects such as food stores. In many cases the food store is linked to a wider development scheme or masterplan involving other uses and infrastructure such as roads. Therefore the preparation and inclusion of infrastructure elements to the Regulation 123 List needs to be clearly defined and understood to avoid double counting (known as 'double-dipping').

Typical 'site specific' S106/S278 costs that will be outwith the Regulation 123 List should be factored into the CIL Viability Modelling.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	42
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Paragraph Number	Viability Assessment para 3.4 - 3.14
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Application of CIL rates

We would support the view that an 'appropriate balance' should be found so the Council is able to maximise the quantum of development in the area. If the CIL rate is too high, this will impact the rate of development due to CIL charges making development unviable. However if CIL charges are too low, development will be unviable due to insufficient infrastructure provision. Therefore finding an 'appropriate balance' is essential for development and delivery of the Plan.

Setting the CIL lower than the margins of viability is made explicit in the DCLG CIL Guidance (December 2012, p10) where it states that, "A charging authority's proposed levy rate (or rates) should be reasonable given the available evidence, but there is no requirement for a proposed rate to exactly mirror the evidence, for example, if the evidence pointed to setting a charge right at the margins of viability. There is room for some pragmatism."

"Charging authorities should avoid setting a charge right up to the margin of economic viability across the vast majority of their site in the area"

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	43
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	5 Evidence Base (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Assessment para 5.15
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Landowners aspirations

We would support this assertion, where landowners consider that there is a prospect of securing developments on their site that yield a high value, their aspirations to secure higher land values will be prevalent. Land owners are likely to “hold out” until they have explored their potential returns fully, and may not sell the site if the proposed returns are below their expectations.

In the case of retail developments, landowners are likely to hold out for the highest value and are unlikely to accept a reduction in their land value for CIL.

The NPPF assertion on the need to provide competitive returns to a willing land owner are noted and agreed with. We would also note that where landowners consider that there is prospect of securing higher value uses at their site; their aspirations to secure higher land values will be prevalent. Land owners are likely to “hold out” until they have explored and maximised their potential returns fully. We consider that this needs to be taken into account when assessing and setting the benchmark land value.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	44
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Study - Chapter 4 para 5.6 - 5.15
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

We agree with the adopted approach for estimating threshold land value. The use of the residual valuation method is recommended by RICS guidance and the Harman report and benefits from being based upon comparable market evidence. This provides a more accurate view of land value as stated in the report (para 4.9) 'a rational landowner will always seek to maximise site value'. This approach is therefore highly dependent upon use of appropriate comparable revenue evidence and cost assumptions in its appraisal analysis which we discuss in our comment about retail revenue assumptions.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)	Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.
--	---

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">. (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or. (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.
---	--

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	45
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	Viability Study - Retail Revenue Assumptions page75 table
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The earlier November 2013 Viability Study a base rent of £183 psm, however no evidence had been provided and the same rental figure had been adopted for both the small and large format store. The latest September 2014 Viability Study provides comparable evidence for convenience rents, providing an average of £234 psm, which is an increase of £51.00 psm on the previous appraisals. This is a significant increase of 27.87%. We note the comparable evidence includes convenience rents from 2013 in locations such as Cambridgeshire, London, Milton Keynes and Perth. Clearly each location

would be assessed on its own merits and with increased competition food operators will examine trade potential carefully in formulating their offer for any site/property.

We also consider rental data from 2013 to be too historic when considering that in 2014 the larger foodstore operators including Tesco, Sainsburys and Morrisons have experienced difficult trading conditions with significant reductions in performance and losses being made. This has resulted in significantly lower returns to shareholders and significant falls to investor sentiment which has resulted in a re-evaluation of the sector by investors. Indeed both Tesco and Morrisons have announced store closures and the rate of larger foodstore development has reduced significantly. Therefore more current data is needed which will inform the CIL setting process and it is likely that by revising the assumptions particularly in terms of rental levels and investment yield this will affect the level selected for CIL. At the present time the CIL is being based on historic assumptions and it is considered at these levels there is a genuine prospect that development of larger stores (i.e. over 465sqm) will not occur due; this would be harmful to Chichester in terms of it providing services and jobs to the local economy.

Examination of current data will indicate that the CIL levels for smaller convenience stores and those associated with larger stores are now at variance.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	46
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Paragraph Number	Viability Assessment - Cost Assumptions page 22, para 5.5 - 5.8 and page 27 para 6.5 - 6.8
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Cost Assumptions

As stated in our previous representation, a number of appraisal cost inputs need to be reviewed. In addition to the comments in representation 45, the following aspects should still be considered:

- Build Costs - The appraisals at Appendix B have adopted a built cost of £1,171 psm for the 465 sqm store and £1,398 psm for the 4,000 sqm store. However, we have obtained BCIS rates for the fourth quarter of 2014 and rebased the location to Chichester which suggests a median rate of £1,508 psm

for supermarkets between 1,000 and 7,000 sqm and £1,204 psm for smaller stores up to 1,000 sqm. We therefore argue that the build costs used within the viability appraisal are too low.

1 Demolition/Site Preparation/Planning Fees – No allowance has been made for these costs in the latest appraisals.

- Professional Fees – A figure of 8% has still been used within the appraisals. As before, we would expect professional fees to be between 10 – 12.5% of costs to reflect the complexity of convenience schemes.

- Planning Obligations – No allowance has been made for these in the latest appraisals.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	47
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Study - Benchmark Land Value page 76 table 14-4
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

From the table at Para. 14.24 (page 76) it appears that a benchmark land value of £5.282m has been adopted which has been increased from the earlier Viability Appraisal. This increase brings the land values to a more realistic level.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	48
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Assessment - Recommended retail charging rates - page 2 para 1.8
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

We note that the recommended retail charging rate of £125 is still in place for retail which is wholly or mainly convenience use, despite the change in some of the appraisal assumptions.

We still consider this charge too high as it risks rendering convenience retail unviable. This is especially the case for large convenience retail as the ceiling rate is only £195 psm (Table 14-4) which leaves little margin for fluctuation in costs or values which will impact adversely upon the ability to pay CIL. The buffer being proposed here could easily be wiped out.

This is an issue the viability report discusses earlier in paras 3.4 to 3.14. As discussed above in our first comment, it is important to achieve an 'appropriate balance' between ability to pay CIL so as to ensure development does not become unviable whilst ensuring development does not become unviable whilst ensuring CIL payments are sufficient so the infrastructure required in order to ensure successful development is achieved across the local authority area.

This demonstrates the need to provide some sensitivity analysis along with differentiation in CIL rates applied based upon unit size.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	49
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Study - Retail Unit Size assumptions - page 74 para 14.18
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Retail Unit Size assumptions

We note that the same two convenience typologies have been examined as follows: - A larger out of town centre grocery store of 4,000 sqm GIA; - An in-town Metro-style grocery store of 465 sqm GIA scheme.

The viability report still does not supply an explanation as to why these specific sizes have been selected. We would consider that most foodstore operators would have formats which are significantly

larger, and thus would involve greater land take and indeed additional costs of development. A typology in the order of 5,000 to 6,000 sqm would be more appropriate for a larger store.

We would like to refer here to recent amendments to Regulation 13 (differential rates) of the CIL Regulations 2014 which now allow charging authorities to set differential rates within their area. In particular we would like to draw attention to the insertion in Part 3 (after regulation 13 para (1) (b)) to include (c) by reference to the intended gross internal area of development. This amendment has now been made as a statutory instrument and as such we feel that it should be given more weight when assessing CIL rates for new commercial development.

We would strongly suggest that alternative retail scenarios are included for viability testing in addition to the 4,000 sqm and 465 sqm units tested for example: · Medium sized unit of 1,500sqm · Maximum unit of 5,000 – 7,000sqm

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	50
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3

Paragraph Number Viability Study - Site Density - page 76 table 14-4

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer) Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Site Density

The site area has increased to 1.33 Ha for a larger store sized 4,000 sqm, which provides a site density of 30%. We think this is acceptable as it provides space to accommodate necessary landscaping and car parking provision, and therefore generates less revenue to accommodate CIL payment.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	51
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Study
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Sensitivity Testing

There does not appear to be any sensitivity analysis provided to allow for market fluctuations on sensitive variables such as rental value, yield and build costs.

Sensitivity analysis of these variables is essential in order to understand how small market fluctuations can have a big impact upon development viability. For example a small shift of just 0.25% on the yield can have a significant impact.

We note in the Community Infrastructure Level – Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule- March 2014 Executive Summary it is the Council's intention to apply a rate of inflation based on the BCIS Index – see “How the charge will be calculated”. We are aware that BCIS forecasts are already predicting high levels of build cost inflation and thus we would expect some sensitivity testing to have taken place which would validate the level of CIL proposed. Without such testing we consider that the CIL level cannot be found sound.

We recommend that sensitivity tests are undertaken and used to review the proposed CIL rate of £125 psm as we consider this doesn't allow for a sufficient buffer on the CIL rate applied and would not accommodate any such market fluctuations that may render a development scheme unviable.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Atam Verdi (833043)
Email Address	atam@aspinallverdi.co.uk
Company / Organization	AspinallVerdi – Property Regeneration Consultants
Address	Suite 21 30-38 Dock Street Leeds LS10 1JF
Consultee	(833041)
Company / Organization	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ()
Comment ID	52
Response Date	1/5/15 11:31 AM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Paragraph Number	Viability Study
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

We are pleased to have been given this opportunity to comment on the Chichester District Council Proposals and would like to register our interest in receiving details of the Charging Schedule.

The work undertaken to date has been substantial, however in our view makes several optimistic assumptions. Further work and revisions are needed in order to reflect the observations above and particularly:

1. We would recommend that the report is reviewed to be made clearer and more explicit, and that Appendix B is made available to the public such that this can be properly considered. 2. Based upon

our earlier comments we would like to question the following appraisal assumptions: a. Build costs should be increased to reflect BCIS up to date costs for supermarket construction. b. No allowance has been made for planning fees/costs, or demolition/site preparation costs which can be considerable. c. We would support the use of 10% (not 8%) to allow for professional fees given the complexity of such retail schemes. d. The allowance for section 106 is too low. e. The allowance adopted for contingencies is too low, particularly given that the consultants have made no allowance for demolition and site preparation.

3. We feel that it would have been more appropriate to have reviewed a range of unit sizes to reflect the differential CIL rates applicable on each size, this is something that CIL currently allows for.

4. It is essential that a sensitivity analysis is included to consider a combination of assumptions i.e. rent, yield and build costs; the findings should then be used to test whether an appropriate buffer has been allowed for when setting the CIL Charge.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Mr Matthew Sobic (756607)
Email Address	msobic@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	Belvedere 12 Booth Street Manchester M2 4AW
Consultee	(756611)
Company / Organization	Brookhouse (Chichester) Ltd
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Brookhouse (Chichester) Ltd ()
Comment ID	53
Response Date	1/5/15 1:22 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Viability Study and DCS Table 7.1 Proposed CIL Charges
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	<input type="radio"/> Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

I have been asked by Brookhouse Group to make a representation in relation to the CIL - Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. My client is proposing development on land at Barnfield Drive and is in the process of promoting a retail development including a foodstore. We have noted the £125sq.m charge that is proposed for convenience goods retail and the £20sq.m charge proposed for comparison retailing with some concern and have therefore assessed the viability study to see the assumptions behind this charging rate. We would raise concern that the costs with developing a supermarket and comparison retail space are not accurately reflected in the calculation and that the appraisals effectively assume

a clean site with no issues. As Brookhouse know well, this is not the case with many sites in Chichester and issues around Flood Risk, Highways, Foul Drainage Capacity and Water Supply Capacity are all common on many sites in the area. These issues result in significant mitigation works and an assumption of 10% of costs for other construction and 5% contingency do not accurately reflect abnormal costs. These are effectively standard site development costs, no allowance for any abnormal costs have been made. Additionally, my client's site is a former Landfill and quarry site which adds further significant redevelopment costs that would not be factored into the viability study. There are significant remediation costs associated with the Barnfield Drive site.

We would therefore contend that the proposed retail CIL rates have the potential to make many developments, not just my client's, unviable and puts at risk investment in the area. We would suggest that the appraisals are revised to include an allowance for abnormal costs and we would happily discuss the actual costs on our site with your consultant. The impact of these revised appraisals would be a reduction in the proposed retail CIL rates to more realistic figures.

We would also like to suggest that the Council look to build flexibility into their CIL charging rates to allow developers the opportunity to put forward site specific issues that could impact on the amount of CIL they are able to pay. This approach would allow issues relating to excessive abnormal costs to be dealt with on a site by site basis.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	54
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	6 Viability Assessment (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9
Files	833238.pdf 833238 Appendix 4.pdf
Paragraph Number	Viability Study
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The consortium comprising Bloor Homes, Linden Homes, Miller Homes, Seaward Properties Ltd, and Taylor Wimpey, is not convinced that the assumptions used in the PBA viability appraisals are appropriate and robust. Section 4 of Savills representation outlines this position in detail. Savill's is also concerned that the testing of the Strategic Sites is not adequate as appropriate fin-grained testing has not been undertaken.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

A differential rate should be set for Strategic Sites, plus lower rates to be set differentially across the District for all other residential development to account for the fluctuations in the market based on locality.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

If you wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

The Consortium reserves the right to make further comments on the evidence base at the Examination.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	55
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Map 1.1 and Table 7.1 Proposed CIL Charges
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

No differential rates have been proposed for emerging Strategic Sites, thus placing at risk the housing land supply and delivery of the emerging Local Plan.

Limited regard has been had to "scheme mitigation" infrastructure (typically S106/S278) in the viability appraisals.

Proposed CIL rates would not be economically viable.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Differnetial rates for the emerging strategic sites.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	56
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Annexe B Draft Regulation 123 List
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

The Regulation 123 list needs to be redrafted to offer a clearer distinction between what is to be funded by CIL and S106/S278.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

The Regulation 123 list needs to be redrafted to offer a clearer distinction between what is to be funded by CIL and S106/S278.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate) Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	57
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	Annexe A CIL Draft Payments by Instalments Policy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Annexe A. CIL Draft Payments by Installments Policy
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Support with modifications

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Concerned about the statement "the full balance to be payable on first occupation/opening of the development, if this occurs earlier than the due instalment dates set out above" defeats the principle of the instalments policy.

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

Would like the statement replaced by " the full balance is to be payable on completion of the development, or final occupation, if either is earlier than the due instalment dates set out above".

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	58
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	5 Evidence Base (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
Paragraph Number	4.7
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Have comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

With regard to "Payments in Kind" there are no details on how the Council intends for this to operate, what the parameters will be, and the likely circumstances of such an arrangement.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for

transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	59
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

In view of recent government changes to S106, schemes of 10 or less homes will be contributing less in terms of affordable housing, this means they may be able to pay more CIL. The viability study needs to determine whether this is the case.

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of

the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

Comment

Agent	Charlie Collins (833238)
Email Address	CCollins@savills.com
Company / Organization	Savills
Address	2 Charlotte Place Southampton SO14 0TB
Consultee	(584687)
Company / Organization	Tangmere Consortium
Address	Unknown Unknown Unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule
Comment by	Tangmere Consortium ()
Comment ID	60
Response Date	1/5/15 4:27 PM
Consultation Point	7 The Draft Charging Schedule (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.3
Paragraph Number	Table 7.1
Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)	Oppose

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here.

Object to residential charges on viability grounds, as proposed CIL rates would not be economically viable

Please note: The Examiner will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing part of the examination.

Please note: The purpose of presenting the draft Regulation 123 list and details of where s106 contributions will be sought is for transparency and to support evidence of the infrastructure funding gap and the role of the examination is not to challenge this list. The draft payments by instalments policy is also presented for

transparency and won't form part of the examination. Comments received on the Regulation 123 list will however still be submitted to the examiner for information and will also be considered separately by the council for the purpose of developing a final regulation 123 list.

Do you consider it necessary to attend and give evidence at the hearing as part of the examination? (Tick as appropriate)

Yes, I wish to speak to the Examiner at the hearing sessions.

Please specify if you would like to be notified of one or more of the following:

- . (i) The draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008;
- . (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and/or
- . (iii) The approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.