

Chiltern District Council and South Bucks District Council

Community Infrastructure Levy

Statement of Representations Received (including copies of representations received)

September 2019



CHILTERN
District Council



SOUTH BUCKS
District Council

Stronger in partnership

Summary of this document

1. Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires that an authority submitting a CIL charging schedule for examination must, among other tasks, prepare a statement setting out the number of representations it received, a summary of main issues raised by the representations and copies of any such representations, in accordance with Regulation 17.
2. Chiltern and South Bucks received 50 representations on the draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which are detailed in full in this document. Each individual representation outlines how the Council took the comment into account.
3. In line with Regulation 16 of the CIL regulations, the draft charging schedule, the CIL evidence base and the Statement of Representations Procedure are available from <https://chiltern.gov.uk/planning/cil> and the equivalent page of the South Bucks DC website: <https://southbucks.gov.uk/planning/cil>

Summary of main issues raised by representations

- A nil rate should be set for community and cultural facilities such as community centres/halls, theatres and other such uses. This is because such facilities provide immense benefits to their local communities and contribute to the social and cultural well-being of local people.
- Objections to CIL being applied to D2 uses.
- Suggestion that the CIL exemption is raised to 700 units.
- Question viability of charging £35 per sq m for B1 and C1 uses
- General concern that some forms of development will become unviable if CIL is introduced.
- Request to exempt hospitals, primary and acute care in Use Classes B1 and C2 from paying CIL
- Brownfield land is less of a burden on infrastructure than Green Belt releases for development.
- Residential CIL rates should not be the same across all areas within the districts.

Copies of Representations Received

Comment

Consultee	Mr Steven Urry (1212029)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	xxxxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mr Steven Urry (1212029)
Comment ID	12
Response Date	12/06/19 11:05
Consultation Point	4.1 Chiltern Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for Chiltern please specify why.

Don't understand why a large development >400 raises no charge for infrastructure contributions - these sites potentially bring the most impact to local infrastructure?

Summary of Representation

Question on large Sites Exemption. Account Taken by the Councils: The representor will be reassured by paragraph 3.11.2 which states developments over these thresholds will be liable to S106 planning obligations. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Sally Roberts (1216016)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Sally Roberts (1216016)
Comment ID	13
Response Date	12/06/19 15:16
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.7

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Appears to be a representation to be kept informed. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council has written to this representor to ask if she does actually wish to appear at the Examination as no comments have been made. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Ms Rachel Padgett (1216826)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Ms Rachel Padgett (1216826)
Comment ID	14
Response Date	17/06/19 17:42
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Q - Do you have any comments on the council's payment In-Kind Policy for accepting land and/or how this will assist the viability and delivery of development in the district? It often does not happen in practice and developers always have the upper hand. (no to all questions on the online CIL form)

Summary of Representation

The representation asks a question to which the Councils have responded. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils have replied to the question. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Elizabeth Richardson (1211042)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Amersham Town Council
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Amersham Town Council (Mrs Elizabeth Richardson - 1211042)
Comment ID	16
Response Date	25/06/19 13:29
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.11

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: Chiltern District Council

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

This council agrees with the policy.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided.

Summary of Representation

Supports Charging Schedules. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council is grateful for the Town Council's support. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Guy Lambert (1218775)
Email Address	xxxxxxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Guy Lambert (1218775)
Comment ID	20
Response Date	08/07/19 20:57
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The proposals should not be applied to single developments. Small time developers wishing to contribute to the shortage of housing stock should not be penalised for their valuable contribution. Conversion of single dwellings, often unsuitable for modern family living, is a valuable contributor to housing shortages. The new tax will make a substantial number of these very valuable (to the community) projects unviable. It is a tax on "entrepreneurship" too. Suggest that "single" dwellings are excluded.

Summary of Representation

Suggests that CIL should not be charged on single dwellings. Account Taken by the Councils: The CIL Regulations apply to the creation of a new dwelling - it is not in the remit of the Councils to diverge from regulations. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Mandy Willis (1219138)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mandy Willis (1219138)
Comment ID	22
Response Date	10/07/19 15:41
Consultation Point	4.2 South Bucks Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for South Bucks please specify why.

Agree

Summary of Representation

Supports DCS. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council is grateful for the support. The Council do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedule as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Mandy Willis (1219138)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mandy Willis (1219138)
Comment ID	21
Response Date	10/07/19 15:40
Consultation Point	4.1 Chiltern Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.7

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for Chiltern please specify why.

Agree

Summary of Representation

Supports DCS. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council is grateful for the support. The Council does not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedule as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Mr Frederick Felix (1215574)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mr Frederick Felix (1215574)
Comment ID	26
Response Date	23/08/19 23:29
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for:

Chiltern District Council

Summary of Representation

Appears to be a representation to be kept informed. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils will keep Frederick Felix informed. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Chris Primett (1220625)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Chris Primett (1220625)
Comment ID	28
Response Date	15/07/19 15:54
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.8

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

I write on behalf of a number of garden centres within Chiltern and South Bucks District Council Areas with regard to the above. Whilst a garden centre fall within Use Class 1A of the Use Classes Order 1978 they are often restricted by planning conditions as to the range of goods that they can sell. This restriction, together with the low sales densities achieved by garden centres due to the nature of the products sold(for example outdoor plants), the large areas of outdoor space and the seasonality of the business, means that garden centres are not in the same position to pay a CIL rate which reflects high street shops or large out-of-centre retail parks. Such a penalty can lead to CIL liable development in a garden centre being abandoned or delayed. I note that CIL does not draw out this restriction with regard to garden centres and would request that such a distinction is made.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

I write on behalf of a number of garden centres within Chiltern and South Bucks District Council Areas with regard to the above. Whilst a garden centre fall within Use Class 1A of the Use Classes Order 1978 they are often restricted by planning conditions as to the range of goods that they can sell. This restriction, together with the low sales densities achieved by garden centres due to the nature of the products sold (for example outdoor plants), the large areas of outdoor space and the seasonality of the business, means that garden centres are not in the same position to pay a CIL rate which reflects high street shops or large out-of-centre retail parks. Such a penalty can lead to CIL liable development in a garden centre being abandoned or delayed. I note that CIL does not draw out this restriction with regard to garden centres and would request that such a distinction is made.

Summary of Representation

Considers discretionary relief should be applied to low density sales areas such as planting. Emailed to Mr Primmet - asking if he does wish to appear at an EIP. W/C 9/9/19. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that garden centres often sell a wide range of products, and that the levy proposed is not so high as to create viability concerns the districts. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Tom Clarke MRTPI (1222606)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Tom Clarke MRTPI (1222606)
Comment ID	29
Response Date	16/08/19 16:02
Consultation Point	4.1 Chiltern Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for Chiltern please specify why.

We do not agree with the rates for D1, D2 and Sui Generis (where they apply to community or cultural uses such as theatres). We would recommend that a nil rate should be set for community and cultural facilities such as community centres/halls, theatres and other such uses. This is because such facilities provide immense benefits to their local communities and contribute to the social and cultural well-being of local people. While some may be operated by charitable organisations thus potentially benefitting from statutory rate relief, this is not always the case. Many of these facilities are unable to operate on a full commercial basis thus additional obligations from development can further undermine deliverability. Figure 11 within the accompanying Viability Assessment notes that development of this type has marginal viability or lack of viability. It is very common for local authorities to set a nil rate for community and cultural facilities, and this is suggested within paragraph 3.7.57 of the Viability Assessment. We therefore recommend the charging schedule is revised to include community and cultural uses within a nil rate.

Summary of Representation

Does not agree with the rates for D1, D2 and Sui Generis (where they apply to community or cultural uses such as theatres). and that these should be zero rated. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that an appropriate balance has been reached between the charge proposed and the viability of D1, D2 and Sui Generis uses. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Tom Clarke MRTPI (1222606)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Tom Clarke MRTPI (1222606)
Comment ID	30
Response Date	16/08/19 16:02
Consultation Point	4.2 South Bucks Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.5

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for South Bucks please specify why.

As per our comments for the Chiltern rate, we do not agree with the rates for D1, D2 and Sui Generis (where they apply to community or cultural uses such as theatres). We would recommend that a nil rate should be set for community and cultural facilities such as community centres/halls, theatres and other such uses. This is because such facilities provide immense benefits to their local communities and contribute to the social and cultural well-being of local people. While some may be operated by charitable organisations thus potentially benefitting from statutory rate relief, this is not always the case. Many of these facilities are unable to operate on a full commercial basis thus additional obligations from development can further undermine deliverability. Figure 11 within the accompanying Viability Assessment notes that development of this type has marginal viability or lack of viability. It is very common for local authorities to set a nil rate for community and cultural facilities, and this is suggested within paragraph 3.7.57 of the Viability Assessment. We therefore recommend the charging schedule is revised to include community and cultural uses within a nil rate.

Summary of Representation

Does not agree with the rates for D1, D2 and Sui Generis (where they apply to community or cultural uses such as theatres) and that these should be zero rated. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that an appropriate balance has been reached between the charge proposed and the viability of D1, D2 and Sui Generis uses. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Sue Moffat (1211260)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Gerrards Cross Town Council
Address	xxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Gerrards Cross Town Council (Mrs Sue Moffat - 1211260)
Comment ID	32
Response Date	20/08/19 14:41
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . South Bucks District Council

Summary of Representation

Seems to be a rep to be informed of stages. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Gary Heneage (1222837)
Email Address	xxxxx
Company / Organisation	Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
Address	xxxx xxxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft
Comment by	Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
Comment ID	31
Response Date	26/07/19 09:02
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8
Are your comments for:	Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*. Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Draft Chiltern and South Bucks Joint Local Plan 2036 and Appendix 1: IDP Many thanks for the opportunity to comment form, given we wish to comment on both the local plan and the IDP. You will know of course that we have made representations (enclosed) when we outlined the impact of the Living Places draft submission on primary care services (delivered in population expansion, and requested that the District Councils should also consider responses from other providers a number of specific comments we would like to submit regarding Section 11 of the Local Plan (Building Infrastructure). make subsequent comments to demonstrate that statements in these sections are not supported by meaningful developer before providing you with detailed comments, we wanted to take this opportunity to set out the expectations of primary with regard to primary care estate. Primary Health Care Facilities NHS England's Five Year Forward View illustrates drive towards integrated health hubs, utilising technology and working 'at scale' to accommodate these transformations practices allow for a greater range of services to be delivered under one roof. For example, 'at scale' provision allows flexibility social care services, minor-injury centres and social prescribing facilities. It also supports longer GP surgery opening way has a knock-on reduction in hospital admissions (which cost significantly more than primary health services), saving primary care services that can improve the offer to patients. Dispersed, smaller, 'single-use' GP surgeries, cannot offer CCG there has committed to the following principles: - The CCG will strive to develop modern, fit for purpose services

ensure that practices remain resilient and sustainable, CCGs will no longer support the establishment of new single-fund new practices that can cater for at least 10,000 population (5 GPs). - Wherever possible, CCGs will promote the maximise the use of existing infrastructure and to promote joint working. - The CCG will increasingly commission services have traditionally been delivered in secondary care, thus promoting care closer to home. CCGs are exploring the development in a community hub-type setting. - Development plans need to be in line with the BOB ICS Primary Care Strategy (currently 11.1 Building Infrastructure The CCG is reassured to see that the following statements are in the draft local plan: 11.1.1 its spatial strategy and plan objectives, the provision of infrastructure will need to be funded and delivered in a timely new development creates a need for new or improved infrastructure, contributions from developers will be sought to terms. New development should also make best use of infrastructure demand management. In some cases, the cumulative be considered when assessing infrastructure requirements, taking account of other planning obligations such as affordable Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a tariff in the form of a standard charge on new development, which the Council will implement principle behind CIL is that those who benefit financially from gaining planning permission must pay towards the cost such development. Since most development has some impact on infrastructure, it follows that all applicable developments or improving infrastructure. The Council will use CIL as the main way of collecting contributions from developers to fund Where Section 106 (S106) legal agreements are used, contributions from a particular development will be fairly and cumulative impact from the relevant scheme. 11.1.5 Some of the site allocations are excluded from CIL and will be required financial contributions towards mitigation of the development's impact through legal agreements. However, the list of 9 to 17 of the Infrastructure Development Plan Schedule appear to relate to only funding business cases. They include: relate to Practice / CCG Business Case. • Amersham Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Chesham (Chess Medical Centre and Lion Street Surgery) - Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£500k) • New healthcare facilities on National Epilepsy that provision of services can be catered for elsewhere – see below. Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG modification of existing primary care services in Chalfont St Peter and depending on the scale of development in Chalfont require the expansion of the Calcott Medical Centre or relocation to the Gerrards Cross Memorial Hospital site. Developer business case (£TBA). • Additional primary care facilities in the Iver area. Appropriate financial contribution from new to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Provision relating to the site allocation at Holmer Green – appropriate needed. Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Burnham Health Centre – extension under comments re Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case) as capital funding expected Surgery – extension (no mention of anything, just this surgery name) • Threeways Surgery Stoke Poges – modification contribution from new development needed, CCG not requesting funding for whole cost). Funding gap identified as wording in these sections of the IDP is changed to reflect the discussions held between CCG and District Council Planners Threeways Surgery and Beaconsfield, the CCG has been fortunate in securing a capital allocation from NHS England does not mean that public funding should meet these costs if developer contributions are available. Where we are yet to to meet demand, we explained to our Planning colleagues that costed information would only be available once the therefore suggest that within the “funding source” column of the IDP schedule that the following statement is used “level once practice/CCG business case completed”. Section 11.1.6 states that Developer Contributions for certain sites are Health infrastructure contributions is via Section 106 Agreements). These sites are: - More than 10 Ha in area - Sites 10,000 m2 in floor area. The document (under Section 11.2 – Site Allocations) goes onto describe the following sites: Green – 300 homes 3. Amersham Old Town (London Road West) – 40 homes 4. Amersham Old Town (Whieldon Street) 6. Chalfont St Peter – NE – 360 homes (40 % care/retirement homes) 7. Chalfont St Peter – SE – 200 homes 8. Beaconsfield mentions that financial contributions for primary health care facilities within the local area as agreed with the Clinical Health – 360 homes A healthy future together 10. Land to the north of Iver Station - mixed use development to include east of Ridgeway Business Park, north of Iver railway station -

mixed use development to include approximately 90 above are: a. The low threshold of CIL not applying (i.e. only for 400 residential units or less) and by default S106 being that threshold, coupled with the current inability to pool more than 5 no. Section 106 contributions means that it will Section 106 contributions together to make a difference to any particular GP surgery in terms of a meaningful extension. 106 Contributions is lifted (understood to be September 2019), it will still be problematic to obtain enough developer 3 tests for developer contributions funded by S106 Contributions (be necessary to make the development acceptable development and fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development) and to fund new Primary Care facilities note that BCCG wish to agree with you the adoption of the "West Kent Model" for developer contributions or primary in funding of £360 per person in each of the new developments that are described in the Site Allocations. Conservatively home), this would reasonably require £4.415M of contributions, which would mainly be via Section 106 Contributions sites of more than 400 homes) and the minority via CIL contributions. c. CIL is more flexible and provided the threshold say 700 homes, then all bar one of the allocations described above could potentially contribute CIL monies to the Councils place to do so, could pass on some of that CIL to the CCG for health infrastructure spend (so far I can't see anything policy in their documentation). Thus far, we cannot see anything from you in respect of any policy/draft policy that states directed towards Health infrastructure, but we would want a contribution from Developers from CIL that would equate primary health care provision. We would also like to comment on two of the non-residential schemes. 1. Land to the office space, a hotel and ancillary uses; 2. Land adjacent to Taplow Station - 4,000m² of office space. Office workers the locality even if they live elsewhere and therefore developers should provide a proportionate contribution to health developer contributions currently can only come from Section 106. We would contend that as office workers would utilise should address some health infrastructure nearby. By way of comparison, please see the link <http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/sites/default/files/South%20Oxfordshire%20Infrastructure%20Delivery%20Plan-%2004%2001%to> to see examples of where a Council (in this case, South Oxfordshire District Council) has been helpful in terms of outlining see particularly Chapter 4 (Infrastructure and Types and Assumptions) and the specific health infrastructure mentioned expanded premises for a health centre" (1700 homes) Chalgrove Airport - £3 M S106 for "new GP surgery" (3000 homes) for "new GP surgery" (3,500 homes) Grenoble Road - £2.592 M S106 for "contribution towards GP provision" (3,000 S106 for "contribution towards GP provision" (1,100 homes) Northfield, SE Oxford - £1.555 M S106 for "contribution Campus - £TBC for expansion/reconfiguration of Morland House Surgery, Wheatley On a more positive note, it is good gains" and supports public open spaces however it would be good to read that it embraces development of "green areas" place. The overall plan lays out housing support for elderly people but does not provide any details as to whether there for those who have other conditions which challenge their independence. We would welcome further discussion on following progress with implementing the Local Plan and IDP closely.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Argues that threshold for CIL be raised to 700 units - this is based on pooling and S106 compliance issues. The comments Plan and to some extent a funding list. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that thresholds for CIL to work with the CCG in future iterations as the Local Plan develops. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee Mrs Sue Moffat (1211260)
Email Address xxxxxxxxx
Company / Organisation Gerrards Cross Town Council
Address xxxxxxxxx

Event Name Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by Gerrards Cross Town Council (Mrs Sue Moffat - 1211260)
Comment ID 33
Response Date 20/08/19 14:45
Consultation Point 4.2 South Bucks Rates ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.6

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for South Bucks please specify why.

Gerrards Cross Town Council would like the following amendments made to the Recommended Charging Schedule: C1 - Hotels - increased to £50 per square metre C4 - Houses in multiple occupation - increased to £200 per square metre

Summary of Representation

For South Bucks only - increase C1 Hotels to £50 and C4 HMO's to £200 psm. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not consider that the viability evidence supports these changes and does propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Owen Neal (1222877)
Email Address	xxxxxxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Owen Neal (1222877)
Comment ID	34
Response Date	20/08/19 15:59
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Sport England notes that 'Sporting and recreation facilities' are included within the definition of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) infrastructure in the 2008 Planning Act (section 216), which means money raised can be used to fund new or enhanced sports facilities. Sport England would expect the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be updated on the basis of an up to date Playing Pitch Strategy and/or Sports Facility Strategy (In line with paragraph 73 of the NPPF). Sport England is not aware of an up to date evidence base for South Bucks and Chiltern districts. Its understood that work is ongoing on a Playing Pitch Strategy for the area but this has not been completed satisfactorily. In order to ensure this money is collected and has a chance of being spent on sport, the projects must be very specific. Rather than the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and/or Regulation 123 List having a generic point about "improving outdoor sports pitches", Sport England would recommend the Council to list the sports projects in order of priority and in some detail. Such will increase the likelihood of delivery. Unless the Council identify specific projects on the IDP, it may be more effective for sporting contributions to be sought through planning obligations, however this is only in the case where it can be linked to a strategic housing development.

Summary of Representation

Would like an up to date playing pitch and sport facility study to inform S106/CIL priorities. Account Taken by the Councils: This request has been responded to and does not relate to the DCS but rather the Local Plan and if a need is established then this can be considered for the Infrastructure Funding Statement. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Paul Griffin (1223083)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Paul Griffin (1223083)
Comment ID	35
Response Date	22/08/19 09:03
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . South Bucks District Council

Summary of Representation

Appears to be a representation to be kept informed. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils will keep Paul Griffin informed. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Comment

Consultee	Helen Griffiths (1223256)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Helen Griffiths (1223256)
Comment ID	36
Response Date	22/08/19 16:11
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Chiltern District Council

Summary of Representation

Appears to be a representation to be kept informed. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils will keep Helen Griffiths informed. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Thomas Rumble (1223435)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Thomas Rumble (1223435)
Comment ID	37
Response Date	23/08/19 14:42
Consultation Point	4.1 Chiltern Rates (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.6

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

If you do not agree with the proposed levy rates for Chiltern please specify why.

We act for Kebbell Homes who control a proportion of the proposed strategic allocation at South East Chalfont St Peter in the Regulation 19 Local Plan under Policy SP BP8. The draft Charging Schedule and Policy BP SP1 explain that on sites of over 10ha in size applications will be CIL exempt and infrastructure contributions will be agreed through the S106 and S278 process. We would request that clarity is inserted into the charging schedule to specifically confirm that strategic sites (including the Policy SP BP8 allocation) are to be CIL exempt. We therefore request that the Charging Schedule and Policy BP SP1 are made clear in relation to this point prior to submission for examination.

Summary of Representation

Requests CIL Charging schedule is explicit on exceptions over 400 homes. Account Taken by the Councils: This representation references the Publication Local Plan allocations - the DCS only considers thresholds not allocations. Allocations may change at the Local Plan EiP - therefore it is not right to be site specific in the DCS. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Claire McClean (Canal & River Trust) (1224120)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Claire McClean (Canal & River Trust) (1224120)
Comment ID	39
Response Date	18/07/19 15:58
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

We note that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not include any reference to the Trust's waterways, despite the potential for these to support local aims for improved walking and cycling, improved green infrastructure, health and wellbeing, flood alleviation, air quality and utilities.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

General comment on infrastructure - specifically waterways and funding. No comments are made on the charging schedule. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council will prepare annual Infrastructure Funding Statements. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does include improvements the Grand Union Canal. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Agent	Jane Carter (1224337)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxxxxxx
Consultee	Gerrards Cross Lawn Tennis Club (1224334)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Gerrards Cross Lawn Tennis Club (1224334)
Comment ID	41
Response Date	15/08/19 16:11
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

On behalf of my client Gerrards Cross Lawn Tennis Club (GXLTC) I am objecting to the proposed CIL being applied to all D2 uses. We do not agree with the proposal to levy of £35 per sqm on all D2 uses irrespective of who is providing them. The viability Assessment Final Report states at paragraph 3.7.47 that "it is not necessary to carry out full appraisals of these because a simple comparison of the completed value with the build cost indications from BICS points to poor (at best) marginal development viability). Any CIL levied on the improved outdoor sports facilities will have to be raised by the Club and its members. Given the size of the building to cover a court the additional costs from the CIL charge would almost certainly prevent the proposed improvements and potentially jeopardise the long term future of the Club, which needs improved facilities to maintain and attract members. If Chiltern DC nevertheless decide to impose the £35 per sqm levy on D1 and D2 uses it should at least retain the ability to apply discretionary relief or exceptional circumstances relief to ensure that non-profit making sports clubs and associations which provide many facilities within communities which the District or Parish Council would otherwise have to provide, to be able to afford to expand and improve facilities. The amount of money raised from such developments would be relatively small but the adverse impacts could be considerable as sports facilities and clubs decline.

Summary of Representation

Requests that no charge is made on D1 or D2 uses or to at least provide discretionary relief or exceptional relief. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that an appropriate balance has been reached between the charge proposed and the viability of D1 and D2 uses. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Agent	Mr Alan Divall (1224345)
Email Address	XXXXXXXXXXXX
Address	XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX XXXX XXXX XXXXX XXXX
Consultee	Whitbread Group PLC (1224346)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Whitbread Group PLC (1224346)
Comment ID	42
Response Date	16/08/19 16:30
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.15

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Summary of Representation

Questions viability of charging B1 and C1 uses £35 per square metre - referencing the Councils' Dixon Searle Partnership evidence. Also referencing pooling and the creation of a Regulation 123 list. Account Taken by the Councils: The pooling and Regulation 123 list are not issues that relate to the charging schedule. In addition both these are no longer required by the CIL Regulations. In relation to the charge of £35 per square metre for B1 and C1 uses the Councils do not propose to make any modifications as it considers the charge not to be a viability burden on such uses. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Alan Byrne (1223059)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	Historic England
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Alan Byrne (1223059)
Comment ID	43
Response Date	19/08/19 16:32
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

Are your comments for: Neither Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Historic England's has no specific comments to make on the above document.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Historic England have no comments to make on the charging schedule. Account Taken by the Councils:
The Council is grateful for Historic England's consideration of CIL. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Nicola Thomas (1213740)
Email Address	xxxxx
Company / Organisation	Bucks & Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership
Address	xxxxxxxxx xxxxx xxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Bucks & Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership (Nicola Thomas - 1213740)
Comment ID	45
Response Date	21/08/19 16:37
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

“The proposals (Section 5) look as though CIL will apply to developments of less than 400 homes; and s106s to those above the threshold of 400 homes or more or on sites of 10 ha or more. However, s5.0.2 also states that s106 agreements will continue to be used to secure site-specific mitigation. As the biodiversity accounting scheme being put together by the NEP with its Partners for Bucks and MK relies on s106 agreements to secure the financial contribution for any required offsite mitigation for development of all scales (minor and major), please could the wording of this section make it clear that the proposed CIL threshold wouldn't apply in this case – i.e. that s106 agreements would still be secured for all scales of development (including below 400 homes and less than 10 hectares) wherever an offset is required specifically for biodiversity net gain purposes for the specific development.” “The Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership (The "NEP") would expect infrastructure funded by CIL receipts to include green infrastructure needed to support development solely to support social or economic gains and benefits. We would also welcome clear definitions in the Regulation 123 document as to when or if biodiversity enhancement might be regarded as infrastructure for the avoidance of doubt. The NEP would expect the CIL 123 list should include: - strategic habitat creation, enhancement and restoration - the ecological enhancement of watercourses

in line with the Water Framework Directive. We would expect the CIL 123 list to exclude: - on-site and off-site biodiversity enhancement works, which are primarily for flora and fauna and not community benefits, that are necessary to offset biodiversity loss of a particular development.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

This representation requests that biodiversity offsetting fund collection is exempted from CIL below the thresholds set in the draft charging schedule. Account Taken by the Councils: An offsetting scheme is not currently in place or agreed by the Councils. An exemption can be considered at an appropriate time in the future. The Councils do not propose to make a modification in relation to this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Jagjit Brar (1223160)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Jagjit Brar (1223160)
Comment ID	46
Response Date	21/08/19 16:39
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.12

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The intention is that the levy should focus on the provision of new infrastructure and not to be used to prop up deficiencies of existing infrastructure provision. We agree to the adoption of a CIL policy and accept the Recommend Charging Schedule with the following amendments: C1 Hotels be increased to £50. C4 Houses in Multiple Occupation be increased to £200.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

This representation request an uplift to the charging schedule for HMO's and Hotels. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not consider that the higher rates for these uses are currently supported by evidence. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Elizabeth Pickering (1215420)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Education and Skills Funding Agency, Department for Education
Address	xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Education and Skills Funding Agency, Department for Education (Mrs Elizabeth Pickering - 1215420)
Comment ID	47
Response Date	22/08/19 16:44
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The housing growth planned for Chiltern and South Buckinghamshire will place significant pressure on social infrastructure such as education facilities. A need for new primary schools and multiple school expansions has been identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The timely delivery of these school places alongside phased development of housing will be critical to meeting education needs.

5. We note that the draft charging schedule includes a proposed CIL rate for D1 non-residential uses below a specified 'large site' threshold, while developments larger than this threshold will be expected to mitigate their impacts through the use of Section 106 planning obligations. 6. Paragraph 3.11.2 of the charging schedule defines large sites as developments larger than 400 dwellings, 10 hectares or 4,000 square metres floor area. DfE requests that you omit the reference to floor area from this paragraph, consistent with Tables 1 and 2 which only refer to dwelling numbers and hectares. This is because many school developments fall below 4000 square metres gross internal floor area (the average for a new primary school is around 2,008 square metres), and there is a risk that the Councils would inadvertently find state-funded school development liable to pay CIL. This appears to be an error, since the development of a school provides infrastructure in its own right, at considerable cost. 7. DfE welcomes the approach taken in the viability assessment underpinning this charging schedule,

giving proper consideration to the costs of education provision and making reference to both the DfE guidance on securing developer contributions and local evidence of pupil yields and the costs of provision. We support the interrelationship between the IDP and the viability assessment, so that site-specific project costs are incorporated into the viability assessment when onsite schools are known to be required. 8. Local authorities have sometimes experienced challenges in funding schools via Section 106 planning obligations due to limitations on the pooling of developer contributions for the same item or type of infrastructure. However, the revised CIL Regulations remove this constraint, allowing unlimited pooling of developer contributions from planning obligations and the use of both Section 106 funding and CIL for the same item of infrastructure. You will no doubt wish to update Section 5 of the charging schedule to take account of these changes, which come into force on 1st September 2019. The advantage of using Section 106 relative to CIL for funding schools is that it is clear and transparent to all stakeholders what value of contribution is being allocated by which development to which schools, thereby increasing certainty that developer contributions will be used to fund the new school places that are needed. DfE supports the use of planning obligations to secure developer contributions for education wherever there is a need to mitigate the direct impacts of development, consistent with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations. 10. With regard to the IDP and funding gap analysis, we question whether the identified education projects should be expressed as part of the funding gap. Where the funding sources are "Section 106/other", this suggests that school provision will be funded either by developer contributions in full, or in combination with local authority funding from the DfE basic need grant, depending on viability. On the assumption that the associated housing developments will go ahead, we suggest these projects are listed as known funding and do not form part of the funding gap. As a living document the IDP can be updated as project costs and amounts to be provided from different funding sources become more certain. 11. We note in the concurrent Local Plan consultation that site allocations (with specific education requirements) only account for 5,200 homes out of a supply of 11,099. It may be expected that a significant part of this remaining housing requirement will come forward in the form of small developments (below the 400 dwelling threshold) as windfalls or sites from the HELAA. It is important to consider the size of the CIL funding gap and whether there will be sufficient CIL funds available to cover the cost of the school places required as a result of these smaller developments. If CIL will be insufficient or unavailable at the point of need, it would be preferable to seek developer contributions through a planning obligation, to mitigate the direct impacts of development. Government 1 EBD OG, June 2019, National School Delivery Cost Benchmarking Report³ basic need grant for the creation of new school places does not include funding for land acquisition, so it is particularly important that pooled developer contributions (Section 106 and/or CIL) are secured for the purchase of standalone sites for new schools or school expansions when required, and when such planning obligations would comply with the Regulation 122 tests. We request that you consider carefully the appropriate balance of CIL and Section 106 funding for education, to ensure that new schools and school expansions can be delivered when they are needed, in step with housing development. It is regrettable that no specific projects to increase special school or other special educational needs capacity have been identified in the IDP, pending a review by the county council. We recommend that the IDP is updated when this review is complete, and relevant developments be expected to contribute to the costs of special educational needs provision, in accordance with our guidance on securing developer contributions for education. 13. DfE would be particularly interested in responding to any update to the IDP, viability assessment or other evidence relevant to education which may be used to inform local planning policies and further iterations of the CIL charging schedule. As such, please add the DfE to the database for future consultations on relevant plans and proposals.

Summary of Representation

Concern that the charging schedule defines large sites as developments larger than 400 dwellings, 10 hectares or 4,000 square metres floor area. Requests that DCS omits the reference to floor area because many school developments fall below 4000 square metres gross internal floor area (the average for a new primary school is around 2,008 square metres), and there is a risk that the Councils would inadvertently find state-funded school development liable to pay CIL. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council considers that all development would have an impact on infrastructure and therefore should be liable to CIL - (except for those with uses or status that are automatically exempt from CIL by Regulation). The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Nick Paterson-Nield (1224360)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxxx
Consultee	The National Trust (1224361)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	The National Trust (1224361)
Comment ID	48
Response Date	22/08/19 17:04
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.13

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the **Review** and **Submit** buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked **Save and Close**.

Please remember to click the **Review** and **Submit** buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

We write on behalf of the National Trust (hereafter referred to as 'the Trust') in response to Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils' consultation on the draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule. As background, the Trust owns and manages the Cliveden Estate which comprises an area of 152 hectares located within South Bucks District. Founded in 1895, the Trust is a charity funded through income from membership fees, donations and legacies and revenue raised from commercial operations which aims to preserve the nation's heritage and open spaces for everyone to enjoy. Our representations made in response to the draft CIL Charging Schedule are set out below.

CIL Exemptions We welcome the inclusion of reference in paragraph 3.7.1 to development by charities for charitable purposes subject to an application by a charity landowner for CIL relief being exempt from CIL liability. It is consistent with Regulation 43 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 which states: (1) An owner (C) of a material interest in the relevant land is exempt from liability to pay CIL in respect of a chargeable development if (a) C is a charitable institution; and (b) The chargeable development will be used wholly or mainly for charitable purposes (whether of C or of C and other charitable institutions). (2) But paragraph (1) does not apply where (a) That part of the chargeable development to be used for charitable purposes will not be occupied by or under the control of a charitable institution; (b) The material interest is owned by C jointly with a person who is not a charitable institution; or (c) Exemption of C from liability to pay CIL would constitute a State aid. For the purposes of paragraph (1) use of a chargeable development for charitable purposes includes leaving it unoccupied. However, we note that no guidance is included within the draft Charging Schedule regarding how applications for relief from CIL liability can be made. We recommend that such advice is included to provide clarity for those able to claim exemption from CIL liability. We, therefore, recommend that text is provided either within the Charging Schedule or on the Councils' website which explains how applications can be made. An example, Waverley Borough Council provide the following guidance on their website: You must have assumed liability to pay CIL on the chargeable development to apply for relief or exemption. To qualify for a relief or exemption, a claim must be submitted using the appropriate form and approved prior to any development starting on site. Regardless of a relief or exemption you must submit 'Form 6: Commencement Notice' before the development commences. Failure to do so will mean that the Council cannot issue relief or exemption and the full CIL liability will be payable. Alternatively, as is the case in Wycombe District, a guidance note could be published on the Councils' website which, among other guidance, details how applications for charitable relief can be made. Discretionary Relief from CIL Regulation 44 of the 2010 CIL Regulations provides for the offering of discretionary relief to a charity landowner where the greater part of the chargeable development will be held as an investment, from which the profits are applied for charitable purposes. CIL charging authorities can also choose to offer exceptional circumstances relief where the changing of CIL would have an unacceptable impact on the economic viability of development (Regulation 55), and where the exemption of a charitable institution from liability to pay CIL would constitute State aid (Regulation 45) and would otherwise be exempt from liability under Regulation 43. We note that paragraph 4.4.3 of the draft Charging Schedule states that: Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils are not proposing to make available either discretionary charity relief or the exceptional circumstances relief. We acknowledge that this relief is at the discretion of the CIL charging authority. However, we have concerns that the proposed approach will result in charitable institutions investing profits for charitable purposes being unjustifiably liable for the payment of CIL. Discretionary relief is provided in such scenarios by other CIL charging authorities, including in Wycombe District² and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. To this end, we recommend that Section 4.4.3 of the draft Charging Schedule is amended to make provision for discretionary charitable relief where there is evidence that the profits from an investment will be applied for charitable purposes. A completed

comment form is enclosed at Appendix 1. We trust that the enclosed representations are duly made, and we look forward to receiving confirmation of receipt. Please contact the writer should you require any additional information or have any queries.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No reason provided.

Summary of Representation

This representation requests that charitable CIL exemption is made available in the charging schedules. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils did consider such an exemption but determined to not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as all development has an impact. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Mr Troy Hayes (1211011)
Email Address	XX
Company / Organisation	Troy Planning and Design
Address	XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXX
Consultee	Chalfont St Peter Parish Council (1223349)
Email Address	XXXXXXXXXX
Address	XXX XXX XXX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Chalfont St Peter Parish Council (1223349)
Comment ID	49
Response Date	22/08/19 12:29
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.13

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The Parish Council does not believe the proposed levy rates strike an appropriate balance between securing additional investments and potential effects on the viability of developments in the charging area. The Parish Council continues to hold the opinion that the PDCS consultation was premature as respondents could not fully understand the impact of a zero CIL rate for strategic sites when the size or location of strategic sites were not known. These representations for the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) reinstate the concerns raised by the Parish Council during the PDCS consultation in 2018, as well as identifying further inadequacies of the Viability Assessment and assumptions. It is of concern that the Local Plan & CIL Viability Assessment explains for the 'large sites' how the information and assumptions appear to be unreliable. It is acknowledged in the consultation that there are draft amendments to the CIL Regulations proposed; these are in the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment No.2) Regulations 2019. These amendment regulations are to come into force on 1 September 2019 and therefore at the time that the levy is to be adopted, the newly amended Regulations will apply and therefore the Council will need to consider how to best reflect the updates and changes. It is unclear from the Councils' documentation how this significant change to the regulations will be reflected in the evidence base and proposed Charging Schedule. It is entirely unclear if, or how the viability evidence prepared for the Councils informed its proposals to apply a nil (£0/sqm) rate for 'Large sites over 400 homes or 10 hectares in area'. In order for a potential 'strategic site' to be given a 'low or zero levy rate' then the evidence must show that the site has low, very low or zero viability. The Councils have failed to provide such evidence, particularly in relation to the arbitrary size set for a 'large site' of over 10 hectares. Table 2 (Strategic Sites – Potential Viability Results May 2019) of the viability study (Appendix 2b) assesses larger and strategic sites. Both of the sites within Chalfont St Peter appear to perform positively, which begs the question why the sites should be zero-rated. National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)2 only states: "If the evidence shows that the area includes a zone, which could be a strategic site, which has low, very low or zero viability, the charging authority should consider setting a low or zero levy rate in that area. The same principle should apply where the evidence shows similarly low viability for particular types and/or scales of development." The Draft Charging Schedule for Chiltern and South Bucks was published for consultation in June 2019. The DCS has been informed by the findings of the "Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment June 2019". CIL regulations require rates to be attributable to individual Charging Authorities and therefore the draft charging schedule is presented in two tables; one for Chiltern and one for South Bucks. The rates included within the tables are both the same. For the avoidance of doubt, these representations relate to both of the draft charging schedule tables. The testing assumptions in the PDCS applied the equivalent of an additional £10,000/dwelling cost to all typologies to cover 'site works'. It was considered by the Parish Council that this value typically represented costs on larger sites associated with enabling work to open-up sites (e.g. access, utilities infrastructure and levelling) and that a cost of this magnitude would be less likely to be seen on smaller sites. It was suggested that this could increase the case for differential charging as part of the viability evidence base. The testing assumptions for the DCS now include a note to say that site works have been assumed as £33,000/dwelling for the larger/strategic sites. It has not been made clear why there is a such a large difference here, compared with the PDCS consultation, nor why this figure only applies to strategic sites. Site works costs will still be incurred for the smaller development sites and therefore the Parish Council continues to support the use a

differential charging rate in the viability evidence base. Professional fees should be set at a range dependant on the size of a scheme, rather than a flat 8% rate. This should generally reflect how larger sites have more substantial requirements for such input as a proportion of build costs. It is not clear why the Viability Assessment itself has included a range of 8-10% for professional fees, yet the Appendix 1, which includes the residential. Assumptions include the flat rate of 8%. Consistency should be applied throughout the reports. As stated in the representations to the PDCS, the marketing fees suggested are very low at only 1-3%. A range of between 3-6% is more commonly applied but this has not been reflected in the updated assumptions. It is noted that the PDCS assumptions included an allowance for electric vehicle charging points and that the DCS assumptions no longer include such an individual allowance, but rather groups it as part of the overall sustainability allowance. Through Policy DM NP10, the draft Local Plan requires an electric vehicle charging point for each new home in all major residential developments and will support the provision of electric vehicle charging points in all new small-scale residential development. It is of concern that neither the Viability Assessment nor the residential assumptions include reference to this being an individual policy cost, therefore it cannot be known how extensive the implications of policy DM NP10 (Natural – Air Quality) are for new development. The Parish Council raised through the PDCS the question of whether bungalows had been included as a typology, given there are a number of them in the Districts. This has not been addressed through the updated Viability Assessment, which is of concern to the Parish Council, who understand that bungalows can have significantly varying effects on viability testing. The average price per sqm for Chiltern is £5,589.80 and for South Bucks is £5,498.70. The average for Chalfont St Peter is recorded at £5,849. Sales prices for each settlement do deviate from the median quite considerably. For example, Beaconsfield has an average value per square metre of £8,806, over £3,000 higher than the average for South Bucks. To a lesser extreme, Amersham has an average value per sqm of £6,113, some £500 more than the Chiltern average. The parish of Chalfont St Peter is more likely to be representative of an area of generally higher values concentrated on the respective northern and southern boundaries of South Bucks and Chiltern Councils (see Viability Assessment Appendix III). The residential CIL rates cover an area so vast (i.e. the total area of Chiltern and South Bucks) that they cannot possibly be reflective of the true viability of a specific area. This could have severe impacts for some of the lower value areas, whilst higher value areas may be not contributing as much as they could. When comparing the proposed residential CIL rates, there is quite considerable variation to the surrounding areas, particularly in relation to the fact that even at a single borough or district level, differential charging areas have typically been adopted to reflect varying rates of viability. • Dacorum Council, to the north east of Chiltern, has residential CIL rates ranging from £100-£250, plus a zero rate for identified strategic sites. This charge was approved in 2015 and has been in place since. • Three Rivers follows a similar principle, with rates ranging from £0-£180. This charge was approved in 2015 and has been in place since. • Wycombe has two zones, that range between £180.80 and £216.96. Charges were initially approved in 2012. • Windsor and Maidenhead rates range between £0-£240. This charge was approved in 2016 and has been in place since. Notwithstanding concerns over direct comparison with neighbouring authorities, it is generally considered that higher rates of CIL may be achievable in some parts of Chiltern and South Bucks, without putting the majority of development at risk. It is not typically appropriate to compare every typology tested against all benchmark land values identified – for example the largest sites are unlikely to be acquired at values reflecting existing residual use. Typologies are typically grouped into a narrower range of appropriate benchmarks. The approach adopted may falsely imply that some sites are unable to support CIL charging against unrealistic benchmark land values and does not substantiate the lower charging rates proposed. A relevant range of ‘typologies’ related to emerging Local Plan allocations does not seem to have been clearly tested. The largest typology that has been tested is 100 dwellings or a site size of 2.5ha, yet decisions have been made in relation to CIL for ‘large’ sites which are given a threshold of 400 dwellings or 10ha. It is therefore, not clear how an approach can be put forward that is based on the assessment of a limited range of typologies, reflecting only a quarter of the size of sites that the findings have been applied to. This approach does not provide the relevant evidence to support a £0/sqm CIL charge on ‘strategic sites. It should be noted that ‘strategic sites’ in some higher value areas may be able to support CIL whereas other such sites may not in other areas but when there has not been an assessment of a typology of over 100 dwellings, it cannot be properly justified. The Parish Council generally supports the approach for CIL charging for non-residential uses, but the following points seek to ensure that all potential implications are fully explored. The retail rates are higher than in other nearby areas and it is important not to deter retail development in appropriate locations. The rates proposed are equivalent to residential development and may act as a disincentive to retail, ‘high street’ uses. Further testing would be beneficial to explore differential rates based on unit size or

distinctions between retail uses. It may therefore only be the largest convenience stores ('supermarkets') and retail warehousing that should be liable for a higher CIL rate. The £35/sqm rate proposed for other uses is fairly 'nominal' and in the case of major non-residential development may not fully address infrastructure requirements to the same extent as alternative mechanisms such as S106 planning obligations. This should be reflected as part of spending priorities, particular as a result of major developments such as motorway service stations, or related to HS2, that may affect the Parish. The Parish Council is also conscious that a significant proportion of non-residential development may not be CIL-liable (i.e. as a result of non-accessible areas the public would not visit or through being 'in use'). Such arrangements can be difficult to operate procedurally and result in a more limited contribution to funding at the rates proposed – although the Parish Council recognises that this does not itself justify an increased charge for non-residential development. If a £0/sqm rate is adopted for 'strategic sites', the Councils should consider stating that this zero-rate applies to both residential and non-residential uses. If this is not the case, there is a risk that on land identified for non-residential uses, CIL could act as a disincentive for development and lead to the non-delivery of mixed-use parts of a residential development-led site. The Parish Council has focused this part of the representations on the decision to set all 'large' development at a zero CIL rate. Fundamentally, it has not been made clear why 400 dwellings or a site size of 10ha have been set as the thresholds for the definition of a 'large' site. It appears from the Viability Assessment that these thresholds have been applied because the Councils had determined a threshold approach would be introduced for CIL and that draft Policy BPSP1 (Developer Contributions to Support Growth) identifies these thresholds. This suggests therefore that the thresholds have not been determined as a result of the Viability Assessments, but rather they have been predetermined by the Councils. Therefore, the rates are not justified, as they are not based on proportionate evidence for instance, it has not been adequately assessed whether the site threshold for zero rating could have been larger. Table 2 (Strategic Sites – Potential Viability Results May 2019) of the viability study (Appendix 2b) assesses the strategic sites. Both of the sites within Chalfont St Peter appear to perform positively. When considering the size of a developable site, it is important to understand how the developable area reduces once various designations and policy constraints are considered. Often, as the site area increases, the allowance for land needed for the additional infrastructure also increases and this must be deducted from the gross site area. For the purposes of demonstration, it is interesting to apply the following research findings (Table 3) to understand gross to net ratios. Site area (hectares) Gross to net ratio (range) Gross to net ratio mid-point Up to 0.4ha 100% - 100% Between 0.4 – 2ha 75 – 90% 82.5% Greater than 2ha 50 – 75% 62.5% If the above (Table 2) is applied to a site size of 10ha, as used as the threshold for the levy proposed here, the developable area would be 6.25ha. If one were to then apply an estimate of 30 dwellings per hectare, this results in 188 dwellings. This therefore does not correlate with 400 dwellings as the threshold. The Parish Council would therefore suggest a much larger site size threshold should be used, to better correlate with the 400 dwellings criterion. Based on the above gross to net ratios and the calculation applied, it would be more appropriate to use a threshold of 21ha. Threshold included in Viability Assessment Alternative Threshold Gross Site Area 10ha 21.28ha Net Site Area 6.25ha 13.3ha Dwelling per hectare 30 30 Dwelling 188 400 The above (Table 1) is a crude calculation, but it gives a clear indication of the limitations of the use of 10ha in the determination of site size for a 'large' site and justification for a larger threshold being used. The Parish Council has also carried out some initial calculations in relation to the potential CIL receipts for both the District Councils and the Neighbourhood (Parish Council) portion in relation to Chalfont St Peter Parish Council. The following assumptions have been used to calculate potential CIL receipts: • The average floorspace per dwelling has been calculated based on the indicative floorspace used in the Viability Assessment (page 23), which includes flats and houses. This results in an average of 104m² per dwelling. • A potential CIL rate of £150/m² has been applied. • Whilst draft policy DM LP1 (Homes – Providing Choice in Home Sizes) includes the potential housing mix, the sites are not at an advanced enough stage to understand how this mix will be applied and therefore, the mix has not been applied at this time. • An affordable housing threshold of 40% has been applied, to assume that only 60% of the new dwellings will contribute towards CIL. As evidenced in Table 2, the potential CIL income from sites SP7 and SP8 would be significant. These contributions could be spent on helping meet local infrastructure needs, particularly the neighbourhood portion, which amounts to over £1 million. The Parish Council has raised significant concerns regarding the Draft CIL Charging Schedule, and its supporting evidence. The Parish Council does not support the use of a zero CIL rate on sites considered 'large' and would further contest the threshold of a 'large' site - particularly in relation to the arbitrary setting of a 10ha threshold. The Parish Council proposes an alternative threshold in the calculations and it is suggested that consideration be given to increasing the threshold accordingly.

Summary of Representation

Representation considers: unclear how thresholds have been established and the evidence for the £0 per square metre levy on large sites. Considers the threshold should be higher so that more is collected by CIL. Considers that zero rating should be tied only to low viability. Refers to changes from the PDCS to the DCS such as opening up costs per home. Concerned that DM NP10 - Air Quality has not been assessed in the viability report. Concern that the same charging rate is applied over both districts - considers some areas could have higher rates. Concern over the low range of typologies such as the number of homes on a site and no references to bungalows. Concern that the retail levy should only apply to convenience stores and warehouses to avoid putting off smaller retailers. Concern that HS2 and Motorway Service Areas would only be charged at £35 per square metre. Account Taken by the Councils: The 400 homes and 10 ha threshold relates an assumption of 40 homes per hectare overall on large sites. The 2014 CIL Regulations [13 (1) (d) introduced the ability to apply differential charging rates to a charging schedule by reference to the number of dwellings and the ability to zero rate has been in the CIL Regulations since they came in to force. The Councils do not consider that £150 per square metre for retail uses would put off retail developers. The approach used by the viability consultants has been supported through the examination process consistently. Large developments would be CIL exempt and therefore infrastructure contributions made through S106 agreements. This will provide a suitably buffered, flexible approach bearing in mind that the full and final extent of infrastructure costs, mitigation works and any abnormalities are not settled. The approach, which is not untypical for the largest sites, will also better facilitate the direct, timely delivery of the required infrastructure and will support affordable housing delivery by not adding fixed CIL costs that are top-sliced. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Michael Davies (1224429)
Email Address	xxxxxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx
Consultee	Portman Estate (1224430)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Portman Estate (1224430)
Comment ID	50
Response Date	23/08/19 12:55
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.11

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the **Review** and **Submit** buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: South Bucks District Council

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked **Save and Close**.

Please remember to click the **Review** and **Submit** buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The draft CIL Charging Schedule 1.1. The Portman Estate supports the draft CIL Charging Schedule where it seeks to apply a £0 levy to "...large sites over 400 homes or 10 hectares in area" such as the Beaconsfield allocation, in recognition of the significant on and off-site infrastructure proposed which includes substantial affordable housing. 1.2. Having regard to the supporting information available, in the form of the Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (June 2019), the Estate wish to raise no major issues or viability case. However, there are a few aspects of the Viability Assessment where queries are raised, and areas where further clarification is sought. These matters are set out below. The Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (June 2019) 1.3. The Councils have produced a Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (June 2019) to inform the draft Charging Schedule, herein after referred to as the 'Viability Assessment'. This reflects national Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG') which recognises that "Plan makers can undertake site specific viability assessment for sites that are critical to delivering the strategic priorities of the plan" (PPG, Paragraph 005 Reference ID: 10-005-20180724). Paragraph 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509 explains that "It is the responsibility of site promoters to engage in plan making, take into account any costs including their own profit expectations and risks, and ensure that proposals for development are policy compliant". 1.4. Dixon Searle Partnership ('DSP') were commissioned by the Councils to carry out a Viability Assessment which has involved the "... review of the financial viability of site typologies (representing a range of typical site types likely to come forward across the Plan) and specific sites where those are important in delivering the aims and objectives of the joint Plan" (para. 1.5.2). The Viability Assessment makes clear that DSP have undertaken a "high level" Viability Assessment of the strategic sites using "...cost estimates provided by the Councils and based on information provided by Buckinghamshire County Council (amongst others) relating to infrastructure provision such as education and transport" (para. 1.2.4). 1.5. It is noteworthy that the Councils accept, within the Viability Assessment, that the potential exists for the strategic sites to be able to "...overcome abnormal issues and support added costs when further master planning is undertaken..." and recognises that the "...viability may need to be reviewed further as more becomes known about those sites" (para. 2.6.3). The Portman Estate considers this important within the context of the Beaconsfield allocation where further work is required to inform the exact type and scale of infrastructure proposed, e.g. in the form of the on-site community facilities which proposed Policy SP BP9 states will need "...to be agreed with the Council through the masterplan process" (Emerging Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan, Policy SP BP9). 1.6. Appendix 2b of the Viability Assessment contains the high level viability appraisals undertaken to inform the consideration of CIL within the context of the strategic site allocations. The Portman Estate appreciates that the assessment is high level at this stage and agree with the Councils that viability may need to be reviewed further as the masterplanning process continues to develop and the extent of certain site-specific provisions are fully known. 1.7. At this stage however and based on the high-level assumptions made within the Councils assessment for the Beaconsfield allocation, the Portman Estate is confident that a viable scheme on the Portman controlled land within the allocation can be achieved. 1.8. In response to the high-level assessment undertaken on behalf of the Councils, the Portman Estate wish to highlight the following queries in respect of the Beaconsfield appraisal: Education Costs 1.9. The £11 million cost assumed for the provision of a two form entry primary school on a 1.7 hectare site is queried for the following reasons: 1. It is not clear what this figure includes, i.e. does it include the cost for the 1.7 hectares of land required for the school? Does it include an allowance for the 52 place pre-school that is also sought? 2. The figure of £11 million differs from the £10 million quoted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan also dated June 2019 and it is not clear why there is a difference of £1 million between the two evidence base documents. 3. The figure itself, of £11 million, seems excessive within the context of other primary school costs assessed on other sites and so further evidence is required to

understand exactly how this figure has been derived. Assumed Density 1.10. A density of 35 dwellings per hectares has been assumed across the entirety of the allocation. Given the scale of the Site, it would be prudent to test a range of densities because in reality, a range of densities will be delivered across the allocation in response to different character areas and site specific constraints and opportunities. Indicative Capacity 1.11. Whilst it is prudent to assess the Site within the context of an indicative capacity of 1,600 dwellings, regard must be given to the Wilton Park proposal, its associated Section 106 package and the net increase in dwellings that this development will deliver, i.e. 264 dwellings of the 1,600 proposed under Policy SP BP9 of the emerging Local Plan. Response to the CIL Charging Schedule & Viability Assessment Submitted on behalf of the Portman Estate The Portman Estate August 2019 3 1.12. The residual capacity of the Site, i.e. 1,336 dwellings, must therefore be the baseline position for off-site contributions to avoid any potential for double counting, in view of the Section 106 contributions being provided directly by the Wilton Park development, e.g. towards the expansion of the Holtspur Secondary School. The DSP evidence fails to take account of the specific circumstances associated with Wilton Park and therefore the site appraisal should be amended to reflect the exact circumstances that prevail in the Section 106 Agreement for Wilton Park. Community facilities 1.13. Policy SP BP9 of the emerging Local Plan requires the provision of “other community facilities within the development site” which will be “...agreed with the Council through the masterplan process”. The representations submitted on behalf of the Portman Estate in response to Policy SP BP9 explain that robust evidence must be produced by the Councils which identifies the exact type and scale of community facilities to be provided at the Beaconsfield allocation to serve its future residential population. Such evidence must be informed by an assessment of existing community facilities in Beaconsfield, in order to ensure new community facilities being provided within the allocation area respond to an identified need and do not undermine the vitality and viability of existing community facilities within the locality. This will then inform the type of facility required and the extent of costs and land-take that can be expected to meet this provision. Health care financial contributions 1.14. Policy SP BP9 of the emerging Local Plan explains that financial contributions for primary health care facilities within the local area will be sought, as “...agreed with the Clinical Commissioning Group”. The IDP refers to a funding gap of £4.5m to provide a new GP surgery in Beaconsfield which combines two existing practices and states that financial contributions will be sought from new development needed to support this project. 1.15. A planning application for a new surgery, on land adjacent to the A40 which is intended to replace the Milbarn Medical Centre on London End and The Simpson Centre on Gregories Road, is currently pending consideration by South Bucks District Council. The developers (Apollo Capital Projects Development Ltd.) are hopeful that the new facility will be open for business by the end of 2020. 1.16. As the proposals are subject to a detailed planning application (LPA ref: PL/19/1954/FA), costs associated with their delivery should be made available to inform the likely contributions that can be expected from the Beaconsfield allocation. The 100 space car park 1.17. The Portman Estate, within their separate representations to the Local Plan, query the need to provide a public car park within the ‘Beaconsfield’ allocation, in particular, why this is necessary to support a 1,600 home development. 1.18. No evidence has been provided to support its provision, nor to demonstrate that it is necessary within the context of mitigating impacts directly arising from the proposed allocation. The high-level viability assessment undertaken on behalf of the Councils similarly makes no reference to its provision which will have long-term cost implications associated with its future management and maintenance. Local centre 1.19. The Viability Assessment appraisals include a 2 hectare ‘Local Centre’. It is not clear what evidence exists to support the scale of Local Centre assessed, nor how this reflects the scale of Local Centre envisaged by proposed Policy SP BP9 which is 1,000sqm gross. Further, and as the separate representations submitted on behalf of the Estate in response to the draft Local Plan explain, evidence is required to justify the scale of retail provision proposed at the ‘Beaconsfield’ allocation in order to understand the impact of such provision upon the existing town centre provision. SANG 1.20. The IDP (Appendix 1) states that the Beaconsfield allocation will need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (‘SANG’) which is reflected within the allocation wording (Policy SP BP9) in order to “...mitigate the potential disturbance from the additional recreational impacts on the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation”. The high-level viability assessment makes no reference to the provision or cost of a SANG. Gypsy and traveller pitch provision 1.21. It is not clear how the figure of £412,000 for a 15 pitch gypsy and traveller site has been derived and further clarification is sought in this regard. In our (Savills) experience, the figure appears to be light, indeed we have received quotations elsewhere, for a 10 pitch scheme, which have been in the region of £1,000,000.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Concern with the Publication Local Plan site assessment by Dixon Searle Partnership for the proposed Beaconsfield allocation including the costs of the education, health, retail, car parking and Gypsy and Traveller provision. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider the approach taken to reviewing viability is suitable for the purpose and consistent with the guidance. The approach to nil-rate such sites for CIL will allow, as far as possible, the necessary headroom and flexibility to accommodate infrastructure provision works and contributions to the optimum levels achievable - with final levels to be settled. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Adam Kindred (1224431)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	xxxxxxxxxxxxx, xxxxx xxxxx
Consultee	Biddulph Buckinghamshire Ltd (1224432)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Biddulph Buckinghamshire Ltd (1224432)
Comment ID	51
Response Date	23/08/19 13:06
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The DCS set out for CDC states that 'Large sites over 400 homes or 10 hectares in area' have a £0per sqm rating. As has previously been indicated this is supported by Biddulph given the significant level of infrastructure that is required to come forward to deliver large sites. To note, the table on Page 7 is unclear as there appears to be reference to 'Infrastructure Requirements' within this, however there is no further detail nor is it clear what this relates to. As per our previous representations, we would request further clarification on whether all land uses proposed on sites which meet the definition above (i.e. over 400 homes/10 hectares in area) would incur a £0per sqm CIL, or whether other uses would be CIL liable as per the table set out on Page 7 of the DCS. It is noted that in Paragraph 3.11.2 that 'large sites will continue to rely upon S106 Planning Obligations due to the scale of site-specific mitigation' however we would request that it is made clear that the £0 per sqm applies to all uses proposed within a Large Site and not just the residential element. There is a requirement on many large sites to deliver a range of uses and it is considered that these other uses should also have a £0per sqm liability as they complement the main land use (residential) and contribute to the development of a successful development. Specifically, in relation to Site BP6 there is a requirement to deliver a 1 Form Entry Primary School on site. The DCS identifies that proposals for non-residential institutions (Use Class D1) which would encompass a School, have a CIL charge of £35per sqm. As set out Biddulph is understanding of the requirement to implement CIL within CDC and SBDC however, they would appreciate clarification that all uses within a proposal for a Large Site would be £0per sqm. Whilst this is inferred throughout the document, it would be welcomed if this was made clear.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Requests clarification that the CIL exemption to large sites includes all use classes. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils will make this clear in the CIL Adoption Council papers. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Heather Archer (1224616)
Email Address	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Address	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXXX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Heather Archer (1224616)
Comment ID	52
Response Date	23/08/19 14:38
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

In the case of the above consultations, Highways England is interested in the potential impact that the development might have upon the M25, M40 and M4 motorways and A40 (part). When examining these consultations we pay particular attention to the requirements of the Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 that is consistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. In this regard we have been in ongoing dialogue regarding the potential impacts upon the SRN. The ongoing dialogue resulted in the production of a transport assessment of the potential impacts of the Joint Local Plan development upon the SRN, namely the "Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan Modelling Report – Local Plan Impacts on the Strategic Road Network" (October 2018). We previously commented that the risks of any severe impacts upon the SRN were low from the Local Plan development and have no further comments at the present time. Of growing concern to Highways England is air quality and the impact of development traffic contributing to emissions from traffic on the SRN. We acknowledge and agree with the Sustainability Appraisal Report recommendations in Section 6.4 of the need to establish stronger links between the Local Plan policies, LTP4, strategies detailed in Air Quality Management Action Plans and the Clean Air Strategy. We shall be paying particular attention to air quality matters in future and stress the need for appropriate monitoring.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

This representation does not raise any issues in regard to the DCS. Account Taken by the Councils:
The Council is grateful for the representation from Highways England and notes that there is no objection to the CIL DCS. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Ziyad Thomas (1224621)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxx xxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Ziyad Thomas (1224621)
Comment ID	53
Response Date	23/08/19 14:59
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Use Class Policy DM LP7: Homes – Older Persons, Specialist and Supported Living of the Local Plan stipulates that the Use Class of Extra Care accommodation is based solely on self containment stating: 'Specialist housing may be self-contained Use Class C3, non-self-contained Use Class C2 or sui generis' (Paragraph 5.8.2) This is incorrect. Extra Care accommodation covers a wide spectrum of care and support and it has been well established through good practice, guidance, appeal precedent and case law that the determining factors as to use class is not self-containment but the nature of the care and support provided, and the facilities that come with it. Both McCarthy & Stone and Pegasus Life have self contained Extra Care schemes that sit within Use Class C2. This matter will be elaborated upon in our representation to the Local Plan. The LPCVA tests Extra Care accommodation on the understanding that it is likely to sit within use class C2 and therefore would not be expected to provide affordable housing, however Extra Care accommodation was tested with 40% affordable housing provision to look at a 'worst case scenario' (Paragraph 3.4.49). The conclusions of this approach were as follows: 3.4.50 The indications are that if such a scheme falls into C3 use, then the £150/sq. m CIL

should be supportable as above, especially bearing in mind these comments. However, if considered within the scope of C2 then certainly the £35/sq. m CIL charges proposed by the Councils would certainly be supportable. The application of the Use Classes Order makes little sense in this context. A scheme that meets the characteristics of an Extra Care development defined in the LPCVA (i.e. developments that provide 35% communal facilities and additional up-front staffing costs for the provision of care which typify the Extra Care developments PegasusLife and McCarthy & Stone deliver could, under the current wording of Policy DM LP7, be classified as C3. A change of Use Class would not make a scheme more able to support a CIL rate of £150 per sq m. The application of Policy DM LP7 and the CIL Charging Schedule are disjointed and has the effect of burdening self-contained Extra Care schemes that sit within Use Class C2 with an unrealistic and unviable level of CIL. Site Density The appraisals assume a site density of 125 dp/ha (or a site size of 0.48 hectares for 60 units) is achievable across all schemes throughout the District. We consider that the nature of the prescriptive design policies proposed within the Draft Local Plan are such that achieving such a high density of development is unachievable. The amount of land required and the corresponding cost has therefore been underestimated. Sales Values and Incentives The appraisal undertaken for a scheme of 30 units comprises value areas VL9 (£6,000 p/) to VL18 (£8,000 p/). Value areas VL1 - VL8 are not tested as part of the sheltered housing appraisals. This comprises a disconnect between the proposed draft Local Plan Policy DM LP7 which requires sheltered housing to be located in all sustainable locations. VL1 - 8 areas are still considered to be sustainable settlements but are excluded from the viability testing. Without appropriate testing in lower value areas (VL1-8) caution needs to be taken to assess whether the effect of the proposed CIL charging rate could be supported in lower value areas. Non Saleable Floor Area We welcome the adjustments made within the appraisals for sheltered housing that reduces the non saleable floor area to 75%. We have found such an adjustment to be reflective of the net to gross adjustments experienced across our developments. For extra care developments we have found this figure to be lower, in the region of 65%. Such adjustments are welcomed by the Consortium. Build Cost The RICS BCIS build cost analysis provides a specific rate for supported housing including sheltered and extra care housing types. In our experience, the rates are typically 10-15% higher than conventional blocks of apartments due to the specific design and finish required for this type of proposal. The additional financial requirements imposed by requiring construction to a higher than standard specific (Part M4(2) requirements) is reflected in the appraisal models run. Such a step is welcomed. The use of the specific base build costs associated with specialist housing proposals for older people is advocated to fully account for the bespoke costs associated in developing this typology. Sales Rate The LPCVA does not appear to detail the sales rate used by Dixon Searle Partnership in their viability appraisals and there appears to be no difference in the sales rate between 'conventional' forms of housing and specialist older persons' housing. We would appreciate clarification on the sales rate used in advance of Examination in Public. Sales rates for older persons' housing are markedly slower than general needs comparable schemes and the entire development needs to be completed prior to the first sale. This point also negatively affects the viability of schemes. In the Consortium's experience, a typical average across the region would be 1 - 1.3 sales per month, depending on demand and current market climates. Churchill Retirement Living have been selling 'Peel Lodge' in Marlow since June 2018 and has sold 63% of units to date at a rate of 1.19 units per month. Clearly there are locations where this average will vary (higher and lower VL areas). The current Argus model testing, which negates VL areas 1 - 8, is unable to reflect this sales rate. Ground Rents The subsequent effect of including 40% of dwellings as affordable housing excludes 40% of dwellings from ground rent payments. This affects the impact of empty property costs (as covered below). Empty Property Costs Voids or empty property costs are a direct implication of longer than average sales periods extending to several years. The developer is required to cover the upkeep, ground rent, service charge and other costs for a fully functioning building until each dwelling is sold. The Empty Property cost for Sheltered housing used by DSP in the appraisal report for sheltered housing (Appendix II) was £60k. This accounts for £1k per unit. In the Consortium's experience an allowance of £3,000 per dwelling is reasonably representative of the typical empty property costs for a retirement proposal. Sales and Marketing Costs The Dixon Searle Partnership Viability Report notes that sales and marketing costs will be comparatively higher for this housing typology due to the typically slower than average sales rate. Combined sales and marketing allowances of 6% of GDV or greater are not uncommon due to sales periods spread over several years and owing to the unique purchaser profile. This allowance must be accounted for within the typology testing in order to accurately reflect representative costs experienced by typical retirement developers. Profit An allowance of 17.5% profit on GDV is assumed within the appraisal for sheltered housing developments. Profit can be viewed as a measure of risk and countless appeal decisions have determined that retirement housing proposals are riskier than

mainstream housing proposals due in most part to slow sales rates, reduced market, dependency on third party sales to release equity and as a result of all these factors, a very long breakeven time which results in exposure to the peaks and troughs in the housing market. Minimum requirements in respect of profit assumption for specialist housing proposals for older people is therefore 20% on GDV and there are emerging arguments that in line with NPPG guidance, a higher hurdle rate may be justified. A minimum 20% figure should be included within this study for the purposes of testing viability for this typology. Our view is that the initial assumed outputs and scope of the viability appraisals fail to accurately reflect the costs of delivering specialist older persons' housing. The viability of these forms of development have been overestimated and the consequence is the setting of an affordable housing requirement and CIL liability that are unrealistic. Furthermore the disjointed nature of Policy DM LP7: Homes – Older Persons, Specialist and Supported Living and the Charging Schedule rates will have the effect of burdening self-contained Extra Care schemes that sit within Use Class C2 (such as those delivered by PegasusLife and McCarthy & Stone) with an unrealistic and unviable level of CIL.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

This representation concerns the impact of CIL, as proposed, on the viability of care developments. Concern is also concerned on the definition of C2. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that the viability evidence and its assumptions are appropriate and proportional for the purposes of CIL viability, and do not consider that certain forms of market housing should be treated more favourably than others in setting CIL. It is considered that overall a great variety of schemes will be seen, and the charging approach should not become over-complicated. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Zahra Waters (1224530)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxx xxxxx
Consultee	Berkeley Homes (Oxford & Chiltern) Limited (1224528)
Address	xx xx xx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Berkeley Homes (Oxford & Chiltern) Limited (1224528)
Comment ID	54
Response Date	23/08/19 11:13
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

The evidence base recognises that there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the scope of infrastructure required, and associated costs in relation to the strategic allocations (which includes the site). The evidence base concludes that a nil CIL rate should apply across the strategic allocations. Therefore the treatment of CIL should be simple for the strategic sites. However, the draft CIL schedule identifies a CIL charge for residential uses of £150 per sq m save for "Local Plan sites with a capacity to provide 400 / 10 per ha or more dwellings Infrastructure contributions via S106." This wording is not clear in relation to the delivery of the strategic allocations, and indeed those allocations to which it applies. The CIL schedule should therefore be updated as set out below. Specific viability analysis was undertaken in relation to each of the strategic allocations which is set out in Appendix 2a of the viability assessment. It is therefore clear from the evidence base that the strategic allocations (including SP BP9) should be exempt from CIL due to the nature of the allocations and the infrastructure they are required to provide. Instead contributions would be sought through the s106 process. The current wording of the CIL Charging Schedule does not reflect the evidence base. For South Bucks the CIL schedule states "Local Plan sites with a capacity to provide 400 / 10 per ha or more dwellings Infrastructure contributions via S106" have a CIL rate of £0. However, whilst the strategic sites, including SP BP9, have a capacity of 400 or more homes or are 10 hectares or larger, this wording within the draft Charging Schedule does not reflect that many of the sites, including SP BP9, are made up of smaller land ownerships/parcels and are likely to come forward via a number of separate planning applications. These applications will in some circumstances be lower than the thresholds identified but will still be required to contribute to the infrastructure requirements identified within the policies. The Land off Park Lane site, which forms part of the SP BP9 allocation has an anticipated capacity of 70-100 dwellings. Therefore, whilst forming part of the wider strategic allocation, and contributing to the infrastructure requirements identified within the draft policy, the current wording of the CIL charging schedule does not make it clear that should a planning application come forward on the site it should not be CIL liable. The reference to 400 dwellings/10 ha should instead refer to and specific the relevant allocation sites which are proposed to be CIL exempt. This will acknowledge that separate planning applications may come forward within the allocation that are under these thresholds. Such an approach would be consistent with both emerging Local Plan Policy SP BP9 and the evidence base. Suggested Amendments Therefore, to ensure the draft CIL Charging Schedule is applied as intended by the evidence base, we suggest the following revised wording for the strategic allocations within the South Bucks table is used. We would also suggest that a plan accompanies the Charging Schedule to make it clear which of the strategic sites are included within the CIL exemption. "Development within the strategic site allocations as shown on the accompanying plan - Nil" The accompanying plan should include site SP BP9 and the other relevant allocations. Section 5 of the draft CIL Charging Schedule document should also be updated to reflect the above. This will make it clear that it applies to all development within the identified strategic sites and will allow for a number of smaller planning applications to come forward as envisaged by the emerging Local Plan without requiring both CIL and s106 contributions.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

This representation seeks to tie the Publication Local Plan site allocations to the CIL exemptions in order to be clear that parcels of less than 400 homes within larger allocations including Beaconsfield are clearly CIL exempt. Account Taken by the Councils: The CIL zero rating applies to thresholds not allocations. CIL is proposed to be adopted prior to the Local Plan and does not rely upon the Local Plan for its evidence. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent Molly How (1224427)

Email Address xxxxxx

Address xxxxxx
xxxxx
xxxxx
xxxxx

Consultee Retirement Village (1224428)

Address xx
xx
xx

Event Name Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule

Comment by Retirement Village (1224428)

Comment ID 55

Response Date 23/08/19 11:17

Consultation Point Community Infrastructure Levy ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.7

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

There are a number of differing types of 'age restricted' development including sheltered housing, retirement living, assisted living, extra care and care homes. These are distinct from traditional residential developments. All provide specialist facilities but the level of services and care given can vary significantly, as will the design of the development. Sheltered, retirement and assisted living are usually provided under the C3 planning Use Class, with extra care and care homes being Use Class C2. However, it should be noted that not all C3 development is equally viable. The viability of retirement developments reduces with the level of care given for the reasons set out briefly below: Design Efficiencies - Traditional housing is the most efficient design as 100% of the built space is saleable. Flatted developments are less viable as the common parts cannot be sold and age restricted developments become less efficient and give less built space which can be sold as the level of care increases, as set out below. • Traditional / General Needs Houses - 100% Net to Gross efficiency; • Traditional / General Needs Apartments - 85% Net to Gross; • Sheltered Living / Retirement Living Apartments - 75% Net to Gross; • Assisted Living / Extra Care Apartments - 65% Net to Gross. C2

developments will generally only be 65% efficient, meaning that only 65% of the build space will receive a receipt. Construction Costs - Retirement developments cost more to construct than general flatted developments or traditional housing as they often include lifts (even if only two storey), specially adapted bathrooms and fitted out treatment rooms etc. Professional Fees - Housing estates are often designed around an existing set of plans based upon a house builder's product type, such that anyone can see the same home at many different sites. Accordingly, fees only need be expended to place these designs within the specific site's setting and make any adjustments for local materials or the planning conditions. Age restricted developments will require a greater level of professional input in order to ensure the scheme meets the specific needs of its intended occupants, as well as the need to design the additional facilities that these schemes have. We would expect fees for traditional housing estates to be in the order of 4-6%, whereas for a C2 development this would be 8-10%. Construction Rates - Any apartment block must be fully constructed before the sale of a single unit can be completed, due to design. As a result, the capital cost of the block must be financed in its entirety. An age restricted development, in particular a C2 extra care scheme, with additional construction costs and facilities (which must be completed in time for the first occupation) will require a greater funding burden. Empty Property Costs - As the facilities within an age restricted development benefit a resident's wellbeing and, in the case of assisted living and extra care, their day to day care needs, developments must be fully operational before the scheme can be occupied. Once completed, any facilities within a development will need their operational costs covering. This is achieved through a service charge paid by residents. However, the amount chargeable to any one owner is only proportionate to the development at full occupation. Accordingly, the developer has to cover the cost of any unsold units which can be significant. As most residential schemes do not have additional facilities, developers of such schemes do not face this cost burden. Even where schemes do include additional facilities (such as swimming pools) their operational start can be delayed until a certain level of occupation is achieved. Furthermore, due to the differences in the market, the sales rates of general housing is faster and thus any costs are further reduced. Sales Rates - Age restricted developments are limited to those over the age of 55 or older. This significantly limits the market of potential purchasers in comparison to general needs housing which can be purchased by anyone (even the elderly). Any sale is likely to involve additional family members, predominately resident's children, who will also need convincing that a property provides the best place for their parent(s). Accordingly, the sales rates of age restricted developments are much slower which increases their finance costs. Developments are further impacted as such schemes are limited to purchases with care needs. Sales & Marketing Costs - The increased sales period faced by age restricted developments means that the sales office has to be manned for longer, which increases its cost relative to general needs housing. On average a typical market housing scheme might cost circa 3% to sell compared to 5% for an age restricted development. Risk Return/ Profit - Any profit requirement that a developer seeks is carefully balanced between the need to secure highly competitive and limited development sites vs the risks of a potential project. As a result of the issues raised above, funders of age restricted developments often require a greater 'hurdle rate' compared to general needs housing. Expected profit margins range from 15% to 20% of Gross Development Value, with housing estates normally at the bottom of this range, standard flatted developments in the middle and age restricted developments at the top. This reduces the competitiveness of operators of age restricted development in the market for land. The impact of these issues on the viability of age restricted developments, in particular use class C2, is that ultimately age restricted developers are less able to pay the same price for land as residential developers. It is therefore much harder for them to secure sites for development and meet the housing needs they aim to supply. One of the very few ways the imbalance is redressed, so that age restricted developers can compete, is by applying a reduced or nil CIL rate on C2 developments. The Council's own local plan evidence base proves the point regarding the viability of housing for the elderly. As part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan, a viability study (dated December 2018) was recently undertaken by Aspinall Verdi. Numerous property types were tested, including 'Specialist Accommodation for Older People'. The testing showed that traditional housing schemes could afford a value of circa £95,000 per unit, where C2 extra care housing could only afford circa £18,000 per unit. The Government has shown concern around the delivery of housing for the elderly and the House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee recently (February 2018) reported on 'Housing for older people'. Viability was specifically addressed by the committee. The Committee stated that 'that the level of planning contributions on specialist housing is impeding the delivery of homes.' They recommended that Her Majesty's Government create a separate sub-category or planning use class to reduce the contributions required. This particularly related to the provision of affordable housing, but the adoption of a reduced or nil CIL rate will clearly also have a big effect on the viability and delivery of housing

for the elderly. As discussed, the viability of extra care housing is challenging in comparison with standard C3 housing. Therefore, if the same CIL levels are applied, the delivery of this much need class of development would be impacted. The imposition of a flat rate planning charge has been criticised as being 'one size fits all'. The differentiation between mainstream housing and specialised forms of housing set out in the Draft Charging Schedule is therefore welcomed. Planning Use Classification The footnote at the bottom of Table Two (Charging Schedule - South Bucks District Council area CIL Rates) states that development falling within Use Class C3 "includes self-contained accommodation, including elderly and sheltered accommodation and self-contained student accommodation". Specialised housing for older people can fall within Use Class C2, due to characteristics of communality. The footnote therefore unclear as development falling within Use Class C2 can be delivered in the form of self-contained accommodation. For instance, when considering an appeal for an 80-bed care home and 139 No. close care flats and cottages in Wiltshire {05/11/2012 DCS No 100-079-538), an Inspector took the view that close care units constitute Use Class C2 development. The charging schedule would therefore be clearer if this footnote was removed. As discussed, not all C3 development is equally viable. Even when categorised as Use Class C3, retirement development is less viable than general housing. It appears that the Draft Charging Schedule does not consider fully or account for this.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

Expresses concern that C2 and C3 have different percentages of profitable space and that some elderly care can fall within C2 - so suggest the *C3 element of of the Charging Schedule is removed. Also concern that some forms of development will become unviable if CIL is introduced. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that the DCS proposals are appropriate in their current format. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Tim Seymour (1224814)
Email Address	xxxxx
Address	xxxxxxx xxxxxxx xxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Tim Seymour (1224814)
Comment ID	56
Response Date	23/08/19 11:24
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.10

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for:

Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

1. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) supporting the CIL consultation states at paragraph 35 that the CIL as currently proposed makes no provision for contributions to Acute healthcare requirements. BHT object to this matter owing to their unusual situation as providers of both Acute and Community healthcare services. 2. There is no certainty in the CIL document, as it is written, that Hospital related development (stated as being C2 in the document) will be exempt from the minimum CIL contribution of £35 per square metre. It is important that the local planning authorities understand fully the range of care provided by BHT and the way that it operates with the CCG to ensure that CIL or S.106 contributions are not sought solely for the purposes of primary care by the CCG but that the secondary and community care provided by BHT is also fully understood and acknowledged by the Councils. These representations are made in the context of substantial new housing and employment growth across the whole County, and specifically the 11,099 new homes proposed by the emerging Chiltern and South Buckinghamshire Local Plan and a further 5,687 of the Council's unmet need to be provided within Aylesbury Vale.1 (it is appreciated that the CIL once adopted would relate solely to the Chiltern and South Bucks Council Areas) which will only serve to increase the demand on the BHT services as a result of increased population from the growth proposed in the emerging Local Plan. Not only will the plan result in an increased population from net in-migration, but the new population moving to the area will live longer and have associated age related health issues which will require support from services provided by BHT. no provision is made in the IDP for funding for these Acute healthcare services or their associated community care provisions. Paragraph 34 above is clear that the NPPF makes provision for the consideration of contributions towards infrastructure for health through the plan making process. BHT consider that is entirely reasonable to request that their service and infrastructure requirements are included within the emerging CIL for schemes up to 400 dwellings and that for schemes over 400 dwellings that S.106 contributions will be sought alongside other infrastructure provider requests. The Reg 19 CIL Consultation Draft Charging Schedule is not categoric in stating that any new hospital development within the Districts will be exempt from CIL contributions. BHT request, that for absolute clarity, the Charging Schedule be explicit that BHT hospital related development, whether it falls within C2 or B1 Use Classes be expressly exempt from CIL contributions given the fact that it will be providing new health infrastructure for the authorities in the Districts. Without such clarity the authorities may choose to levy CIL contributions from BHT within the terms of the Draft CIL Charging Schedule as set out above. These representations have evidenced that BHT faces funding challenges both in the immediate term and the longer term for the plan period up to 2036 for both the Acute and Community Healthcare services that it provides. Data from NHS England and the Buckinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment evidences the existing and future health needs of Chiltern and South Bucks Districts especially around matters relating to obesity and ageing and their associated illnesses. BHT are a key partner in the delivery of the Buckinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy. BHT request that more detailed reference and explanation be made with regard to these matters in the explanatory text and Appendices 1 and 2 of the IDP supporting the draft Development Plan and draft CIL Charging Schedule. BHT request that Acute Healthcare costs be factored into CIL contributions for schemes up to 400 dwellings and that BHT request S.106 contributions for schemes greater than 400 dwellings. Should the BHT request to be included within the CIL not be accepted then S.106 requests will continue to be made on schemes for new residential development at their discretion. BHT also request that development for health infrastructure purposes on their hospital estate be exempt from CIL contributions as requested above.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

This representation seeks to exempt hospitals, primary and acute care in Use Classes B1 and C2 from the levy. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils did consider such an exemption but determined

to not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as all development has an impact. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Phillip Plato (1224533)
Address	xx xx xx
Consultee	Brown Not Green Chesham Ltd (1224822)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Brown Not Green Chesham Ltd (1224822)
Comment ID	57
Response Date	23/08/19 11:43
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for:

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

BNG has concerns that the proposed CIL levy does not strike the appropriate balance between securing additional investments and potential effects on the viability of developments in the charging area. BNG are concerned the infrastructure spending gap may be significantly worse than that due to many significant projects appearing to be reliant upon (unquantified) developer contributions under S.106 or S.278. There is a concern that many developers will be able to resist making such contributions either on the basis of viability or that they will challenge whether the contributions sought are directly and proportionally related to the development they are undertaking. Indeed, many of the site allocations in the emerging Local Plan are excluded from CIL. (ie developments over 400 homes). However, many of the contributions to be sought under say S.106, cannot be quantified because much of the costs of related infrastructure is not yet specified and is awaiting the preparation of (as yet unpublished) "masterplans" for allocated sites. The fear is many sites, especially those development sites around Chesham, will either be undeliverable/unviable or worse, delivered without the appropriate infrastructure necessary to avoid injurious affects upon a town that is already struggling with inadequate infrastructure. Air Quality Monitoring Area in Chesham and designated Air Quality Management Area. Costs and actions to be determined by the Air Quality Action Plan – where is it? (Green Infrastructure)At this point it is not possible to identify measures to mitigate impacts as the evidence work is on-going but the potential need for measures is included in this list as an advance marker of potential future requirements Expansion / modification of existing primary care services in Chesham, particularly for the extension of the Chess Medical Centre and the Red Lion Street surgery. Appropriate financial contribution from new development needed. Chesham Flood alleviation scheme – town centre proposals, potentially including deculverting the River Chess along St Mary's Way and measures to improve flood water storage on the periphery of the town. CDC in discussion with EA at present in relation to options for the town centre route. Options for the route still under discussion with the Environment Agency Depending on scale of development, (BNG NOTE: 900+ homes, 500 homes or just 100?) (BNG NOTE – If whole of Chesham GB site is removed from GB is presumably for further expansion?) Expansion Chesham Grammar School: (BNG NOTE: is that all? What will £2m buy?) Investment to enhance useage and attractiveness of the Districts' shopping centres, e.g. public realm improvements, public art, additional parking, CCTV, etc (BNG NOTE – Would Chesham really get any of this?) BNG NOTE: Significant retail expansion is being proposed in Chesham but on the Car Park sites. Car Parking is vital infrastructure to sever the customers of existing retailers. This potentially a vital area of infrastructure for the town that is being given inadequate consideration. Incubator space / growth space for new and fledgling businesses (BNG NOTE – Where in Chesham?) Signalisation of Junctions on A416, Chesham (see local transport modelling report, July 2017) (BNG NOTE: Is that all Chesham might get?) £1.2m - £2.6m (BNG NOTE - another big variation! – However, is this even realistic? Where is the space for any significant improvements when evidence shows the junction already exceeds capacity) New or extended Bus services to serve new development sites: Based on cost information from Bucks CC and is as at Sept 2017. It is subject to change. Provision of bus service infrastructure such as stops, shelters and Real Time Passenger Information, including specific requirements for Green Belt options: Based on cost information from Bucks CC and is as at Sept 2017. It is subject to change. Improvements to public transport/walking and cycling links to increase sustainable transport options between employment, services, housing and onward travel options: TBC BNG NOTE – This is astonishing! The GB Option at Chesham is NOT a sustainable location and significant investment is needed to create acceptable transport links. BNG NOTE: What happens if bus services are cut or removed in subsequent years? Capacity and access improvements to railway stations including measures to enhance links to other sustainable transport TBC BNG NOTE – Is this even practical?(BNG NOTE: Though at Chesham station they will be expected to walk / cycle nearly 2.5km up/down a steep hill!) Charging points and infrastructure for electric vehicles: To be provided in locations accessible to the public Estimated costs are provided at this point. They relate to a rapid / ultra-fast charger (£11 - 150, 000 per charging point). (BNG NOTE: Is this a typo? Potentially only 4 charging points across the whole two districts for the next 20 years!!) . Costs are based on the provision of 10 new points in the four main centres in the plan area by 2036. This is an estimate and is subject to change. BNG Note- Is Chesham one of these 4 centres? There are a significant number of projects marked "TBC" or where costs are "subject to change" or with a significant range of projected costs. If this is replicated across the wider area of Chiltern & South Bucks (& a cursory review of the other Infrastructure Delivery Projects suggests it is) then BNG have concluded that the Infrastructure Spending Gap is very likely to be significantly higher than estimated. Accordingly, a lot of important infrastructure requirements will NOT

get funded. BNG have concluded therefore that the proposed CIL levy does not strike the appropriate balance between securing additional investments and potential effects on the viability of developments in the charging area and is “unsound”.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information provided

Summary of Representation

Concerns that the proposed CIL levy does not strike the appropriate balance between securing additional investments and potential effects on the viability of developments in the charging area. Provides an infrastructure list and highlights some gaps in funding information. Does not comment specifically on the Charging Schedule. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils are grateful for the information presented. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Mr Rob Smith (1224167)
Email Address	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Buckinghamshire County Council
Address	xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Buckinghamshire County Council (Mr Rob Smith - 1224167)
Comment ID	58
Response Date	23/08/19 14:24
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

3.4.2: Please provide an explanation on how this is planned to be done. 3.4.3: It is anticipated that the majority of this impact will be on the transport network, but also in respect to new developments then potentially schools, shopping and health facilities. Clarification is needed in regards to what priorities will be placed on these as they will ultimately have implications for BCC future services. 3.4.4: Much of these seem to relate to capital investments. Long term sustainability needs to be considered, and how these are funded on an ongoing basis. 3.4.6: Clarification is needed on how this will be delivered. 3.5.1: Please provide further explanation on how does this differentiate the different nature of the communities/ areas? Some areas may require greater assistance and therefore greater support. 3.10.2: What is this gap? 3.11.2: What is the basis of the 400 homes ... threshold? The viability assessment states that the following developments will be excluded from CIL are: - Sites of 10 hectares and greater; or - Developments of 400 homes and greater; or - Development of 10,000 square metres and greater. This is referred to as coming from C&SB. How has this been determined? What are the implications of that needs to be considered. 3.11.3: It would be useful to determine what does and doesn't fall into the respective areas for CIL charges. The £35 per m2 charge seems to be a "all other developments" that don't fit within either residential or retail. The viability assessment highlights a number of developments which they feel should be £35 or £Nil charged such as museums, surgeries / storage

depots / cafe etc. but this is not exclusive and therefore could there be a possibility where key development which should pay the higher rate fall into the lower rate? 4.1: It is understood that the main focus of these should be towards s 106 rather than CIL. What would provide the greatest benefit for the area CIL or s106. This potentially is developer led approach i.e. with infrastructure provision on-and off-site under section 106 agreements and charging authorities charge a zero CIL rate. This potentially could work well but details need to be provided for the reasoning as to why this methodology has been followed as opposed to alternative authority-led approach. The benefit of the authority-led approach is that it avoids the risk that strategic sites are subsequently split up allowing developers to argue that they should not be responsible for the major infrastructure, much of which will fail to satisfy the Regulation 122 and 123 tests. It is understood that the main focus of these should be towards s 106 rather than CIL. 4.2: See above. Should this text be comparative? 4.5.4: It is expected that BCC will be required to bid for money for impacts on highways/ transport infrastructure etc. The questions is how this will be achieved effectively especially within the new Unitary Authority 5.0.2: As identified above. Larger sites generally have greater impacts on a wider area and therefore the impacts of such need greater focus for mitigation.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Representation covers a number of questions in regards the DCS consultation document. It does not raise any objections. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils have talked through the questions with the County Council who support the Councils approach. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Mr Andrew Booth (1212915)
Email Address	
Address	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mr Andrew Booth (1212915)
Comment ID	59
Response Date	09/07/19 13:06
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.10
Are your comments for:	<input type="checkbox"/> Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Funding of infrastructure and services appears, by central government policies and local government interpretation, open to being used to underfund these areas. Clarify what the Community Infrastructure levy covers to ensure that it covers the full cost of the expanded infrastructure and services that the proposed development will incur to providers. Developers should not be able to negotiate out of the costs as in many places the current infrastructure is reaching overload. Be clear if there is a way developers can negotiate out the affordable housing provisions and how the local planning authority will provide the affordable housing. Infrastructure and services (water, sewerage, electricity, gas, telecommunications) is provided by suppliers who do not work within most planning authorities areas. This must be addressed. Similarly education authorities are not always within one planning authority this must also be addressed. Failure to be clear will lead to failed or failing services. Clarify what the CIL covers and how the policy ensures that it is set at a level that really contributes without putting an extra load on other areas.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

Generally concerned about infrastructure - no comments on the Schedule. The representor would like to see what infrastructure would be funded and that it covers the full amount required and what the council will do if affordable housing is negotiated out. Account Taken by the Councils: The Council are required to produce a an Infrastructure Funding List and publish these annually. The representor will be able to see these on the Councils website. Affordable housing and viability has been taken in to account when setting the charging schedules. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Georgina Mead (1214979)
Email Address	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Address	xxx xxxxx xxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mrs Georgina Mead (1214979)
Comment ID	60
Response Date	20/08/19 15:18
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.9

Are your comments for: . Chiltern District Council

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

It has also come to our attention that there is a funding gap from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The proposed cost of the infrastructure is between £179 and £231m and, therefore, does not comply legally with National Policy. This is particularly significant in the present straightened economic climate when there are excellent alternatives cost effective plans to use brown fill sites for housing in Chesham not Green Belt in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Brown fill sites are generally closer to the town centre and in more sustainable locations as advocated by the Chesham Renaissance CIC Masterplan.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No information provided.

Summary of Representation

The representation expresses concern in regards to the infrastructure funding gap and considers brown field land to be less of a burden on infrastructure than Green Belt releases for development. Account Taken by the Councils: A funding gap is part of the evidence to justify the implementation of CIL. The gap is considered against the total target amount that the charging authority proposes to raise through the levy. The Council does not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedule as a result of this representation.

Comment

Consultee	Christopher Mead (1224583)
Address	xxxxxxx xxxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Christopher Mead (1224583)
Comment ID	61
Response Date	20/08/19 15:20
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.10

Are your comments for: . Chiltern District Council

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

It has also come to our attention that there is a funding gap from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The proposed cost of the infrastructure is between £179 and £231m and, therefore, does not comply legally with National Policy. This is particularly significant in the present straightened economic climate when there are excellent alternatives cost effective plans to use brown fill sites for housing in Chesham not Green Belt in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Brown fill sites are generally closer to the town centre and in more sustainable locations as advocated by the Chesham Renaissance CIC Masterplan.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided.

Summary of Representation

The representation expresses concern in regards to the infrastructure funding gap and considers brown field land to be less of a burden on infrastructure than Green Belt releases for development. Account Taken by the Councils: A funding gap is part of the evidence to justify the implementation of CIL. The gap is considered against the total target amount that the charging authority proposes to raise through the levy. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Mr Tony W A H Molesworth (1213291)
Email Address	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Chesham Renaissance Community Interest Company
Address	XXXX XXXX XXXXXX XXXXX
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Chesham Renaissance CIC (Mr Tony W A H Molesworth - 1213291)
Comment ID	62
Response Date	23/08/19 15:06
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6

**You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.**

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination No

**You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.**

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

**You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.**

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

**You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.
Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.**

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Response to Chiltern and South Bucks Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule I. The charging rate for dwelling houses is £150 / sq. m. 2. We do not agree that the residential CIL rates should be same across all areas within the districts. 3. Many pages in the accompanying reports are devoted to demonstrating that there is a very wide disparity of both new and resale prices across the district. In such circumstances most authorities adopt a differentiated or zonal approach to charging rates. 4. It is only necessary to look as far as the Inspector's Report on Hertsmere Borough Council Inquiry (29 October 2013) and its draft CIL Charging Schedule to find the following: 'paragraph 23: The Stage 2 EVA sought to build on the Stage 1 EVA to provide evidence and justification for a differentiated approach to reflect differences in values and development characteristics across the borough. Clearly, where there are significant differences in values across an area, a zonal approach can be appropriate and, indeed, desirable, as it helps to mitigate risks to viability.' 5. Further support for the view of Chesham Renaissance may be found in nearby Enfield where four CIL rates have been adopted varying from nil to £ 120 /sq. metre to reflect variations in values. This was supported by the Inspector as reflecting market information. 6. We do not agree with the rate proposed for B 1, 2 & 8 Uses. 3.7.7 Unfortunately, it continues to be necessary to restate our acknowledgment that, particularly when viewed in terms and using assumptions appropriate to this type of strategic level local authority viability assessment, the viability of many non-residential forms of development looks likely to remain challenging. 2. 3.7.30 Looking at other forms of employment (B Use Class for example) development, the smaller town centre offices scenario testing produces poorer results still, across a wider range of tests and bearing in mind that significantly higher land values (BLVs) could be expected to be relevant (all would be on PDL rather than greenfield). While these again are potentially strongly positive at 5% and to a lesser extent 5.5% yields with 'H' rent assumptions but are negative otherwise. 3. 3.7.32 Coming back to the overview, a nominal CIL level would not in itself make the difference between viability and non-viability -the viability issues are inherent in the relationship between the much larger figures involved in considering development values and costs. Potentially a theme also for a wider range of CIL assessment assumptions based non-viable scheme types, we acknowledged earlier that there is room for pragmatism; and that the viability evidence need not be exactly followed in the Councils' approach (the CIL viability guidance within the PPG refers to this). 3.7.33 Overall, therefore, although the viability evidence alone cannot specifically support the proposed £35/sq. m CIL charges, there is a wider context to look at here and perhaps particularly in relation to the 'out of town offices' scenarios/plan relevance. From these statements it would seem logical to have a nil rate rather than a nominal rate on all B Class development.

Summary of Representation

Considers residential CIL rates across the districts could be varied. Also considers that B1, B2 and B8 Use classes should be £0 per square metre for CIL. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider the DCS based on Chiltern and South Bucks is appropriate for Chiltern and South Bucks. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Miss Nicola Glover-Wright (1211124)
Email Address	xxxx
Address	xxxxxxx xxxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Miss Nicola Glover-Wright (1211124)
Comment ID	63
Response Date	10/07/19 16:12
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council	Yes
---	-----

Are your comments for:	<input type="checkbox"/> Both
-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Summary of Representation

Appears to be a representation to be kept informed. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?	No
-------------------------------	----

Comment

Consultee	Mr Patrick Allen (1215107)
Email Address	xxxxxx
Address	xxxxx xxxxxx xxxxx xxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mr Patrick Allen (1215107)
Comment ID	64
Response Date	11/07/19 16:13
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

I see a massive amount of work which has no strong or pertinent information. 1. What is the estimated funds raised through this process? 2. How many businesses are going to be put out of business? To what extent is current business and development in South Bucks going to be damaged by three charges? 3. What is the money going to be spent of specifically? There is a complete lack of detail on projects. 4. I trust finally LED lighting will be included. A no-brainer. But that has been true for many years already.

Summary of Representation

Representation appears to suggest CIL will be a burden on businesses and also seeks to understand what the CIL funds will be used for. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils consider that the right balance is made between securing funds for infrastructure and achieving viable development. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Agent	Mr Neil Richardson (1224506)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxxx xxxxx xxxxxx
Consultee	Neil Richardson (1225416)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Neil Richardson (1225416)
Comment ID	65
Response Date	23/08/19 16:23
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Please elaborate on para 3 of above draft CIL about government and agency funding streams and final sentence of this para. Further please elaborate on para 10 of above draft IDP.

Summary of Representation

Representation poses questions on the consultation document. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils have responded to the representer who has not made a comment on the DCS. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Agent	David Murray-Cox (1224884)
Address	xx xx xx
Consultee	Taylor Wimpey UK LTD (1222566)
Address	xxx xxx xxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Taylor Wimpey UK LTD (1222566)
Comment ID	66
Response Date	23/08/19 16:41
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8

Are your comments for: . Chiltern District Council

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

This representation sets out TW's detailed comments upon the LPCVA, which primarily informs and underpins the housing policy requirements set out in the LPPSD whilst also examining the propensity to introduce a CIL charging regime (and hence informs the CIL DCS published for consultation). Requests for clarification and modifications to the LPCVA are proposed under a series of thematic headings. Viability in Plan-making The Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')¹ and updated National Planning Practice Guidance for Viability ('PPGV')² in February 2019 and May 2019 respectively. Both the NPPF and PPGV include an up-to-date position on the Government's intended role for viability assessment, the methodology, and procedures expected of all stakeholders in the preparation of such evidence. Paragraph 010 of PPGV concisely defines the Government's objective for the role to be played by viability within the planning system: "In plan making and decision making viability helps to strike a balance between the aspirations of developers and landowners, in terms of returns against risk, and the aims of the planning system to secure maximum benefits in the public interest through the granting of planning permission." PPGV is clear that the role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Paragraph 002 confirms that the process must be inclusive and undertaken over several stages: "It is the responsibility of plan makers in collaboration with the local community, developers and other stakeholders, to create realistic, deliverable

policies. Drafting of plan policies should be iterative and informed by engagement with developers, landowners, and infrastructure and affordable housing providers.” Policies introduced to the plan should be realistic and deliverable. Specifically: “Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that takes account of affordable housing and infrastructure needs and allows for the planned types of sites and development to be deliverable, without the need for further viability assessment at the decision making stage.” Paragraph 020 of PPGV confirms that the inputs and findings of any viability assessment should be set out in a way that aids clear interpretation and interrogation by decision makers. It is TW’s view that a number of the residential appraisal input assumptions adopted within the LPCVA are incorrect, inadequately evidenced or inappropriate. The impact of this is that the results of the LPCVA overstate the financial viability of development site typologies assessed and hence overstate the ability of development to meet the draft policies within the LPPSD as well as the residential CIL rate proposed within the CIL DCS of £150/m² (GIA) for sites up to 300 dwellings (or less than 10ha). The LPCVA comments on its findings within the Executive Summary, with para. 5 stating that: As a result, TW regards the LPPSD as failing to comply with the requirements of the NPPF, which at paragraph 31 states: “...all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence. This should be adequate and appropriate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals.” In summary, TW considers that the housing policies of the LPPSD (Policies DM LP1 to DM LP4) have not been effectively assessed in accordance with the NPPF and the PPGV. Neither the draft LPPSD policies nor the CIL DCS can therefore be considered justified or sound. This poses a risk to the deliverability of the LPPSD. TW requests that the detailed matters raised within this representation, in respect of the LPCVA, are addressed by DSP in their role as independent advisors to the Councils. Updated evidence, in the form of an LPCVA addendum or update, should be published for formal stakeholder review and comment in advance of the Examination of the LPPSD and CIL DCS. Critical to the success of producing this LPCVA addendum will be a further, meaningful process of industry engagement. Specifically, in accordance with PPGV, it is TW’s request that DSP, acting on behalf of the Council, engage with landowners, promoters and developers to rectify stated concerns by effectively establishing and seeking to agree appropriate inputs into the LPCVA. The technical matters of representation are set out under the following subheadings with reference made to the headings and paragraph numbering within the LPCVA for ease of cross-reference. TW does not consider that the net:gross efficiency ratios of 87% and 77% (i.e. the net developable area being equal to 87% and 77% respectively of the gross site area) on site typologies of 30 units (mixed) and 100 units (mixed) to be sufficient to accommodate the requirements of: Policy DM DP12 – New Street Networks. New development is expected to create routes that connect existing and new communities, provide movement across and through the development area and provide opportunities for future street connections. Policy DM DP14: Accessible neighbourhoods; new development should provide access to facilities, services and public transport within a short distance of people’s homes and; Policy DM DP15: Blue and Green Infrastructure: Residential sites of 20 homes or more of 0.5ha or more, new useable public open space of 10% of the gross area covered by residential development is required within the LPPSD. The net:gross efficiency should be decreased to 75% as a maximum, which will necessitate a larger gross site area to be reflected in viability testing. We also considers that the testing of flatted unit typologies at an 100% net:gross efficiency ratio to be unrealistic for the same reasons as above, and also in respect of the Council’s standards for car parking provision and servicing. We request confirmation as to how DSP has treated the requirement for car parking and servicing in flatted development within the LPCVA, as it does not appear that any allowance has been made for incorporation of undercroft provision within the costs applied or physical space externally. This matter requires clarification and is expected to necessitate a reduction in the net:gross efficiency, which will necessitate a larger gross site area to be reflected in viability testing. PPGV elaborates on the NPPF by confirming the importance of transparency for improving data availability and accountability: “Any viability assessment should follow the government’s recommended approach to assessing viability as set out in this National Planning Guidance and be proportionate, simple, transparent and publicly available. Improving transparency of data associated with viability assessment will, over time, improve the data available for future assessment as well as provide more accountability regarding how viability informs decision making.”³ The LPCVA is inconsistent with both the NPPF and PPGV in this respect for it provides no details of the development programme applied for each site typology – other than stating the build period. There is no further information provided with respect to the appraisal cashflow (i.e. timing of pre-construction and sales) within the appraisal typologies. Whilst typology appraisal summary sheets are provided within appendices (e.g. Appendix IIb), this does not provide stakeholders with the ability to review and comment upon the cashflow inputs and timing assumptions. The information

required for disclosure for each site typology includes: • Pre-development periods • Enabling and servicing infrastructure timing • Construction (months) prior to first sale • Confirmation of total unit sales per annum per outlet and volume out outlets assumed • Affordable unit disposal programme • Timing of CIL costs • Timing of payment of other S106 planning obligations Given that the assumptions made by DSP will directly influence the accruing of development finance (interest) within each of the site typology appraisals, and will therefore have a direct impact on the financial viability of all site typologies tested, it is essential that this evidence is presented transparently for stakeholder review and comment. It is not possible for industry stakeholders to ascertain the robustness of the methodology applied without full disclosure.

Market Housing (Sale) Revenues 2.27 A framework for sales values was established within the LPCVA in an attempt to reflect the variation in property values across the main settlements in the Chiltern and South Bucks districts. 2.28 Paragraph 2.4.5 of the LPCVA confirms that for the residential scheme types modelled the sales values are informed by research undertaken by DSP. It states that data has been researched from a range of readily available sources, such as Land Registry, Zoopla, Rightmove, various house builder and estate agent websites; and associated follow-up enquiries as relevant. The data is provided at 'Appendix III: Market Values & Assumptions Research'. The data comprises new-build sold prices, re-sale sold prices and available new-build properties. The sold price data includes: address; post code; transaction date; sale price; property type; freehold/ leasehold tenure; EPC floor area; and supplementary calculations on value (price per £/m²) - which are also updated in line with UK HPI. The sold price data is summarised by corresponding settlement area for each district (Chiltern and South Bucks) and their average price (£/m² and £/ft²). The available new-build property data includes similar address and price information, and provides a link to each entry, but also determines number of bedrooms (within the 'description' field) for each property. The data is summarised in a similar manner to the sold price data, though it does not utilise the number of bedrooms captured to disaggregate the results to a greater degree (for more detailed and precise analysis). Paragraph 3.17 of Appendix III provides a 'collective assumption overview' of residential 'Value Levels'. This constitutes an unhelpfully brief overview of the research data and an introduction to DSP's assumed Value Levels (from VL1 to VL16), which are set for both the Chiltern and South Bucks districts and are applied to testing. The Value Levels ('VL') are suggested to be representative of the extensive research into housing values. It remains unclear how it has been analysed and considered satisfactory to transpose the average values (£/m²) derived from market research directly to the Nationally Described Space Standards ('NDSS') unit sizes (GIAs) for testing purposes. Without a more detailed summary of all data, disaggregating properties by their number of beds and average area (m²), we are unable to accurately check that the value levels, ascertained from the market research, are being applied appropriately and proportionately to these NDSS unit sizes, as such this remains an area of substantive concern. Turley has undertaken a brief review of available new-build properties and sold price data for new-build properties transacted over the past year in Chalfont St Peter and Holmer Green, to determine the size of properties being delivered/ coming forward locally to these markets (given their relevance to TW's interests). The results for the available new-build properties generally comprised a number of small developments containing large detached properties (with samples ranging around 139-197m²). However, the sold price data included several records from a large housing development – "comprising 187 dwellings"⁴ - within Chalfont St Peter, being delivered by national housebuilder Charles Church. The sold price data for this development contained 2 and 3-bed terraced properties that were 65m² and 85m² (in size) respectively. The details are summarised below: Turley and TW are aware that other data from this development is included within the data DSP collected in the LPCVA. This data, other than suggesting that volume housebuilders continue to deliver sizes below that of NDSS, highlights the reason for concern as to the approach of the LPCVA in arbitrarily applying values derived from market research to the larger NDSS unit sizes. There is a risk that creates a distortion upwards of expected gross development value. It is requested that DSP clarify the methodology applied to 'transpose' comparable evidence of transactions and marketed prices, to the NDSS unit sizes applied within the LPCVA. The Government published a technical consultation paper, "Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England", on 15 October 2018. This consultation ran to 26 November 2018; the paper included reference to potential legislation in 2019, "which would be unlikely to complete its passage until mid-2020 at the earliest." On this basis, it is clear that the Government fully intends to remove ground rents as a revenue stream from residential development as soon as is practicably possible. It is unrealistic for the LPCVA to continue to assume ground rent revenue will be generated by new-build flatted development, and this revenue should be removed from the assessment, with appraisals re-run excluding any such income.

Affordable Housing Revenue 2.43 The LPCVA presents the technical inputs to appraisals within Appendix I - Viability Assessment Update - Residential Assumptions (1), and whilst it provides capital values for affordable

rent units, it does not provide: • the methodology (calculation inputs) for arriving at the capital values utilised; • the capital values for sale of affordable home ownership (assumed shared ownership units); or • confirmation that the capital values have been market tested with Registered Providers (RPs) to demonstrate that they are representative of local market reality. This information must be provided such that stakeholders can effectively review this. Conveyancing and Agency Fees – Affordable Housing

2.45 It does not appear that the LPCVA makes any allowance for the disposal costs by a developer in transferring affordable dwellings to an RP. The developer will incur legal fees and, frequently, agency fees in undertaking disposal of on-site affordable dwellings. Such costs have been agreed with the District Valuer Service (DVS) as reasonable and representative of market reality on numerous sites across the south east in reviewing site specific viability assessments. To reflect commercial reality, it is advocated that a minimum sum equal to 1.5% of the GDV of affordable dwellings should be applied within the LPCVA to account for such costs. Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3)

2.46 Allowances for Access to and use of Buildings, Part M4(2) and M4(3) have been incorporated into the viability testing within LPCVA in alignment with LPPSD Policy DM LP6 (Homes – Accessibility and Adaptability), at a rate informed by the EC Harris DCLG Housing Standards Review Cost Impact, which was published in September 2014. Whilst this represents a rational starting point to inform costs, TW have two primary concerns with the robustness of this approach firstly, it remains unclear how the average extra over costs have been calculated from the source data as it is challenging to directly align the figures adopted with the research publication; and • the underlying evidence base is now almost five years old. If utilising this evidence, the historic published costs should be updated to present day (to reflect inflationary effects) by use of the RICS BCIS all-in Tender Price Index. The indexed present-day costs should then be reapplied within revised viability testing. Garages

2.48 It is requested that DSP clarify their stance with respect to the inclusion of garages within the LPCVA. There is currently no reference to garages, and it is assumed they are excluded. This is a significant oversight. It is necessary for developers to provide garages with certain unit types (usually 3+ bedrooms) and sizes in order for schemes to be marketable and achieve pricing (and/or sales rates) in line with market expectations. Garages will result in an additional cost on development in both the: • construction of dwellings; and • calculation of CIL liability arising from a proposed development. To ignore provision of garages within a robust Local Plan and CIL viability assessment process is therefore unacceptable. This is of particular relevance given that the LPPSD sets out requirements from new developments for garage space and parking spaces in Parking Standards DM CP3 and Appendix CP3. This is set out within Table 2.2. Having reviewed recently permitted and developed sites across the borough, in addition to development in nearby neighbouring local authority areas, it is evident that schemes most frequently incorporate either attached single or detached single garages (normally 18m² in Turley's experience) for 3-bed and 4-bed units. Occasionally schemes include single detached garages and some developers incorporate a proportion of 4-bed units with single integral garages (also normally 18m²) or double garages with 5-bed units (normally 36m²). In summary, it appears rare for development sites not to include single garage provision for 3-bed units, and all 4-bed units surveyed incorporate single garages. Further evidence relating to specific sites can be provided upon request should this be of assistance to DSP. Based on cost data provided to Turley by national housebuilders for various garage types, and reflecting the typologies prevalent upon development sites within the borough, it is recommended that an average cost of £7,500 per unit is added to the construction cost for 3-bed and 4-bed unit types to reflect provision of a single garage. An average cost of £15,000 per unit should be added to 5-bed unit types to reflect provision of a double garage. The unit size data, when taken either from developer's marketing materials or from EPC records, will explicitly exclude garage provision (whether internal or external to the built unit). An area allowance for garages should therefore also be made by DSP in the calculation of CIL liability generated by each of the site typologies tested, in accordance with Turley's analysis above.

2.58 The LPCVA includes an allowance for site servicing costs at £33,000 per dwelling. Whilst the inclusion of such an allowance is rational and endorsed by TW as necessary, it is unclear as to how the figure used has been arrived at. TW is aware of servicing costs increasing substantially beyond this notional allowance – with this being particularly relevant to the 100 unit typology, and moreover, larger sites not included in the typology list, but appearing in the strategic site development appraisals, which normally require highways and access infrastructure works, utilities reinforcement and site-wide drainage infrastructure (e.g. SUDS). Such works will fall outside any on-plot unit build or external works provisions. It would be beneficial for DSP to clarify their benchmarking process that led to the conclusion that £33,000 per unit was a suitable figure to meet such costs for testing within the relevant typologies.

2.61 The LPCVA has not allowed for abnormal costs within viability testing of residential site typologies. Paragraph 2.6.3 states the following: "...In particular in relation to the strategic site allocations, the Council acknowledge there is

the potential for the development of some sites identified by the Councils to need to overcome abnormal issues and support added costs when further master planning is undertaken and that viability may need to be reviewed further as more becomes known about those sites.” For generic typology testing, the exclusion of an abnormal cost allowance can be regarded as appropriate. However, if doing so it is essential that: (a) The viability testing (and application of policy costs thereafter) includes a sufficient buffer back from the margins (i.e. maximum limits) of viability. This will ensure that viability testing results and conclusions/recommendations are not presented at levels that risk rendering development sites unviable when subject to the introduction of abnormal works costs, which are generally found to apply to both brownfield and greenfield development sites. (b) The BLVs are increased to represent the serviced land values (i.e. assuming that abnormal costs have already been met through works undertaken by the landowner prior to disposal for development). Such costs cannot be accommodated by the landowner if adopting BLVs that reflect a “raw material view” operating on a ‘EUV plus’ basis as doing so would risk reducing land values to remove a suitable incentive for disposal. The exclusion of abnormal costs from the viability appraisals will markedly overstate the appraisal results – given that abnormal works can be costly and will frequently be incurred early in a sites development (hence having a more pronounced cashflow impact). If the LPCVA is to exclude abnormal costs, then suitable flexibility must be introduced within the wording of policies within the LPPSD to provide recourse to site-specific viability assessment at the application stage such that where sites are impacted by abnormal costs, this constitutes a valid justification for reductions in the level of affordable housing (or tenures/unit mix) in order for schemes to be delivered on a viable basis.

Healthy Equipped Play Areas 2.67 Policy DM HP3 – Healthy equipped play areas requires both the provision of these play areas and a financial contribution to secure their management in perpetuity. No reference is made in the LPCVA as to whether this cost is incorporated.

Electric Vehicle Charging Points 2.68 In the LPPSD at 9.10.7 it clearly states the Council will require electric vehicle charging points to be provided on all new major developments. Recent published Government research has placed this cost at an average of £976 per charging point⁵. It is not clear in the LPCVA whether this cost is accounted for. If it is not incorporated, it should be and appraisals re-run.

Professional Fees 2.69 Paragraph 2.9.1 of the LPCVA sets out that professional fees are applied within the viability appraisals at 8%-10% of build cost. This cost should be applied to construction costs and external/site works costs, and for the purposes of viability assessment at the Plan-making stage, should be set at 10% in order to ensure suitable allowance is made to cover the spectrum of professional services both pre and post grant of planning permission, plus the cost of promotion (for strategic sites) and planning application fees.

Section 106 (S106) Planning Obligations 2.70 Paragraph 2.12.5 of the LPCVA confirms that the site typology viability appraisals (for generic sites) incorporate a notional sum of £3,000 per unit towards S106 planning obligations alongside CIL liability. The LPCVA states that DSP considers this an “additional contingency... acting alongside the CIL payments in terms of the collective developments costs to be considered.” DSP consider this to be sufficient allowance for any matters that may fall outside the scope of the current or a reviewed CIL – we assume the Regulation 123 list had not been reviewed in detail by the Councils, as it is not mentioned in the LPPSD and would further assume this may be due to anticipation of further work on the LPPSD and further consultation on CIL. The LPCVA also confirms that the Councils have made DSP aware of additional policy cost areas that have not been reflected in explicit cost assumptions within the appraisals, including contributions towards the provision of Community Officers and Skills and Employment Plans. The notional sum of £3,000 per dwellings towards planning obligations (S106) is considered inappropriate in isolation and without substantiation. Evidence from previous approved developments should be provided by the Councils to confirm that £3,000/unit represents an appropriate and evidenced level of S106 contribution for inclusion in viability testing. DSP have included an estimate of obligations which will fall due in the appraisals for the strategic sites, however, given the timescale for strategic sites to be developed, the impact of costs could far outstrip those currently included. Whilst DSP acknowledge this fact, it is not mentioned in the LPPSD. PPG is clear that development costs, including “any policies on planning obligations in the relevant Plan, such as policies on affordable housing and identified site specific requirements for strategic sites”, should be taken into account when setting CIL rates – particularly those on strategic sites or brownfield land.

6 Developer Overhead and Profit 2.76 A developer profit of 17.5% of gross development value (GDV) on open market housing is adopted within all the strategic site appraisals of LPCVA. An affordable housing developer profit of 6% of GDV is also applied. However, in the LPCVA it would appear there is a profit range suggested of between 15% - 20%. It is unclear as to how the profit level of 17.5% has been considered and arrived at as being appropriate in respect of the strategic sites, which have more significant capital infrastructure and S106 cost burdens and therefore inherently carry a greater risk to the developer. A market housing developer return equating to 20% of gross

development value is regarded as essential to reflect the requirements of regional and national housebuilders across all site typologies – and without question in respect of the strategic site allocations. A 6% return on affordable housing GDV is widely accepted for local plan viability assessment purposes, albeit housebuilders will not differentiate in this manner in reality. It is wholly inappropriate to apply an arbitrary mid-point profit level. Any ‘buffer’ for additional perceived risk should be addressed within both the allowed development costs (i.e. via increased servicing costs and the incorporation of abnormal allowances) and the scaling back of the cumulative policy costs on development to ensure such costs do not push scheme typologies to the margins of viability. Benchmark Land Values (BLVs) 2.80 PPGV states explicitly that BLVs should, “...be informed by market evidence including current uses, costs and values wherever possible”. PPGV subsequently requires plan makers to: “...establish a reasonable premium to the landowner for the purpose of assessing the viability of their plan. This will be an iterative process informed by professional judgement and must be based upon the best available evidence informed by cross sector collaboration. For any viability assessment data sources to inform the establishment the landowner premium should include market evidence...”⁸ Crucially, PPGV confirms that the BLVs set must reflect the “...reasonable expectations of local landowners”⁹. There is no evidence within the LPCVA of local market analysis to inform the BLVs applied within viability testing. On the above basis, the LPCVA is flawed and fails to provide a sound evidence base for justifying the relevant draft policies within the LPPSD. The LPCVA applies only two greenfield BLVs – at £100,000/ha (gross) and £250,000/ha (gross). In TW’s experience there is no evidence of greenfield land with development potential either within or neighbouring settlements transacting for £100,000/ha. It is an unrealistic benchmark to apply and is un-evidenced. This value is more akin to the EUV of paddock land without development prospects. Unless DSP can provide evidence that such land is being transacted locally for development, at this price, it should be removed from the LPCVA. The ‘upper’ greenfield BLV of £250,000/ha (gross) is reflective of absolute minimum strategic greenfield release values (reflecting the cost of major servicing and/or abnormal works) on the largest development sites. It is completely misrepresentative of landowner’s expectations for greenfield sites of a scale tested within the strategic site typologies in the LPCVA. Greenfield land owners will have reasonable expectations in respect of the value of their land within the development market and, if it is deemed appropriate for their land to be released for residential development, they will see no reason why they would achieve a lower price than would be achieved for a similar parcel of previously developed land (PDL). Unless DSP produce local evidence of transaction prices (re-weighted as necessary) in accordance with PPGV, then TW is of the strong opinion that BLVs for greenfield development sites must be increased to reflect the ‘Greenfield Enhancement (upper)’ rate of £500,000 per gross ha utilised within the LPCVA in order to avoid landowners from being dis-incentivised to dispose of land for development. The LPCVA appears to place considerable reliance upon MHCLG’s publication ‘Land value Estimates for Policy Appraisal: May 2017 Values’¹⁰. The ‘Guidelines for use’ section states the following: “The land values presented here have been provided specifically for the purpose of policy appraisal and are based on the assumptions set out in this document. It is strongly recommended that they are not used for any other purpose...” This is elaborated upon within the section titled ‘Residential land values’, which states: “The purpose of these values is to use in appraising land projects from a social perspective, in line with Green Book principles”. The evaluation of land projects for social purposes, in accordance with the Green Book, is a different purpose to that of preparing evidence of development viability across a local authority area in order to inform (and test) the soundness of policies within an emerging Local Plan. None of the underpinning assessment evidence, which demonstrates the calculations for arriving at the benchmarks, has been published by MHCLG. This means it does not form appropriate, available evidence that can be scrutinised by stakeholders. Nor has the LPCVA provided any confirmation that the BLVs have been sense checked against and hence informed by market evidence (including current uses, costs and values where possible) as is required by PPGV¹¹. Turley and TW are yet to see a Local Plan utilise this information to inform Local Plan policy and be found sound. In fact, neither party has seen the MHCLG evidence utilised for this purpose before – primarily due to its high level nature and questionable robustness for application at a local scale. It is TW’s request that DSP, acting on behalf of the Councils, engage with landowners, promoters and developers to rectify the concerns raised by effectively establishing and seeking to agree appropriately evidenced BLVs, which will be sufficient to incentivise local market delivery, prior to the Examination of the LPPSD. PPGV is clear on the importance of this process in ensuring the evidence base is robust. It states: “In order to establish benchmark land value, plan makers, landowners, developers, infrastructure and affordable housing providers should engage and provide evidence to inform this iterative and collaborative process.” PPG requires that, “charging schedules should be consistent with, and support the implementation of, up-to-date relevant Plans”. PPG on CIL confirms that CIL evidence

should be prepared in accordance with PPG on viability. The latter requires that viability assessment at the plan making stage should ensure policies are realistic and the total cumulative cost will not undermine deliverability of the plan. Moreover, policy requirements should be clear for the industry so that they can be accurately accounted for in the price paid for land¹⁶. Turley has been engaged in the Brighton & Hove CIL Examination where DSP has also acted for Brighton & Hove City Council (B&HCC). During the Examination Hearing, held in spring 2019, the Examiner was clear that the CIL viability evidence must be conducted on a 'policy on' basis – thereby CIL liability should only be applied (via appropriate rates) where site typologies (and most importantly strategic site allocations) are demonstrated to be viable and have sufficient 'headroom' to accommodate a CIL charge after meeting all the relevant policies in the Local Plan. The Examiner expressed particular concern that DSP's methodology for B&HCC (which is closely consistent to that applied for the Council's), failed to make a clear and robust allowance for an appropriate viability buffer to ensure that the rate of CIL avoided placing development at the margins of viability. The Examiner also expressed concern that DSP's methodology failed to conduct a local market sense-check of the BLVs applied to development, which would accord with the requirements of PPG. TW is concerned that the same issues are evident in respect of the LPCVA, and the recommendation for residential CIL rates applied within the published CIL DCS. Specifically, in respect of: the BLV's applied to residential development – and strategic site allocations in particular, which are extremely low and have not been benchmarked against any local market evidence, and therefore risk overstating the propensity of such sites to accommodate both the LPPSD policies and proposed CIL liability; • the proposed setting of the residential CIL rate of £150/m² to the SP BP3 Holmer Green strategic site allocation, despite the results of the LPCVA clearly demonstrating that it cannot accommodate a CIL charge when applying the appropriate 'policy on' methodology; and • the absence of any reference to an appropriate buffer being set in respect of the recommended CIL rates within the CIL DCS, which becomes more pertinent when recognising the factors cited in this representation that cumulatively point to the LPCVA overstating the financial viability of residential development typologies assessed. CIL rates should not be set on the basis that they necessitate a site-specific financial viability case to be made to demonstrate divergence from adopted policy within the relevant plan¹⁷. There is a high risk that this will be a necessity if the current proposed CIL rates set out within the CIL DCS are adopted. Next Steps TW requests that the matters raised within this representation, in respect of the LPCVA, are addressed by DSP in their role as independent advisors to the Councils. Updated evidence, in the form of an LPCVA addendum or update, should be published for formal stakeholder review and comment in advance of the Examination of the LPPSD and submission of the CIL DCS to PINS for Examination. Critical to the success of producing this LPCVA addendum will be a further, meaningful process of industry engagement. Specifically, in accordance with PPGV, it is TW's request that DSP, acting on behalf of the Councils, engage with landowners, promoters and developers to rectify stated concerns by effectively establishing and seeking to agree appropriate inputs into the LPCVA in order that the CIL DCS rates can be formulated on an evidenced and justified basis.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

This representation makes many comments on the Local Plan and the DCS in relation to assumptions and potential omissions in the Dixon Searle Partnerships viability assessments and requests additional stakeholder engagement. Account Taken by the Councils: The councils have reviewed these comments and consider that the evidence on viability is appropriate and proportionate for the purposes of informing their proposed approach to CIL. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Agent	Sarah Wilks (1225769)
Address	xx xx xx
Consultee	Transport For London (1225770)
Address	xxxx xxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Transport For London (1225770)
Comment ID	67
Response Date	21/08/19 17:01
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.4

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of submission to the examiner Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations Yes

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by the District Council Yes

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the Chiltern and South Bucks CIL draft charging schedule. I am responding on behalf of Transport for London (TfL) as a strategic transport infrastructure and service provider. The comments here are based upon the proposed charging schedules and the supporting documents, including the Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment (June 2019), Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (June 2019) and Funding Gap Analysis Report (June 2019). Separate responses have been sent in relation to the Local Plan consultation and associated draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan. TfL has an interest in public/sustainable transport proposals particularly those affecting rail stations where TfL provides services on the Metropolitan line and, in future, the Elizabeth line. We have no specific comments to make on the draft charging schedule at this time, other than to say that the amended CIL Regulations take effect on 1 September this year and you may wish to update the charging schedule and supporting information to reflect the forthcoming changes. In addition, we consider that public/sustainable transport links are vital in supporting 'good growth' and that CIL will continue to play an important role in funding infrastructure to support new development. We believe that there would be value in identifying a small number of public/sustainable transport schemes that could be funded or part funded through CIL receipts and exploring the potential for joint working and/or funding in some cases in order to bring forward certain schemes.

Summary of Representation

The representer does not make comment on the DCS but does suggest that the receipts could fund a number of public transport schemes and is willing to work with the Councils on this matter. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils are grateful for the proposed engagement with TfL. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	Mr Alan Gladwin (1211717)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Address	xxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Mr Alan Gladwin (1211717)
Comment ID	68
Response Date	07/06/19 11:01
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5

Are your comments for: Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

3.9.1 big changes in infrastructure do not pay the charge? when they will obviously make biggest local changes 4,5,3 adding a big or number of houses to a small area, changing the area a lot, the payment for the area is capped? the design of this plan is for Big changes to small areas to be the least expensive planning option. I appreciate the big developments pay the planning office the most and are green stamped through, the purpose of the office is to try and raise funds for the council while doing nothing because, as a department it has no powers, regularly overridden even if it tries to prevent un-wanted development. (school in Stoke Poges for example) 7 years for shops to be approved then built with no disabled access, as "Planning office is not used to looking at big projects" I am contemplating putting in plans, my neighbour recently extended, do I draw my plans showing his approved plans, or do I include his new porch, the roof lights, the side facing windows and the land grab of adjacent field, not shown on his plans but now built?

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Comments made in regards general planning matters and in regards to the zero rating on large sites. Account Taken by the Councils: Perhaps has not understood that the S106 mechanism will pick up

the infrastructure costs on large sites. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Comment

Consultee	Sharon Jenkins (1213721)
Email Address	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
Company / Organisation	Natural England
Address	unknown unknown unknown
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Natural England (Sharon Jenkins - 1213721)
Comment ID	69
Response Date	11/07/19 11:07
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4

Are your comments for:

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Natural England does not consider that this Community Infrastructure Levy poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation. The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document. If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.

Summary of Representation

Considers that CIL does not pose a risk to the natural environment and makes no further comment. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils are grateful for the comment. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required? No

Comment

Consultee	William Knighton(Chiltern Railways) (1222571)
Email Address	xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
Address	xxxxx, xxxxxx, xxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	William Knighton(Chiltern Railways) (1222571)
Comment ID	70
Response Date	30/07/19 11:09
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5

Are your comments for: . Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

(Referring to BP9): The sort of housing growth set out by these plans will however require capacity interventions on the railway infrastructure in order to meet expected increased demand. Chiltern Railways' current train services can become overcrowded during both the morning and the evening peaks. Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross are two of our busiest stations in the area, and their car parks are frequently at or near full capacity. Expansion of the car parking facilities at these locations is desirable and would benefit from third party funding in order to make such schemes viable. We are therefore disappointed that financial contributions towards improving facilities at Beaconsfield station are not included in the site-specific requirements of development there. While the station is outside the development area identified for Beaconsfield, it is exposed to the likely increased numbers of passengers that will be generated by the development. A shortfall between the station's facilities and the additional demand placed as a result of development on it would be bad for both current and future passengers using the station. For this reason, we welcome the recognition in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (paragraph 99) that some Chiltern Railways stations in the area - particularly Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross - will require investment to keep pace with predicted passenger growth. This includes (but is not limited to) improvements to their car parking facilities. We are very glad to see the inclusion of this item in the Draft infrastructure requirements table, which sets out the key requirements for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In order to support the Councils' aspirations for sustainable transport, it is important that stations remain prioritised recipients of CIL funding. In our view it is better to invest in advance of anticipated growth, instead of lagging behind.

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Supports and would like 'station improvements including car parking to benefit from CIL contributions.
Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils are grateful for the comments and invitation for future collaboration. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No

Comment

Consultee	Gary Heneage (1222837)
Email Address	xxxxxxx
Company / Organisation	Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)
Address	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx
Event Name	Community Infrastructure Levy draft Schedule
Comment by	Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) (Gary Heneage - 1222837)
Comment ID	71
Response Date	26/07/19 11:13
Consultation Point	Community Infrastructure Levy (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.8
Are your comments for:	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both

You will not be able to change your comments once you have clicked *Save and Close*.

Please remember to click the *Review* and *Submit* buttons in order for us to receive your comments.

Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

However, the list of Health Section 106 sites as shown on pages 9 to 17 of the Infrastructure Development Plan Schedule appear to relate to only funding business cases. They include: • Beaconsfield Developer contributions to relate to Practice / CCG Business Case. • Amersham Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£100k) • Little Chalfont Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Chesham (Chess Medical Centre and Lion Street Surgery) – extension and modification of Surgeries - Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£500k) A healthy future together • New healthcare facilities on National Epilepsy Centre (BP SP 7) or contribution so that provision of services can be catered for elsewhere – see below. Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Expansion / modification of existing primary care services in Chalfont St Peter and depending on the scale of development in Chalfont St Peter and Gerrards Cross this may require the expansion of the Calcott Medical Centre or relocation to the Gerrards Cross Memorial Hospital site. Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA). • Additional primary care facilities in the Iver area. Appropriate financial contribution from new development needed. Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case (£TBA) • Provision relating to the site allocation at Holmer Green – appropriate financial contribution from new development needed. Developer contributions to relate to

practice / CCG business case (£TBA) Burnham Health Centre – extension and additional parking spaces (no mention under comments re Developer contributions to relate to practice / CCG business case) as capital funding expected from NHS England. • The Chalfont St Giles Surgery – extension (no mention of anything, just this surgery name) • Threeways Surgery Stoke Poges – modification of existing premises (appropriate financial contribution from new development needed, CCG not requesting funding for whole cost). Funding gap identified as £50k. We would like to recommend that the wording in these sections of the IDP is changed to reflect the discussions held between CCG and District Council Planners on these matters. In some cases e.g. Threeways Surgery and Beaconsfield, the CCG has been fortunate in securing a capital allocation from NHS England to help fund these two projects however that does not mean that public funding should meet these costs if developer contributions are available. Where we are yet to identify the true cost of additional infrastructure to meet demand, we explained to our Planning colleagues that costed information would only be available once the business case had been completed. Can we therefore suggest that within the “funding source” column of the IDP schedule that the following statement is used “level of developer contributions to be established once practice/CCG business case completed”. Section 11.1.6 states that Developer Contributions for certain sites are excluded from CIL (i.e. only recourse to Health infrastructure contributions is via Section 106 Agreements). These sites are: - More than 10 Ha in area - Sites of more than 400 homes - Sites of more than 10,000 m2 in floor area. The document (under Section 11.2 – Site Allocations) goes on to describe the following sites: 1. NE of Chesham – 500 homes 2. Holmer Green – 300 homes 3. Amersham Old Town (London Road West) – 40 homes 4. Amersham Old Town (Whieldon Street) – 50 homes 5. Little Chalfont – 700 homes 6. Chalfont St Peter – NE – 360 homes (40 % care/retirement homes) 7. Chalfont St Peter – SE – 200 homes 8. Beaconsfield – 1600 homes (on page 180 it mentions that financial contributions for primary health care facilities within the local area as agreed with the Clinical Commissioning Group) 9. Land west of Iver Heath – 360 homes A healthy future together 10. Land to the north of Iver Station - mixed use development to include approximately 1,000 homes 11. Land to the east of Ridgeway Business Park, north of Iver railway station - mixed use development to include approximately 90 homes. In our opinion, the problems with the above are: a. The low threshold of CIL not applying (i.e. only for 400 residential units or less) and by default S106 being the method of developer contribution above that threshold, coupled with the current inability to pool more than 5 no. Section 106 contributions means that it will be very difficult for the CCG to pool enough Section 106 contributions together to make a difference to any particular GP surgery in terms of a meaningful extension. b. Even when the cap on pooling Section 106 Contributions is lifted (understood to be September 2019), it will still be problematic to obtain enough developer contributions within a “local” area to satisfy the 3 tests for developer contributions funded by S106 Contributions (be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development) and to fund new Primary Care facilities through these contributions. Please note that BCCG wish to agree with you the adoption of the “West Kent Model” for developer contributions or primary care health infrastructure, which would result in funding of £360 per person in each of the new developments that are described in the Site Allocations. Conservatively (on the assumption of 2.4 persons per home), this would reasonably require £4.415M of contributions, which would mainly be via Section 106 Contributions (as the majority of houses allocated are in sites of more than 400 homes) and the minority via CIL contributions. c. CIL is more flexible and provided the threshold for CIL can be increased to a minimum of say 700 homes, then all bar one of the allocations described above could potentially contribute CIL monies to the Councils who, provided there was a policy in place to do so, could pass on some of that CIL to the CCG for health infrastructure spend (so far I can’t see anything from the Councils on such a policy or draft policy in their documentation). Thus far, we cannot see anything from you in respect of any policy/draft policy that states that a percentage of CIL payments will be directed towards Health infrastructure, but we would want a contribution from Developers from CIL that would equate to the above-mentioned £360 per person for primary health care provision. We would also like to comment on two of the non-residential schemes. 1. Land to the north of Denham Round-about - 16,000m2 of office space, a hotel and ancillary uses; 2. Land adjacent to Taplow Station - 4,000m2 of office space. Office workers will require some primary care provision in the locality even if they live elsewhere and therefore developers should provide a proportionate contribution to health infrastructure. . In the case of the latter scheme, developer contributions currently can only come from Section 106. We would contend that as office workers would utilise local GP surgeries, a Section 106 Agreement should address some health infrastructure nearby. Berinsfield - £1.468 M for “new and expanded premises for a health centre” (1700 homes) Chalgrove Airport - £3 M S106 for “new GP surgery” (3000 homes) Culham Science Centre - £3.024 M S106 for “new GP surgery” (3,500 homes)

Grenoble Road - £2.592 M S106 for "contribution towards GP provision" (3,000 homes) North of Bayswater Brook - £950k S106 for "contribution towards GP provision" (1,100 homes) Northfield, SE Oxford - £1.555 M S106 for "contribution towards GP provision" (1,800 homes) Wheatley Campus - £TBC for expansion/reconfiguration of Morland House Surgery, Wheatley

If you would like to be heard by the examiner, please explain why

No Information Provided

Summary of Representation

Concerned about pooling restrictions where developments are below the 400 unit exception. Concern about meeting the decision making planning tests for S106. Suggests the CIL exception is raised to 700 units - so all but one of the allocations are subject to CIL. Account Taken by the Councils: The Councils did consider such an exemption but determined to not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as all development has an impact. The Councils do not propose to make any modifications to the charging schedules as a result of this representation.

Modification required?

No