

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Borough of Poole implemented CIL on 2nd January 2013, being one of the first local authorities in the country to do so. With the Council now approaching three years of having the existing rates in operation viability work was commissioned to assess the current market conditions and propose new CIL rates. Through a six week public consultation from 16th February to 31st March 2015 representations on whether these rates are deliverable and will not unduly burden landowners and developers from bringing sites forward were received and these have now been summarised and responded to by Planning Officers.

As part of the consultation 1,712 consultees from the planning consultation database were contacted as well as 1,967 recipients of the Planning and Regeneration govdelivery e-bulletin. Over 30 responses were received from residents, community groups and representatives from the development industry. Two key questions were asked within the consultation document published online, these being:

- Question 1 - Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?
- Question 2 - Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?

Representations were also received that did not specifically address these questions and these have been recorded within 'General Comments'. The representations received from the Marine Management Organisation and Dorset County Council provided a statement of 'No Comment' to the questions posed through the consultation document.

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
Highways Agency			<p>Supports the strategic use of CIL and site specific use of S106.</p> <p>Due to pressure on A31, S278 agreements will be needed for highway infrastructure in Poole. These are a financial burden and need to be factored in to the viability work</p> <p>Sustainable and public transport improvements not on Reg123 List. Under CIL Regs contributions may only be pooled from up to 5 separate planning obligations for a specific item of infrastructure. How will area wide measures e.g. to improve sustainable and public transport connectivity, be delivered through S106 with a CIL levy in place?</p>	<p>The pooling of S106 contributions and how this can be managed is currently an issue being considered by Council Officers.</p> <p>The CIL rates have been set for less than 50% of the headroom of any development allowing additional costs through S106 to be factored in on a site by site basis as there is no one size fits all cost that can be applied to the viability work.</p>
BoP Councillors Ann Stribley & Peter Pawlowski	<p>The huge variation to current CIL rates gives little confidence to the process.</p> <p>Sea view and non-sea view developments must be treated differently especially in Sandbanks.</p> <p>Recently small scale developers have delivered much of the housing. Has the impact of these rates on them been considered?</p>	<p>In rates comparison table Zone A developments would not have been built under the proposed rates.</p> <p>Proposed charge in Sandbanks is staggering – how could this have changed so much in 2 years?</p> <p>Such a change adds doubts to the proposed rates for the rest of the town.</p> <p>Why is Broadstone/Merley recommended as a £180/200 CIL area despite including the two most “affluent” wards in the town?</p> <p>Rates in some areas will stop development and jobs will be lost in the building sector.</p> <p>Self-build schemes and other exemptions</p>	<p>CIL was supposed to make the developer contribution process simpler but will likely have the opposite effect.</p> <p>CIL makes no link between infrastructure need and the contributions made; it is simply a tax on profit e.g. little infrastructure need in Sandbanks but most CIL funds are generated here.</p> <p>Developer contributions are usually calculated down, not exemplifying a development industry that is awash with profits.</p>	<p>BoP implemented CIL in January 2013 based on a Viability Report (produced by BNP Paribas) dated July 2011 using data and assumptions pre-2011. This was a time when the affects of an economic down turn were heavily felt by the development industry with the 2011 report stating in paragraph 2.9; “This is a difficult context within which the Council is testing the ability of sites to generate funding for infrastructure through CIL”. Half a decade on and the development industry is showing strong signs of recovery which has contributed to the difference in CIL rates. The Council could have set higher rates for Sandbanks in the current CIL rates, but erred on the side of caution and merged it into Branksome, which had a lower rate. However development in Sandbanks is buoyant despite the recession and the viability work shows that there is significant headroom that would warrant a charge.</p> <p>The difference between sea view and non-sea view</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
		<p>will see developers finding ways around paying massive rates.</p>		<p>developments will be explored further by the consultants prior to publication of a DCS.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.18 of the Viability Study highlights that small and medium sized developers have been taken into consideration when making build cost assumptions.</p> <p>The rates comparison table is simply a means of comparing potential revenue from the proposed rates to the existing rates. It is not assuming that those developments that came forward in a different economic climate would have done so if the proposed rates were in place at that time.</p> <p>With the Former Power Station Site (£0), Brownfield Strategic Sites (£30), Town Centre (£60) and newly defined Rest of Borough (£20) proposing significantly reduced rates it is unlikely that jobs will be lost in the building industry as these sites will provide the majority of the housing need.</p> <p>It is recognised that various exemptions will see developments not paying CIL but this would be irrespective of what level that rates are set at.</p> <p>With regards to CIL making the developer contribution process simpler and the links to infrastructure need these are issues concerning the principles of CIL at a government policy level.</p>
<p>Poole Quays Forum, Vision for Poole Group & Southern Poole Chairmen's Liaison Group</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The Viability Study has not been made available for review so can not agree if have not read it. The PDCS does not adhere to policies within the stated documents in para 1.8 of consultation document.</p>	<p>No - strongly object.</p> <p>Appreciates the challenges of delivery in the Regeneration Area but does not support the significant reductions in CIL rates.</p> <p>Referring to para 4.3 of the Poole Bridge Regeneration Initiative Planning Obligations Volume 3 SPG (December 2004) not aware of any new challenges facing delivery that have not been known for a significant period. Why is BoP stance changing, especially in light of the continued economic recovery?</p> <p>How can the Twin Sails Bridge Core Scheme be paid for with such low CIL rates proposed?</p> <p>Unreasonable and unacceptable for</p>	<p>Affordable housing contributions:</p> <p>The Regeneration Area provides a once in a generation opportunity to deliver much needed affordable housing in a truly sustainable location. A Town Centre location is much more sustainable than edge of town, where the charging schedule is currently proposing a 40% contribution, as it is close to jobs, services and infrastructure and does not rely on vehicular travel.</p> <p>The Regeneration Area could provide key worker and shared ownership schemes which would not have such an impact on viability as social rented housing.</p> <p>A higher benchmark should be set as a benchmark of 20% within the Town Centre will result in the under-delivery of</p>	<p>The Viability Study was available online, and continues to be, for the duration of the consultation period. The stated planning policy documents were taken into consideration when setting the proposed rates.</p> <p>The Poole Bridge Regeneration Initiative Planning Obligations Volume 3 SPG was published in December 2004. Since then the economic climate has gone through a dramatic change and while some areas are progressing with regards to development there are other areas where development is not viable at the current rates.</p> <p>The Twin Sails Core Scheme forms part of the Reg123 List which CIL funds from across the Borough contribute to, not just the Regeneration Area sites.</p> <p>While the Former Power Station Site will not be contributing directly to the Twin Sails Bridge Core Scheme it will provide its own onsite infrastructure</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
		<p>development on the Former Power Station Site not to contribute to the ongoing cost of the Twin Sails Bridge Core Scheme.</p> <p>PCS11 states that Regeneration Area development will only be permitted if it delivers a second lifting bridge and supporting road infrastructure. Why are these sites going to pay a much smaller contribution to the cost of this vital infrastructure?</p> <p>The Regeneration Area will significantly increase the number of children in Hamworthy/Town Centre but with the zero rate or extremely low rate of CIL how will educational infrastructure be met?</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates for the power station site and strategic brownfield sites should be amended to the £60 per sqm rate proposed for the wider Town Centre. This would still provide a significant reduction in CIL but would ensure the sites contribute sufficiently to key infrastructure within the area.</p>	<p>affordable housing within the most sustainable location as developers will negotiate down from this already low figure.</p> <p>This low expectation is a failure to achieve one of the overarching objectives of the Town Centre regeneration; the provision of affordable homes for the people of Poole.</p> <p>In light of the national housing crisis, rising house prices and serious issues regarding the affordability of housing in Poole and the UK as a whole, it is totally unsustainable for any part of the town to be exempt from contributing to the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates do not conform to the Council's existing adopted planning policies or the NPPF and established principles of sustainable development.</p>	<p>needs and contributions towards site specific S106 agreements. If a CIL rate were to continue to be imposed it is highly unlikely no development would come forward on the site. The same can be said for the other Regeneration Area sites which would not be able to be delivered if the rates remain as existing, or were set at the same proposed level as the Town Centre.</p> <p>School places form part of the Reg123 List which are eligible to benefit from CIL funding. Meetings are ongoing with Children, Young People & Learning at the BoP to ensure the delivery of the Regeneration Area sites are factored into pupil place planning.</p> <p>The Borough recognises the importance of delivering affordable homes in Poole but the under delivery and inability to provide affordable housing due to viability concerns is a national problem which is difficult to combat.</p> <p>While it may not be possible for all Council planning policies to be met through every development the concept of sustainable development is at the core of the Borough's intentions regarding development and it is a fundamental factor in assessing the deliverability and viability of any site.</p>
Southern Poole Chairmens' Liaison Group		CIL payment level for the interior streets of Sandbanks is too high. It should be the same level as for Canford Cliffs streets.		The difference between sea view and non-sea view developments will be explored further by the consultants prior to publication of a DCS.
Carol Longman	No. Agree that there needs to be some form of sustainable funding collection from new builds but the tariffs and methodology used here is ad hoc, with no economies of scale.	<p>No. There seems to be very little parity or logic between the scales. You cannot recommend charging a commercial new build property in Canford Cliffs the same as a local, small developer in Lower Parkstone whereas just a short hop to the north, it would be £20 per sqm as opposed to £370!</p> <p>A large developer and small local builder should pay different rates.</p> <p>The new rates would place an unworkable burden on landowners and developers from building new homes.</p> <p>It needs to be made clear that the old rate boundaries do not match up with the new ones.</p>		<p>Paragraph 5.3.18 of the Viability Study highlights that small and medium sized developers have been taken into consideration when making build cost assumptions.</p> <p>The proposed CIL zones are based on post code boundaries from which average sales prices were generated. Aside from the highest and lowest bands (which are tailored to actual values), average prices are broken into bands to show price variance across the Borough.</p> <p>It will be made clear during the consultation on the DCS that the old rate boundaries do not match the proposed boundaries.</p>
Bourne	Agree with the need for robust evidence to	Do not agree with the proposed CIL rates		Through the DCS consultation the distinction between

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
Leisure Ltd	<p>underpin the detailed consideration of CIL rates.</p> <p>Non-residential development based on very limited scope of viability assumptions, no specific evidence and therefore unreliable.</p> <p>Evidence base to support the proposed Levy on hotel use is based solely on a 'modelled' budget hotel. This is an over-simplification and not a reliable evidence base.</p> <p>A budget hotel operates within a totally different environment to other holiday accommodation. Must take into account factors that relate to different types of hotels such as seasonality, type of leisure facilities the hotel has and upkeep costs for hotels that occupy Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Unclear if the existing land use (greenfield or brownfield) has been considered for hotels.</p> <p>The non-viability of hotels is endorsed by reference in section 2 of the Viability Workshop implying only an out of centre retail charge for non-residential. The proposed rates contrast the views of agents and developers.</p> <p>Objects to the use of the term 'hotels' as a category. To ensure no confusion between hotels and other tourist accommodation should be amended to 'Use Class C1'.</p> <p>Detailed research for specific sectors of the tourism industry not undertaken. Question the validity and merit of having a rate for all types of hotels.</p> <p>Rockley Holiday Park should not be considered a hotel and should have a zero CIL rate.</p> <p>Important to clarify the hotel category does not include other types of tourist accommodation such as caravan parks.</p>	<p>for hotels.</p> <p>The proposed rate of £85 makes it even harder to deliver a non-budget hotel.</p> <p>Given the importance of tourism in Poole, this approach is negative and unambitious.</p> <p>PCS para 6.10 states it is important Poole can offer high quality tourist accommodation but para 6.5.9 of the viability document suggests the £85 CIL rate may make these developments unviable.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rate on hotels will not have a positive economic effect on development across the local plan area (contrasting NPPG).</p> <p>It should be made absolutely clear that all tourist accommodation that fall outside the 'hotel' category is zero rated.</p>		<p>hotels and other forms of tourist accommodation shall be made explicitly clear.</p> <p>It was recognised through the Viability Workshop that it was more likely for budget hotels to be delivered in Poole as the market for higher standard hotels remains difficult outside of central London. It was also realised through the Viability Study that the proposed CIL rate is targeted at budget hotels, meaning the delivery of high end hotels will be unlikely as they will be unviable.</p>
South West HARP Planning Consortium	<p>The viability evidence appears sound.</p> <p>Is it appropriate to seek such high CIL charges when affordable housing delivery is in need of stimulation?</p>	<p>It is inappropriate to remove affordable housing contributions in the pursuit of CIL (see comments from Greg Clark and Mid Devon CIL examination).</p>	<p>The delivery of affordable housing should be the starting point for local authorities when setting the CIL rate given the extremely high demand and historic under delivery.</p>	<p>When looking across the Borough as a whole the proposed CIL rates try to strike an appropriate balance between the potential delivery of affordable housing and the ability to pay CIL without compromising the need to provide funding towards important</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
	<p>As of April 2015 SUDS is required on any development over 10 units. This should be included and assessed in the Viability Study.</p> <p>The affordable housing tenure split in para 5.4.7 has most probably been informed by the SHMA 2011 Update.</p> <p>Serious reservations about the appropriateness of this evidence base and would like to see further work to assess the true tenure split requirement.</p> <p>Strongly oppose reducing the proportion of social rent to improve viability (para 5.4.7).</p>	<p>To maximise CIL contributions without harming the delivery of affordable housing set a size of scheme threshold.</p> <p>This allows the Council to take advantage of the increased viability of schemes below 11 dwellings that do not have to make an affordable housing contribution, while making sure CIL is set at a level that allows maximum affordable housing delivery at any level above the threshold.</p>	<p>Greg Clark MP (20 April 2012):</p> <p><i>“A key point of the viability test for CIL [charge setting] is that it doesn’t make socially important development unviable, including social housing. I would expect that to be at the forefront of examiners’ minds”.</i></p> <p>The CIL rate must not threaten delivery of the relevant Plan.</p> <p>Para 38 of NPPG (reference ID 25-038-20140612) makes this clear as does Inspectors report on the Mid-Devon District Council CIL examination (November 2012):</p> <p><i>“The Council should have taken all its policy requirements, including affordable housing, into account when setting the CIL rate and on this basis it can be concluded that the viability evidence, on which the proposed charge of £90per/m2, is not robust.”</i></p> <p>The Council should include a policy to carry out a review of CIL every three years or if there has been a 10% change in house prices, whichever is sooner.</p>	<p>infrastructure needs.</p> <p>The impact of SUDS will be taken into consideration by the consultants prior to the DCS consultation.</p> <p>The relationship between CIL viability and affordable housing with regards to site size was considered through the Viability Study.</p> <p>Government guidance states that affordable housing contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of no more than 1,000 square metres. The areas of the Borough where the 40% affordable housing target is proposed to be retained are areas where the proposed CIL rates will be increased. It is also likely that most development in these areas will be below the newly imposed 11 unit threshold. The areas where the affordable housing targets are proposed to be lowered are in areas where the proposed CIL rates are also to be lowered and where developments of over 10 units will come forward. It is therefore clear that the proposed increase in CIL rates in some areas of the Borough is not to the detriment of the delivery of affordable housing.</p>
Christopher Allenby	<p>Strongly disagree.</p> <p>Why give Former Power Station Site all the residential allowance and no commercial unless it is large supermarket on the switching station? Then give the site zero CIL and no affordable housing.</p>	<p>Strongly object to both the CIL rates and affordable housing contributions.</p>		<p>The current Town Centre boundary is unclear as to whether the Former Power Station Site is included with regards to its exclusion from the proposed Borough wide retail rate. This shall be made clear through the publication of the DCS.</p>
ESRG Land & Network Rail	<p>Evidence base not properly explored the viability of revised affordable housing targets for the Stadium site and the other sites in the Town Centre North area.</p> <p>Failed to give consideration to the potential scale of residential development (only 5 and 15 flat schemes) which could be delivered in Town Centre North.</p> <p>Development could include multi-storey residential development on a number of sites. Core Strategy Review questions whether taller, denser development should be allowed in</p>	<p>It is appreciated the CIL viability work should not be on specific developments, though this has been possible for ‘strategic brownfield sites’. Town Centre North includes significant, large, brownfield sites which should be properly evaluated.</p> <p>Sustainable development can only be achieved where it is viable and deliverable (see NPPF para 173).</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates (and affordable housing targets) for other significant</p>		<p>5-15 flat schemes are typical schemes for the Town Centre and. Larger sites would need to be looked at individually with a bespoke viability assessment and possibly S106 agreement rather than CIL. The Viability Study reviewed current allocations and if necessary emerging sites can be assessed once the mix of uses is established.</p> <p>The allocation of additional Brownfield Strategic Sites is being considered through the Poole Town Centre Planning and Urban Design SPD and the Core Strategy Review.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
	<p>sustainable Town Centre locations.</p> <p>In respect of the CIL rate for Poole Town Centre, the methodology is flawed.</p> <p>The scale of development in the Regeneration Area is akin to the Town Centre North area. The disparity between Poole Town Centre and the 'strategic brownfield sites' should be reconciled.</p> <p>The Town Centre North sites should be re-evaluated in the context of the Core Strategy Review and the scale of development in particular revisited.</p>	<p>brownfield sites, including Town Centre North, should be properly explored and the outcome should be accurately reflected in the Charging Schedule.</p>		
David James Architects	<p>Findings are fundamentally flawed and based on ill-advised build rates and land values.</p> <p>The build rates used in the assessment were £1,390 per sqm, which are a third of the actual current costs of approximately £3,300 per sqm.</p> <p>Colmar Construction current projects £3,000 - £3,500 per sqm. Glossbrook approximately £3,600 per sqm.</p> <p>Elsewhere within the Borough Colmar tendering various projects with different levels of specification for £1,500 - £2,500 per sqm.</p> <p>A shortage of skilled labour and continued material price increases will see costs rise in the future.</p>	<p>With these rates developments will not be forthcoming and this will reduce the council's revenue. Will result in loss of jobs in the building industry.</p> <p>Rates are unrealistic and unsustainable</p>	<p>CIL has had a negative impact on development and at its current level is only just sustainable.</p>	<p>These build costs will be passed onto the consultants to take into consideration prior to the publication of the DCS. However it is not clear from the submission what costs have been included within the build costs of the two builders quoted – e.g. external costs, etc. which the consultants separated from the build costs in the viability assessment. We will ask the consultant to contact the builders directly to check.</p> <p>A reduction in rates across much of the Borough will enable development to come forward in these areas.</p> <p>The number of residential units under construction has risen continuously since 2010/11 in Poole. In 2010/11 373 units were under construction, this rose to 395 in 2011/12 and then 409 in 2012/13. The first full year of CIL implementation in Poole saw this figure rise to 631 and for 2014/15 this has risen again to 718. These figures show that the introduction of CIL has had no such negative impact on development. The Council will consider the proposed new rates closely to ensure that this pattern continues.</p>
Juno Developments UK Ltd	<p>Current example - block of 18x1 bedroom apartments in Bournemouth Town Centre £1,290 build costs per sqm.</p> <p>Add at least 10% extra in Poole to meet with Code 3 sustainability.</p> <p>Bespoke individual houses in Canford Cliffs/Sandbanks are expensive to build and economy to scale not applicable as with other schemes, costs can easily exceed £2,000 per sqm.</p> <p>Current rates allow development to happen</p>			<p>These costs will be passed to the consultants to take into consideration prior to the publication of the DCS.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response																								
	<p>and strengthen local economy.</p> <p>Bank costs are not 6%. Typically pay an arrangement fee of 1% of the loan, 8% annual interest and an exit fee of 1.5% of the gross developments value.</p> <p>Other professional costs:</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Architect Design</td><td>£1.50 psqft</td></tr> <tr><td>Architect BuildingRegs</td><td>£2.00 psqft</td></tr> <tr><td>Structural Engineer</td><td>£1.00 psqft</td></tr> <tr><td>Quantity surveyor</td><td>£750 per visit</td></tr> <tr><td>Bat reports</td><td>£1,000</td></tr> <tr><td>Ecological reports</td><td>£1,000</td></tr> <tr><td>Building Control</td><td>£0.75 psqft</td></tr> <tr><td>Purchasing Legals</td><td>£1500</td></tr> <tr><td>Stamp</td><td>What ever it might be</td></tr> <tr><td>Sales fees</td><td>1.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Sales legals</td><td>£1,000</td></tr> <tr><td>Abnormals/Contingency</td><td>10% of build</td></tr> </table>	Architect Design	£1.50 psqft	Architect BuildingRegs	£2.00 psqft	Structural Engineer	£1.00 psqft	Quantity surveyor	£750 per visit	Bat reports	£1,000	Ecological reports	£1,000	Building Control	£0.75 psqft	Purchasing Legals	£1500	Stamp	What ever it might be	Sales fees	1.5%	Sales legals	£1,000	Abnormals/Contingency	10% of build			
Architect Design	£1.50 psqft																											
Architect BuildingRegs	£2.00 psqft																											
Structural Engineer	£1.00 psqft																											
Quantity surveyor	£750 per visit																											
Bat reports	£1,000																											
Ecological reports	£1,000																											
Building Control	£0.75 psqft																											
Purchasing Legals	£1500																											
Stamp	What ever it might be																											
Sales fees	1.5%																											
Sales legals	£1,000																											
Abnormals/Contingency	10% of build																											
Gaming International	<p>It is inappropriate to consider the Stadium site on a scale of development based on 15 flats but more appropriate to consider it as a Strategic Brownfield Site due to the “size and importance in delivering a large proportion of the future housing supply”.</p> <p>Cost of delivering the site at least as great as the Strategic Brownfield Sites and reasonable to assume that the viability would be similar too.</p> <p>Justification needed on basis for charging zone boundaries.</p>	<p>Welcome the headroom created by a reduced rate applying to the Town Centre but do not agree with the CIL rate proposed.</p> <p>The £30 charge for Strategic Brownfield Site rather than the £60 proposed for the Town Centre must reflect the viability of delivering a brownfield site of circa 250 units.</p> <p>The Stadium site should be treated as a Strategic Brownfield Site and be subject to a more detailed assessment of viability. This should result in a £30 rather than £60 charge as well as reduced affordable housing requirements, but it is possible that large brownfield sites within the city centre are less viable than the 3 Strategic Brownfield Sites.</p>		<p>5-15 flat schemes are typical schemes for the Town Centre and. Larger sites would need to be looked at individually. The Viability Study reviewed current allocations and if necessary emerging sites can be assessed once the mix of uses is established.</p> <p>The allocation of additional Brownfield Strategic Sites is being considered through the Poole Town Centre Planning and Urban Design SPD and the Core Strategy Review.</p> <p>The proposed CIL zones are based on post code boundaries from which average sales prices were generated. Aside from the highest and lowest bands (which are tailored to actual values), average prices are broken into bands to show price variance across the Borough.</p>																								
Sport England			<p>Support the use of CIL informed by a robust evidence base.</p> <p>All new dwellings in Poole should provide for new or enhanced sport and recreation facilities.</p> <p>Generally it may be more effective if contributions are sought through planning obligations rather than CIL.</p>	<p>Public open space improvement projects and community sports and leisure facilities are included on the Reg123 List to be funded through CIL. Sports Infrastructure can also be provided through on-site provision or by S106 agreement through any site specific need created by a development.</p>																								

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
			The Council will need to think carefully about sports infrastructure delivery by linking development sites with specific projects to meet identified sporting needs.	
Society of Poole Men		No. Developments will be stifled in certain areas. The proposed amounts will be unlikely to fulfil their objectives and are therefore unacceptable.		The proposed CIL rates are based on a standard viability testing approach, which is advocated by the Harman Report (Viability Testing for Local Plans: Advice for planning practitioners, June 2012). The proposed rates are less than 50% of the headroom on any development, so should not stifle construction.
MMC Nikal Poole Marina Ltd		Support the reduced affordable housing and CIL contribution in the Town Centre, which will help kick start development of key sites that have not come forward due to issues of viability.	Whilst Appendix B shows the proposed CIL zones, the additional categories (Brownfield and Greenfield Strategic Sites) should also be defined.	The boundaries of all relevant zones shall be made clear through the publication of the DCS.
Martin Miller		<p>No.</p> <p>Under the Habitats Regs, all residential development within 5km of Dorset Heathland must mitigate its impacts. A zero rate of CIL for the Former Power Station Site, which does not seem to be delivering its own SANG, does nothing to mitigate this impact.</p> <p>To avoid a dangerous precedent, the CIL rate for the Former Power Station Site must be set so the current levels of contributions are matched.</p>		Mitigation for the Power Station Site is through the Upton Park SANG, which will ultimately mitigate 10,000 new homes. Funding of the SANG is through CIL which is not site specific, unlike a S106 agreement. Therefore any shortfall in contributions unable to be made by the Former Power Station Site and other sites not paying CIL, such as self build exemptions, will be met by the CIL contributions made from other developments across the Borough where values are higher.
Builtform Developments	<p>Typical development in Branksome Park is to demolish a 325 sqm house and erect two 325 sqm houses. Current house value = £1.1m. Value of 2 plots with planning approval = £1.2m. New CIL rate would see contribution go from £48,750 to £120,250.</p> <p>Total costs for submitting a planning application would run to £30,000 - £40,000. Added to CIL charge the development would be unviable as the current value of the house plus costs/CIL would be greater than the value of the site with planning permission.</p> <p>Recent increase in Stamp Duty Land Tax needs to be considered.</p>	<p>Will have a negative effect on development and decrease contributions received. Development that is viable under existing rates will be unviable under new rates, therefore comparison table is unrealistic.</p> <p>Proposed rates for Sandbanks and Lilliput/Branksome Park need to be reconsidered so developers will continue to work in these areas and contribute to the local economy.</p>		<p>These costs will be passed onto the consultants to take into consideration prior to the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>The rates comparison table is simply a means of comparing potential revenue from the proposed rates to the existing rates. It is not assuming that those developments that came forward in a different economic climate would have done so if the proposed rates were in place at that time.</p> <p>A significant proportion of development that will come forward in Sandbanks and Lilliput/Branksome Park is likely to benefit from self build exemptions given the nature of schemes that come forward in these areas. Therefore some developments may be CIL exempt, however; the proposed rates are calculated at a level that can be afforded by developments in their respective areas. It is important to note that the impact of self build exemption was not an issue that was factored into the setting of these rates.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
Natural England			<p>Welcome the proposal to secure SAMM payments through S106.</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of avoidance/mitigation measures for Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar and the Dorset Heathlands SPA, Ramsar and Dorset Heaths SAC through CIL.</p>	Support noted.
Legal and General		It would be beneficial for a nil CIL rate for residential developments in the Town Centre due to the critical impact such development would have for regeneration.	Add wording to confirm retail development in the Town Centre will have a CIL rate of £0; and the definition of 'brownfield strategic sites' and 'greenfield strategic sites'.	The definition of key terms shall be made clear through the publication of the DCS. The proposed CIL rate of £60 per sqm for the Town Centre is viable and will still enable the delivery of housing in this area.
Fortitudo Property	<p>No. The methodology is flawed, it is not commercially viable as the quality would be inferior to what the market expects.</p> <p>No Sandbanks development since 2009 could have been built with these rates.</p> <p>Can not apply same rate to beachside and inland developments.</p> <p>If CIL is index linked why does it need to be increased/reviewed?</p> <p>Combined with Stamp Duty Land Tax rises there is no scope for these kinds of rates.</p> <p>Re-based BCIS build costs for Poole state highest 3-5 storey apartments at £2,342 per sqm and houses £3,654 per sqm. A developer is currently building 3 apartments but spending more than this!</p>	<p>No, they are not commercially achievable. Would be disastrous for the local economy destroying the development community and associated trade.</p> <p>Comparison table is unrealistic as developments would have been unviable.</p> <p>It is hard enough to make development sites work with the existing levels of CIL.</p> <p>No social housing is being delivered because of the existing CIL rate.</p> <p>Need to strike a balance to get development to thrive thus creating a sensible level of CIL and much needed money for Social Housing.</p>		<p>The proposed CIL rates are based on a standard viability testing approach, which is advocated by the Harman Report (Viability Testing for Local Plans: Advice for planning practitioners, June 2012).</p> <p>The costs provided will be passed to the consultants to take into consideration prior to the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>The difference between sea view and non-sea view developments will be explored further by the consultants prior to publication of a DCS.</p> <p>BoP implemented CIL in January 2013 based on a Viability Report (produced by BNP Paribas) dated July 2011 using data and assumptions pre-2011. This was a time when the affects of an economic down turn were heavily felt by the development industry with the 2011 report stating in paragraph 2.9; "This is a difficult context within which the Council is testing the ability of sites to generate funding for infrastructure through CIL". Half a decade on and the development industry is showing strong signs of recovery which has contributed to the difference in CIL rates.</p> <p>NPPG states that in addition to taking account of market conditions and infrastructure needs, charging authorities should also consider linking a review of their charging schedule to any substantive review of the evidence base for the relevant Plan. In this instance this is the Core Strategy Review.</p> <p>The rates comparison table is simply a means of comparing potential revenue from the proposed rates to the existing rates. It is not assuming that those developments that came forward in a different economic climate would have done so if the proposed rates were in place at that time.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
				<p>The significant under delivery of affordable housing has been experienced since 2011, whereas CIL was implemented in 2013.</p> <p>The objective of the Viability Study is to inform policy decisions relating to the trade-offs between the policy aspirations of achieving sustainable development and the realities of economic viability. It recognises that good planning in this respect is about 'striking a balance' between the competing demands for policy and plan viability.</p>
<p>Savills - Consortium of Local Developers</p>	<p>Response focuses on Sandbanks and Lilliput/Branksome Park.</p> <p>Own appraisal carried out amending sales values and build costs. This does not mean agreement with the consultants other assumptions, but want to focus on these areas and may expand on other inputs in the next consultation. Submits a detailed appraisal for a single unit typology in Sandbanks ultimately unviable.</p> <p>Consultants have used prime sales values and benchmark values from secondary locations creating a miss-match.</p> <p><u>Sales Revenues</u></p> <p>No actual sales data has been provided in the Viability Study, instead using average sales figures for Sandbanks are £1,115 per sqft.</p> <p>5 properties that have been recently sold or are up for sale in Sandbanks (4 with sea views) have sales figures of between £645 per sqft and £957 per sqft.</p> <p>Local market not researched in enough depth as average sales prices would be a lot less and single unit typology for Sandbanks should be larger than 111sqm.</p> <p><u>Benchmark Land Value</u></p> <p>Examples of Sandbanks land values of between £23-108m per ha and Lilliput/Branksome Park of over £7m per ha. In particular Sandbanks is far higher than the £15m per ha stated in the report and would</p>		<p>The increase in CIL rates will limit the amount of development that is deliverable and impact on the delivery of new houses in the area. The existing CIL rates have already done this. Evidence from the Viability Study suggests that housing delivery has reduced by approximately 16% since CIL was adopted, whereas nationally in the same period (2012/13 to 2013/2014) housing delivery increased by an average of 10%.</p> <p>The strain on housing delivery has also had an impact on affordable housing completions and this is because of the existing CIL rates.</p>	<p>The costs provided will be passed onto the consultants to take into consideration prior to the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>The Viability Study states “<i>current residential revenues and other viability variables are obtained from a range of sources, including generic websites, such as RightMove and the Land Registry</i>”. These websites provide actual sales data for properties sold.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.18 of the Viability Study states that “<i>the significantly higher cost of small builds is also likely to reflect higher standards and specifications to match local demand for standalone units, which has been prevalent in Poole. These costs have been applied in the viability testing</i>”.</p> <p>The existing CIL rates have not had a negative impact on housing delivery. In 2013/14 (the first full operational year of CIL) 177 CIL liable residential units were built out. This has risen to 300 units in 2014/15; a growth of 70% in one year.</p> <p>The significant under delivery of affordable housing has been experienced since 2011, whereas CIL was implemented in 2013.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
	<p>encourage the consultants to review their values.</p> <p><u>Build Costs</u></p> <p>The consultants have allowed a construction cost in accordance with BCIS but Sandbanks and Lilliput/Branksome Park are so unique they require more research than purely relying on the index.</p> <p>Build costs at the level suggested by the consultants are not deliverable as developments have to be extremely high specification.</p> <p>More specific cost research needed. Can provide a list of developers who have recently completed schemes in the area.</p> <p>Build costs are very site specific but given the high sales values would expect to see these at a much higher £/sqm. This has been agreed with BoP on numerous occasions and can provide evidence of this.</p> <p>Need to consider specific location (super prime, prime or secondary) and adjust rates accordingly so not to deter development.</p> <p>Happy to meet with the consultants and the Council to discuss the evidence.</p>			
Lands Improvement Holdings and Gallagher Estates	The Viability Study recognises the extraordinary challenges for scheme delivery.	<p>Welcome the PDCS and the proposed CIL rate for residential development of £0 for the Former Power Station Site.</p> <p>The delivery of the site is strategically important and will only be possible if the development is viable.</p> <p>The £0 CIL rate for retail development in the Town Centre is also supported.</p> <p>A £0 CIL rate for residential development will enable the applicants and the Council to better secure infrastructure and other contributions through S106 obligations.</p>	As part of the planning application for the Former Power Station Site the Council has been provided with detailed information related to the scheme's viability, which was independently reviewed for the Council by the District Valuer. This information demonstrated the challenges for delivering affordable housing and the associated infrastructure for the site.	Support noted.
English Heritage			Welcome the reference in the Reg123 List to 'Our Streets and Spaces public realm projects'.	<p>The utilisation of site specific planning obligations will be made clear through the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>Discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances has</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
			<p>May want to clarify that site specific planning obligations will continue to offer opportunities for funding improvements to and the mitigation of adverse impacts on the historic environment.</p> <p>Encourages local authorities to apply discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances (and making this clear in a separate statement); where development which affects heritage assets and their settings and/or their significance, may become unviable if subject to CIL.</p> <p>The conservation of heritage assets should be taken into account when considering the level of the CIL so as to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment.</p>	<p>been made available in Poole and is identified through the CIL Guide for Developers and Applicants available on the Council website.</p>
The Theatres Trust		Support the decision to not impose CIL on all other development.		Support noted.
Gladman Developments			<p>Demonstrate the infrastructure need and subsequent funding gap and ensure that the level of total CIL receipts that could be generated through the levy reflects these needs.</p> <p>Council must take account of every possible income stream when setting CIL.</p> <p>Council need to have an up to date, robust evidence base that fully justifies the infrastructure needs based on the amount of development that is required.</p> <p>New houses do not always create new pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>CIL is expected to have a positive economic effect on development.</p> <p>The viability impact of incremental policy obligations must be assessed and reflected in the charging schedule.</p> <p>Council must have a full understanding of the potential costs of infrastructure projects needed to meet needs.</p> <p>Differential rates must be based on accurate, up to date housing market</p>	<p>The infrastructure need and funding gap is identified through the Poole Infrastructure Programme (PIP) which is a technical document which provides an overview of the range of infrastructure projects required to support the Core Strategy growth.</p> <p>The most robust and up to date evidence available is used to justify the infrastructure need and formation of proposed CIL rates.</p> <p>The Council has made exceptional circumstances relief available in Poole but in two and half years of charging has not yet had to utilise this form of relief.</p> <p>Local Developers and the property industry were engaged with early on in the review process through a Viability Workshop whereby they were invited to feed into the review process.</p> <p>The Council intends to continue to implement an instalment policy and appreciates that the proposed rates should strike a balance between providing monies necessary to fund infrastructure while making sure the deliverability of development does not become unviable.</p> <p>The possibility of treating phased planning permissions as separate chargeable development and accepting payments in kind will be made clear through the publication of the DCS.</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
			<p>intelligence.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances relief should be factored into the Council's CIL to avoid rendering sites with exceptional cost burdens unviable should exceptional circumstances arise.</p> <p>Payments in kind for land or infrastructure should be made available by the Council.</p> <p>Engage with local developers and property industry early.</p> <p>It is fundamental that the Council ensures that the proposed levy rates are realistic and not set too high.</p> <p>Urge Council's to adopt an instalments policy and treat phased planning permissions as a separate chargeable development.</p> <p>Welcome the need to review.</p> <p>Must have Local Plan in place prior to adoption.</p>	
W H White Ltd	<p>No.</p> <p>Strategic scale development should be exempt from CIL with funding through site specific S106.</p> <p>Strategic Greenfield Sites often have significant upfront opening up costs as it is unlikely they will connect in to existing infrastructure networks.</p> <p>Strategic scale developments should provide infrastructure on site rather than source funds through CIL so they are delivered with housing.</p> <p>Phasing (while better than no phasing at all) would result in a generic approach to larger developments where a 100 unit and 1,000 unit scheme could be treated the same despite the differences in build-out periods and the ability of developers to secure the necessary finance.</p> <p>Fail to capture all of the costs associated with the provision of on and off-site physical and</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Strategic Greenfield Sites should be zero rated with infrastructure needs met through S106 as Reg123 List largely consists of Town Centre needs and a strategic greenfield site has different needs.</p> <p>Setting higher rates of CIL in certain parts of the Borough will encourage self-build on small windfall sites.</p> <p>Town Centre low and zero rates are worrying as they have benefitted from significant public investment in new infrastructure and will continue to, as well as delivering minimal affordable housing.</p> <p>Affordable housing will become harder to deliver as now developments of 10 and below are exempt.</p> <p>Strategic Greenfield Sites offer the best</p>	<p>Have submitted a critique of the Viability Study considering the assumptions underpinning typology 25 (i.e. Strategic Site Greenfield)</p>	<p>A 1000 dwelling greenfield typology was included in the viability work to help the Council to understand the achievability of affordable housing and headroom for infrastructure. This has been translated into a CIL rate, but in practice it is likely that any strategic site would be subject to S106 rather than CIL. This would enable the scheme to deliver site specific infrastructure befitting a new community, e.g. SANGs and enable assessment/negotiation of scheme viability</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.32 states that on greenfield sites an allowance has been made for opening up works such as utilities, land preparation, SUDS and spine roads. The opening up costs used were £5k per unit for less than 200 units, £10k per unit for 201-500 units, and £18k per unit for over 500 units, based on evidence provided at the viability workshop of a large urban extension in South East Dorset.</p> <p>The value of SANGs should be based upon the existing use value, i.e. agricultural land, on the assumption that it will be in the same landholding that the housing would be built. The size of SANGs and maintenance costs will be bespoke to any</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
	<p>social infrastructure for a Strategic Greenfield Site.</p> <p>Why is the requirement for large sites to provide SANGs as part of the overall infrastructure package (para 5.5 draft Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework SPD 2015-2020) not mentioned?</p> <p>Provision of SANGs presents a significant cost.</p> <p>The section on opening up costs in appendix [A] ‘Viability assumptions’ states: <i>‘the estimate for the strategic sites are carried out separately based on the information which the Council have been able to provide’</i>. It is unclear whether this includes typology 25 ‘SS 1000 Greenfield allocation’ in North Poole. It is not clear what information was provided by BoP. Not aware of any dialogue relating to potential costs having been had with landowners or potential promoters of such development.</p> <p>Some infrastructure from proposed Reg123 list will be provided onsite.</p> <p>Little justification for the change in CIL charging zones – particularly between ‘North Poole’ and ‘Rest of Borough’.</p> <p>Some of the areas mask huge disparities e.g. North Poole includes both BH11 and BH21 which have markedly different characteristics.</p> <p>Strategic Greenfield development should also include the south west of Creekmoor.</p>	<p>prospect for achieving plan-led growth and the timely delivery of new employment and housing, including affordable housing but unlikely to receive same investment as Town Centre.</p> <p>A CIL charge to strategic greenfield sites, given the other on-site infrastructure needs, could prevent the Council delivering sufficient affordable housing.</p> <p>Strategic Greenfield Site rate should not be confined to North Poole.</p>		<p>development and are therefore difficult to estimate at this stage. Further information would be needed on the quantum of development and land use change to create a SANG, which can only be done alongside allocating a site in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The possibility of accepting payments in kind through on site provision will be made clear through the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>The proposed CIL zones are based on post code boundaries from which average sales prices were generated.</p> <p>The boundaries of all relevant zones shall be made clear through the publication of the DCS.</p> <p>Irrespective on the CIL rate set, where applicable, self build relief will still be sought.</p> <p>Town Centre rates are set at a level that is viable for development to be delivered.</p>
BAP Loanco Ltd		<p>Reduction of rate in Town Centre supported as well as zero rate for retail. Reduced rate will encourage development and create a more vibrant centre.</p>		<p>Support noted.</p>
Lauder Property Ltd		<p>In our experience under CIL, contributions have seemed generally to increase.</p> <p>Appears the existing CIL rates were quite carefully considered and set at a level where it would generate more money but not stifle development.</p> <p>New rates will stop development (esp. in</p>		<p>The rates comparison table is simply a means of comparing potential revenue from the proposed rates to the existing rates. It is not assuming that those developments that came forward in a different economic climate would have done so if the proposed rates were in place at that time.</p> <p>A significant proportion of development that will come forward in Sandbanks and Lilliput/Branksome Park is likely to benefit from self build exemptions given the</p>

Public Consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of representations received and Officer responses

Name / Organisation	Q1 – Do you agree with the study methodology and its findings?	Q2 – Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates?	General Comments	Officer Response
		<p>Sandbanks and Lilliput) dead. Charging same in CIL as its costs to build (i.e. £1,300 per sq. m).</p> <p>Comparison table irrelevant as development will be unviable.</p> <p>Leave alone a CIL charging schedule that is doing the job in a simple and fair manner. If you need to increase it, why not simply apply a modest percentage rise to each tier?</p>		<p>nature of schemes that come forward in these areas. Therefore some developments may be CIL exempt, however; the proposed rates are calculated at a level that can be afforded by developments in their respective areas. It is important to note that the impact of self build exemption was not an issue that was factored into the setting of these rates.</p> <p>A review of the CIL rates requires full viability testing to be carried out. The proposed CIL rates are based on a standard viability testing approach, which is advocated by the Harman Report (Viability Testing for Local Plans: Advice for planning practitioners, June 2012). Applying a percentage increase to each tier is already carried out through the existing application of the BCIS All-In Tender Price Index.</p> <p>NPPG states that in addition to taking account of market conditions and infrastructure needs, charging authorities should also consider linking a review of their charging schedule to any substantive review of the evidence base for the relevant Plan. In this instance this is the Core Strategy Review.</p>
Inland Homes Plc		Pilkington Tile site should be zero rated like Former Power Station Site as latest application had viability issues with 0% affordable housing.		<p>The proposed rate for Brownfield Strategic Sites is set at a level that is viable for development to be delivered. The Pilkington Tile permission included the following contributions illustrating that the scheme was viable whilst providing infrastructure:</p> <p>Affordable housing - £624,555 Education - £287,970 Nature Conservation - £329,130 Nutrient Impact - £101,920 Poole Harbour Monitoring Strategy - £7,109 Recreational - £309,616 Travel Plan Monitoring - £2,500 Transport Investment - £339,000</p>

Acronyms

BoP	Borough of Poole	SAC	Special Area for Conservation
BCIS	Building Cost Information Service	SAMM	Strategic Access Management and Monitoring
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy	SANG	Suitable Accessible (Alternative) Natural Greenspace
DCS	Draft Charging Schedule	SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Area
NPPF	National Planning Practice Framework	SPA	Special Protection Area
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance	SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
PDCS	Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule	SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
PCS	Poole Core Strategy	SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems