

### **Summary of Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation**

- 1.1. The Council consulted on its Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule between 29<sup>th</sup> November 2013 and 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014. The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and accompanying evidence base documents were made available to view online at [www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy), or on request to the Planning Policy team. Copies of the documents were available to view at the Cannock Civic Centre, Rugeley Area Office and the Districts' public libraries (Cannock, Rugeley, Hednesford, Brereton, Norton Canes and Heath Hayes) during normal opening hours. A notice of the consultation was also placed in a local free newspaper (The Chronicle 05.12.13).
- 1.2. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Regulation 15 of the CIL Regulations (2010, as amended). Just over 400 stakeholders, including the relevant consultation bodies and those persons and bodies specified under Regulation 15 (5) were contacted via letter to notify them of the consultation period, availability of documents and methods of response.
- 1.3. The Council also invited these stakeholders to attend a workshop event on the 7<sup>th</sup> January 2014. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss in more detail the nature of the CIL charging regime (i.e. how it will be applied and operate), the proposed levy charges themselves, and the local infrastructure projects that the CIL will fund. Separate workshops were held for private developers (who would ultimately be subject to the CIL charge) and for infrastructure providers or delivery agencies (who would be spending those CIL receipts) e.g. the County Council and Parish Councils. By providing separate workshops the Council was able to cater for the different queries and topics of discussion arising from these stakeholder groups.
- 1.4. A total of 20 stakeholders attended the workshop events, including developers; County Council representatives; Parish Councils; neighbouring authorities and other interested parties such as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit. Individual follow up presentations were also given to Norton Canes Parish Council and Hednesford Town Council, at their request. A total of 18 stakeholders formally responded to the consultation.
- 1.5. The table below provides a summary of the formal consultation responses received and the Council's response to them, indicating how they have informed the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list.

**Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Comments**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<b>Council Response</b>	<b>Action</b>
Cannock Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit	Welcome references to the AONB and Cannock Chase SAC within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. However, the SAC does not cover the whole AONB and is habitat focused; not related to landscape and scenic beauty. SAC mitigation measures could have detrimental impact on the AONB and these should continue to be consulted upon. Would welcome opportunity to contribute to producing Regulation 123 list to include AONB related schemes.	Noted. It is recognised that the SAC mitigation and wider AONB landscape management are potentially complementary, as well as being separate issues and items of different infrastructure in their own right. The Council would consider AONB Unit suggestions for the Regulation 123 list to include AONB related schemes.	Consider any AONB related schemes submitted for inclusion on the Regulation 123 list.
	Note potential application of CIL to proposed residential developments in the emerging Local Plan, including land West of Pye Green Road and at Norton Canes. This will be of relevance to the AONB.	Noted. It should be recognised that sites with existing planning consents and Section 106 agreements i.e. land West of Pye Green Road, will not be required to pay CIL charges as they have been granted prior to the adoption of the CIL charge. However, any additional applications (or revised ones) e.g. for further housing capacity on these sites may be liable to the CIL charges if put forward following the adoption of the CIL charging schedule.	None required at this time.
	Note there is to be a joint SPD on SAC mitigation to be produced and the AONB Unit/Partnership is happy to contribute to this.	Noted and welcomed.	Continue to work on joint SPD via SAC partnership.
Birmingham City Council	No comments at this stage but request to be kept informed of progress.	Noted.	None required at this time.
Carter Jonas (representing several clients with land interests in District)	Question the applicability of CIL to retail uses- they do not generally give rise to demand for the type of facilities normally funded by CIL. Could also impact upon viability. Council should acknowledge there may be instances where a CIL payment is not required and will be applied flexibly. There should	Retail development will benefit from and impact on local infrastructure as set out in the current Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2013 and subsequent Regulation 123 list. Such schemes often generate a need for highway and public transport improvements, but in any event the	None required at this time.

	<p>be relief to ensure no double counting with S106/S278 agreements.</p>	<p>CIL system is looking at the overall infrastructure requirements needed to deliver the policies and proposals in the Local Plan as a whole. The proposed rate of £60 per m2 is set at a level considered not to impact on viability. The proposed charge is modest compared with that being proposed in other parts of the West Midlands where most equivalent proposed charges are in excess of £100 per sqm. Peacock and Smith, on behalf of Morrisons, support the proposed charge on the basis that it will not harm viability so this submission on behalf of a named retailer supports the CCDC approach. CIL Regulations protect against 'double counting'. Attention is drawn to 2:6 of the DCLG CIL Guidance Feb 2014.</p>	
	<p>Rate for retail development should be set at £20/sqm.</p>	<p>No financial viability assessment has been provided to support this assertion. Nevertheless it is noted that the principle of a charge is accepted.</p>	<p>None required at this time.</p>
	<p>Suggest timetable for an instalments policy, which links to the timetable for completion. 25% on commencement; 50% within 12 months of commencement; 25% on completion.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council will consider the instalments policy as suggested.</p>	<p>Consider appropriate instalments policy.</p>
<p>Churchill Retirement Living Ltd and McCarthy &amp; Stone (represented by The Planning Bureau)</p>	<p>The Council should consider the effects of CIL upon particular sectors or specialist forms of development, including specialist accommodation for the elderly. This is particularly important given the importance of the delivery of such accommodation within the District. By not properly assessing the CIL rate the Council puts at risk the delivery of its Local Plan.</p>	<p>Having considered the viability evidence submitted the Council is minded to recommend that retirement housing has a <b>nil</b> charge. We would seek to negotiate S106 agreements for affordable housing based on the adopted Local Plan policy on a case by case basis subject to viability.</p>	<p>Consider nil charge when producing Draft Charging Schedule.</p>
	<p>The CIL rate provides a uniform, flat rate for all residential developments- it does not differentiate between type e.g. flats/houses and sector e.g. elderly accommodation. Fails to acknowledge</p>	<p>The Adams Integra report recognises that "there are two factors which may adversely affect viability. Firstly, the rate of sale of sheltered housing schemes is generally slower than for</p>	<p>Consider nil charge when producing Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

	<p>specific viability issues associated with specialist elderly accommodation. Welcome relatively modest £40/sqm charge. However, historically not been able to deliver schemes in the District due to viability issues so concerned even modest charge will affect delivery. Note references within Economic Viability Assessment Report to this issue of sheltered housing viability, however feel guidance is contradictory as it then continues to be included within the general residential rate. No viability testing of sheltered/retirement housing appears to have been undertaken- this should be undertaken if not already done so.</p>	<p>mainstream residential, due to the more limited market catchments. Developers consequently incur greater interest costs on land and build costs. Secondly, these schemes include a significantly higher level of communal space to accommodate social areas and other facilities.”</p> <p>Having considered the viability evidence submitted the Council is minded to recommend that retirement housing has a <b>nil</b> charge. We would seek to negotiate S106 agreements for affordable housing based on the adopted Local Plan policy on a case by case basis subject to viability.</p>	
	<p>Recognise that Adams Integra is well informed on the issues following the examination of the Winchester Council Charging Schedule. However. Provide a number of documents which may assist the Council including a paper on testing the viability of retirement/sheltered housing; a viability assessment of retirement/sheltered housing by Three Dragons; Planning Minister letter regarding specialist forms of development. Request viability of these developments locally is assessed in line with the guidance provided.</p>	<p>Noted- see above comments.</p>	<p>None required at this time.</p>
English Heritage	<p>Support reference to heritage assets in paragraph 4.6, but suggest minor amendment to bring reference fully in line with the NPPF. Would also like to see further references to the historic environment. Paragraphs 4.6/4.7 could be supplemented with reference to open spaces and heritage assets; 'in kind' payments e.g. transfer of an 'at risk' building; repairs and improvements to heritage assets.</p>	<p>Noted. These comments will be taken into consideration in producing the Draft Charging Schedule.</p>	<p>Consider when producing Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

	Chapter 7 should further consider the continued role of planning obligations in relation to the historic environment.	Noted. These comments will be taken into consideration in producing the Draft Charging Schedule.	Consider when producing Draft Charging Schedule.
	The Regulation 123 list should include items related to the protection, conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and/or their settings.	Noted. The Council will consider any suggestions for inclusion on the 123 list from English Heritage and local interest groups.	Consider any heritage asset items submitted for inclusion on the Regulation 123 list.
	Concerned that CIL charges on developments involving heritage assets could be detrimental to their historic significance e.g. by rendering schemes unviable. Encouraging LPAs to apply discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances; where development which affects heritage assets and their settings and/or their significance, may become unviable if it was subject to CIL. Refer to the CIL Relief Information Document.	Noted. The Council will put forward a generic relief policy which would enable all developments experiencing viability issues, including those involving heritage assets, to apply for relief.	Consider discretionary relief policy.
Environment Agency	No formal comments on the charging structure and fees, but wish to be reconsulted on any changes to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Estimated costs for the Rugeley Flood Alleviation Scheme are currently correct however they are subject to change. There may also be additional improvement works identified across the District from continuous Environment Agency reviews of assets and incidents.	Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated and consulted upon as part of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule consultation. Prior to this consultation, the Council will liaise with the Environment Agency on revisions to any items and costs. The Plan is a live document so can be updated with new items in response to individual representations.	Continue to liaise with the Environment Agency on required schemes and costs.
Hednesford Town Council	Note CIL proposals at this stage. Would appreciate a further meeting to discuss CIL, including the neighbourhood pot annual 'cap'.	Noted. The Council has engaged with the Town Council as requested, including providing guidance on CIL receipts for Parish Councils.	Continue to provide guidance and attend meetings, as necessary.
Highways Agency	The Highways Agency favours the use of Section 278 Agreements for the provision of infrastructure required accommodate development traffic on the Strategic Road Network. Section 278 Agreements are enshrined in legislation by the Highways Act, 1980. Under the terms of the Act a Section 278 provides a legal agreement which allows the HA to	Noted. The Council would highlight that items of transport infrastructure may also be helpfully funded via CIL. The Highways Agency is encouraged to keep under consideration any items of infrastructure which may be helpfully funded via CIL.	Continue to consider transport items on the Regulation 123 list.

	<p>complete the required works at the developers expense. We regularly utilise these agreements to complete both small scale works and large highway improvement schemes. In light of the above, the Highways Agency has no comments to make on the proposed CIL Draft Charging Schedule.</p>		
Inland Waterways Association	<p>Note Paragraph 4.7- it is not clear whether the Hatherton Branch Canal project is excluded from receipt of CIL funding under the transport heading or just excluded from the funding gap cost estimate. Whilst the restored canal will have a transport function, it may be more appropriate to include it under the category of "Open space, sport and recreation facilities" in recognition of its intended function providing publicly accessible recreation space. The restored canal can also contribute to "Flood prevention" objectives in the Churchbridge area, "Conservation of heritage assets", "Community facilities" and the provision of alternative Green Space as part of the Cannock Chase SAC mitigation, as well as broader objectives of tourism and economic regeneration. Hope that the Hatherton Branch Canal restoration project will be eligible for contributions from the Community Infrastructure Levy fund when this is established.</p>	<p>The Hatherton Branch Canal project is not excluded from potential CIL funding; it has merely been omitted from the CIL funding gap estimate at this time. This is in recognition of the fact that the cost of this project (in excess of £44million) will require much more substantial funds than could ever be provided via CCDC's CIL (currently estimated to generate around £3.4-£5 million over the remainder of the plan period). In terms of the prioritising the allocation of CIL funds, the Hatherton Branch Canal project would also most likely be less of a priority than other infrastructure which is required to directly support developments e.g. education, transport, local open spaces and the Cannock Chase SAC mitigation measures. The potential multi-functional benefits of the project are recognised and the categorisation of the project does not influence its eligibility or prioritisation in terms of CIL funding. Re-categorisation or further references to its multi-functionality will be considered in the next update of the IDP.</p>	<p>Consider categorisation of Hatherton Branch Canal project in next update of the IDP.</p>
Marshall Bell Ltd	<p>We are a small local business within the Cannock area that predominately provides New Build properties. Any additional cost will have the impact of increasing housing prices, as additional charges such as CIL cannot be absorbed into a cost base, particularly when taking into account the SAC</p>	<p>The SAC contribution is likely to cease and be funded from CIL from 2015 onwards. However the Council recognise that further work needs to be done in assessing viability issues which are specific to small builders of market housing and this will be built into the next stage of the</p>	<p>Undertake further work to assess viability issues in relation to small schemes. Consider outcomes in</p>

	charge of £450 per dwelling which CCDC already require. The introduction of a CIL will have a detrimental impact on local investment, employment and growth within the District, and will have a major effect on SME developers.	consultation of the draft charging schedule. It should be noted that CIL is not charged on affordable housing schemes. The Council has received very few requests to re-negotiate S106 agreements, but where evidence has shown that payment of the full range of obligations would raise major viability issues, we have been flexible in our response on a case by case basis. There is now specific legislative provision in place to enable completed S106 agreements to be amended on viability grounds.	production of Draft Charging Schedule.
	A 'discretionary relief policy' should be taken forward.	Noted. The Council will put forward a generic relief policy which will enable all developments to apply for relief, as required.	Consider discretionary relief policy.
	With regards to an instalments policy, any CIL charge should only be paid when the property is sold onto a third party. To offer a facility of instalments is pointless as the charge will still have a negative impact on cash flow until the property is actually sold.	Noted. The Council will consider an instalments policy for small schemes in the context of the above mentioned additional viability work. On small schemes CIL could be charged on completion to assist cash flow.	Undertake further work to assess viability issues in relation to small schemes. Consider outcomes in relation to instalments policy.
Natural England	<u>Question 1 Response:</u> Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) needs to be prioritised.	Noted. This prioritisation will be determined on an annual basis in the allocation of collected CIL receipts. However it is likely that the Council would set out a rate to be 'top sliced' from all CIL receipts in order to ensure compliance with Habitat Regulation requirements.	Consider prioritisation of SAC mitigation measures as part of allocation of CIL funds.
	<u>Question 2 Response:</u> The evidence base for the SAC should be recognised as underpinning the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, including most recent advice.	Noted.	Reflect up to date evidence and advice within next update of the IDP.

	<p><u>Question 3 Response:</u> Welcome inclusion of 'Mitigation of impact of new housing development on the Cannock Chase SAC'. Support use of CIL to address in-combination effects but SAC must take priority to ensure delivery of mitigation measures and compliance with the Habitat Regulations. Welcome inclusion of 'Open space, sport and recreation facilities' but recommend replacing it with 'green infrastructure' to allow greater flexibility and alignment with Local Plan.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council recognises the importance of the SAC mitigation measures in view of Habitat Regulations requirements. See above comments regarding allocation of CIL funds. The definition of infrastructure within the CIL Regulations has been used, and these reference 'open space, sport and recreation'. In addition, the 123 list will not have broad categories of open, sport and recreation or green infrastructure- the items will be specific projects.</p>	<p>Consider prioritisation of SAC mitigation measures as part of allocation of CIL funds.</p>
	<p><u>Question 4 Response:</u> Mitigation measures for the SAC need to be delivered up front, prior to dwellings being occupied. Need to consider this alongside any instalments policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council recognises the importance of the SAC mitigation measures in view of Habitat Regulations requirements.</p>	<p>Consider appropriate instalments policy.</p>
	<p>Provide information on the use of CIL in the Thames Basin Heaths to provide useful context.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Council to consider information provided.</p>
<p>Persimmon Homes (West Midlands)</p>	<p>Generally welcome use of a CIL charge as it can provide more certainty on the level of obligations required at an early stage. However, this CIL charge should not lead to developments being financially unviable when considered in tandem with other planning obligation requirements e.g. affordable housing, on site open space. It would be helpful for the Council to provide guidance to distinguish between on-site design requirements, site specific planning obligations and developer contributions through the Levy. In view of this the Council should consider an exceptional/ discretionary relief policy and would urge the Council to be flexible to allow 'no-minimum' requirement on affordable housing to ensure viability and to facilitate deliverability.</p>	<p>Support in principle for the introduction of CIL as a more transparent way of funding infrastructure than via individual often protracted negotiations on S106 agreements is noted. CIL Regulations specifically preclude 'double counting' of S106 and CIL charges. The main purpose of the revised Developer Contributions SPD is to explain the circumstances when S106 agreements will still be needed, mostly for specific on site open space requirements, transport infrastructure and affordable housing. A separate Design SPD will deal with on-site design issues. The Local Plan policies recognise that there will be specific cases where viability issues will be raised and the SPD elaborates on this. The Council is minded recommend a relief policy to deal with site specific viability issues.</p>	<p>Consider discretionary relief policy. Consult on draft Developer Contributions SPD alongside CIL Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

Sport England	In principle the schedule is supported as it properly relates to policy for sports provision (CP5), includes sports facilities in the IDP and proposes to also use S106 agreements to secure onsite sports facilities through new major housing development.	Noted.	None required at this time.
SP Faizey Chartered Architects	Question whether a uniform, District-wide CIL rate is appropriate which means that developments in Norton Canes for example contribute to work in Rugeley. There is no direct link, unlike Section 106 agreements.	The Government has decided that the tariff-based approach of CIL provides the best framework to fund new infrastructure, particularly that which arises as a result of cumulative impacts from a number of small-medium developments. These developments do not typically pay contributions towards infrastructure needs via planning obligations. CIL monies can therefore fund cumulative, District-wide needs arising from numerous schemes. This is as opposed to a limited number of medium-large developments funding more specific infrastructure needs arising from their scheme alone, as currently occurs under the planning obligations system. To reinforce this, the CIL Regulations stipulate that from April 2015 (or the date a Council adopts it CIL charge, whichever is the sooner) Council's can not 'pool' more than five planning obligations from different developments towards one piece of infrastructure. The use of Section 106 agreements will therefore be curtailed in relation to funding cumulative infrastructure needs, meaning the Council needs to have a CIL in place to ensure it is able to continue funding infrastructure needs across the District.	None required at this time.
	Question the impact the proposed CIL charges will have on small scale schemes. Suggest a threshold of fewer than 10 dwellings to pay CIL with floor areas less than 75sqm should be set to pay no CIL.	The Council recognise that further work needs to be done in assessing viability issues which are specific to small builders of market housing and this will be built into the next stage of the	Undertake further work to assess viability issues in relation to small

	An appropriate rate could then be set for larger developments and dwellings.	consultation of the draft charging schedule.	schemes. Consider outcomes in production of Draft Charging Schedule.
	The levy should be based on bed spaces, rather than floor area.	The CIL Regulations do not allow for charges per bed space. Developments must be charged based upon floor area.	None required at this time.
	CIL payments should be enforced via planning conditions rather than a separate legal agreement. Suggest a two staged payment schedule with 50% paid prior to commencement and 50% payable prior to first occupation, which could be on a per dwelling basis so that a developer only pays this when the property is sold.	Noted. The Council will consider an instalments policy for small schemes in the context of the above mentioned additional viability work. On small schemes CIL could be charged on completion to assist cash flow.	Undertake further work to assess viability issues in relation to small schemes. Consider outcomes in relation to instalments policy.
The Theatres Trust	Support nil charge for D1, D2 and sui generis uses. Support inclusion of cultural and community facilities within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Noted.	None required at this time.
Walsall MBC	<u>Question 1 Response:</u> Paragraph 38 of housing viability report – lower value areas (Value Points 1 and 2) show no CIL scope and negative residual land values. These low value areas should be defined on a map and it should be made clear whether you will only accept case-by-case viability appraisals for sites in those areas or across the whole District. Paragraphs 58 & 59 of housing viability report suggests contributions might continue to be collected through S106 for impact on the Cannock Chase SAC but reference is made to this as an ‘interim’ policy and it is also identified on page 3 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document as a potential for CIL. It will be interesting as you progress to the Draft Charging Schedule stage to see what the future intention is in the collection of funds towards the SAC whether it be through CIL or S106.	Paragraph 38 of the Adams Integra report states <i>“In areas that may be typically lower value that are shown as Value Points 1 and 2, in our opinion it would not be appropriate to set lower rates bearing in mind that those locations may also “host” some higher value schemes. It is our opinion that individual schemes that are in these lower value areas should be looked at on a scheme by scheme basis. Where it can be shown that a residential scheme has particular viability issues then a case should be put forward by the developer which should then be independently assessed.”</i> This paragraph relates purely to the affordable housing requirement. The report recommendation is clear that any site that a developer thinks has viability issues – for whatever reason (including low sales values) – can be assessed. However	Consult on draft Developer Contributions SPD alongside CIL Draft Charging Schedule.  Consider approach to SAC mitigation measures as part of draft Regulation 123 list work.

		<p>this only applies to the affordable housing element. It does not apply to CIL. CIL is non-negotiable (unless a developer specifically applies for CIL relief). The results of the study showed that the proposed CIL amounts should be able to be absorbed by any scheme in any value point area, but that affordable housing contributions may be more marginal in lower value point areas. The Council does not agree that a map of these areas would be useful. The Developer Contributions SPD will set out the Council's approach to assessing viability concerns on a case by case basis.</p> <p>As part of the 123 list and Developer Contributions SPD preparation process, the Council will be considering its approach to the collection of funds towards SAC mitigation measures.</p>	
	<p><u>Question 4 Response:</u> Phased payments should be offered for larger schemes where it can be evidenced that this would help the schemes overall viability i.e. payment on various stages of development can increase a schemes viability.</p>	Noted.	Consider phased payments policy.
	<p><u>Question 5 Response:</u> Yes a discretionary relief policy should be considered, particularly in lower value areas where viability is already an issue and may be dealt with on a case by case basis.</p>	Noted.	Consider discretionary relief policy.
	<p><u>Other comments:</u> Section 6 (page 4) of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule proposes a rate of £60 for 'food supermarkets/superstores &amp; retail park developments A1'– the floor space size(s) the rate will apply for each of these needs to be specified. Section 6 (page 4) of the Preliminary</p>	Support for residential development charges noted. The Council has specified the floor space size that will apply to retail CIL charges in the Draft Charging Schedule.	Include floor space size for retail CIL charges in Draft Charging Schedule.

	Draft Charging Schedule - Support proposed District-wide residential CIL charge of £40 per square metre subject to the first bullet point in response to Question 1 above.		
West Midlands Housing and Registered Providers (HARPs) Consortium (represented by Tetlow King Planning)	Council should ensure that the delivery of affordable housing is not squeezed by the CIL charges that are set too high. Affordable housing targets should be the starting point for setting CIL rates.	The Council's evidence base documents of the assessments of the economic viability of affordable housing targets alongside CIL address this.	None required at this time.
	Nothing inherently wrong with the Charging Schedule. However, consider that the wording of the Local Plan (Part 1) affordable housing policies. Concerned about the potential for the affordable housing target to be amended via SPD. Any target increase will impact upon the viability of CIL rates. As a result the 'non-negotiable' affordable housing element would be squeezed- see no evidence that a commensurate reduced residential CIL rate would be applied. Policy revisions should be made via a Local Plan/CIL review.	The Council considers that it has robustly assessed the combined impact on general viability of housing development from a combination of a £40 per sqm CIL charge and an aim to achieve 20% affordable units on market house builder's developments. The Local Plan has been found sound, so the process of reviewing the 20% target when market conditions indicate this to be appropriate via a revised SPD was agreed by the Inspector. The Council considers that it would be unreasonable to do a partial review of the Plan just to deal with a change in the general economic viability of housing development. The Council acknowledges that if it wanted to change the CIL rate (other than with index linking) it would have to go through a second examination. So focussing on increasing the delivery of affordable housing by increasing the target percentage, if a new assessment of a general improvement in viability showed that this was achievable, appears to the Council to be an appropriate policy response.	None required at this time.
	Local Plan policy does not specific tenure split, but the Economic Viability Assessment evidence assumes 80% social rented: 20% suitable intermediate tenure, which included some affordable	It would not be appropriate to have to review the plan to deal with changed circumstances on tenure. The viability evidence is based on the assumptions about percentage of social rent	

	<p>rent. This split broadly reflects the SHMA Update (2012). However, funding changes now mean such a split is unlikely- assumptions need to be revisited and HARPs should be consulted upon this.</p>	<p>and intermediate including affordable rent from the analysis of demand in the SHMA.</p> <p>Affordable rent was never intended to make schemes more viable for developers. The Adams Integra reports therefore ignored affordable rent as a tenure in the study as its inclusion would have no effect on the overall viability of a scheme. For the purposes of the economic assessment report the term affordable rent is therefore embraced within the term social rented housing. If there is any difference in the revenue achieved for affordable rented units this would only have a positive effect on the viability of schemes. Also need to be aware that rents need to be "affordable" in local context.</p>	
	<p>Welcome assessment of C2 use class older people's housing- shame this was not continued in the C3 use class assessment. Typically these schemes are less viable than standard market housing schemes. Further viability testing should be undertaken to address this.</p>	<p>The Council agrees this point about market housing for the elderly. In response to more detailed evidence produced on viability by another respondent to the initial consultation and the Council's own Adams Integra report evidence, we are minded to recommend a <b>nil</b> charge for this type of development.</p>	<p>Consider nil charge when producing Draft Charging Schedule.</p>
	<p>Concerned that the Council has not included any real case studies in its CIL testing range. Agree with five 'value points' but more testing should be done for sites below 15 dwellings.</p>	<p>Adams Integra was provided with details of recently negotiated S106 agreements, including all of the financial obligations, to inform their viability studies. The Council agrees that some more detailed testing of the implications for small sites of charging CIL and seeking financial contributions to affordable housing needs to be done including some discussions with small builders who operate in the District (see response to Marshall Bell Ltd). Where small developments are entirely affordable units they</p>	<p>Undertake further work to assess viability issues in relation to small schemes. Consider outcomes in production of Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

		will be exempt from CIL and would not attract "pooled contributions" via S106 agreements for education or open space. The outcome of the recent DCLG consultation on financial contributions to affordable housing being limited to developments of more than 10 units will have implications for local policy on this issue.	
	Exemptions/CIL relief would help in the short-medium term delivery of affordable housing.	The Council agrees in principle that there needs to be a relief policy.	Consider discretionary relief policy.
	Support phasing policy- suggests a policy which requires instalments in thirds with final payment on occupation- attach Havant Council's policy as an exemplar.	The Council agrees in principle that there needs to be a phased payments policy.	Consider phased payments policy.
	Preliminary Draft offers sound basis for charging schedule subject to resolution of issue around affordable housing.	Noted. See above comments.	See above actions.
WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc (represented by Peacock and Smith)	Support for the proposed CIL rate of £60 /sq.m for food supermarkets/superstores. Consider this will not harm the viability of such schemes.	Noted.	None required at this time.