



Philip Bisatt
Planning and Development
The Deane House, Belvedere Road, Taunton TA1
1HE
Tel 01823 356305 Fax 01823 356444
Email: p.bisatt@tauntondeane.gov.uk

Our Ref: PNKB/LDF/PD/4

Your Ref:

16th May 2013

Mr Andy Gadsby
Planning Inspectorate
Plans Team
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/12, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

Dear Sir

Taunton Deane Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): Draft Charging Schedule

Further to our previous correspondence, I am now writing to formally submit the Council's CIL Draft Charging Schedule for Examination.

In accordance with the CIL Regulations, I enclose:

- (i) The Draft Charging Schedule;
- (ii) The statement required under Regulation 19(1)(b);
- (iii) Copies of the representations received in accordance with Regulation 17;
- (iv) Copies of the relevant evidence;
- (v) Declaration under section 212(4) of the Planning Act 2008 (approved by the Council on 15th May 2013).

Electronic copies of documents referred to in Regulations 19(1) (a), (b), (c) and (e) will follow.

I trust this is acceptable and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Philip Bisatt

Policy Officer

Taunton Deane Community Infrastructure Levy

Regulation 19(1)(b)

Draft Charging Schedule

Summary of Main Issues Raised under Regulation 17

The Council received representations in accordance with Regulation 17 from 25 individuals and organisations.

The main issues raised in these representations are summarised below.

- 1 Benchmark land values assumed, their relationship to existing use values and whether the proposed CIL rates provide for a competitive return to a willing landowner.
- 2 Whether developers should be required to bear the full costs of flood mitigation on greenfield sites.
- 3 The impact of having to pass 25% of CIL receipts to parish councils with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4 Whether there should be an analysis of where funds will come from to meet the funding gap identified.
- 5 The planning and funding of infrastructure delivery during the transition to CIL and ensuring that infrastructure is put in place before development.
- 6 Whether the Draft Charging Schedule acknowledges recent changes to the CIL Regulations.
- 7 Whether the proposed differential CIL rates are properly evidenced on the basis of viability.
- 8 Clarity of definition of the proposed CIL charging zones and to what developments they will apply.
- 9 The appropriateness and justification for the proposed levels of CIL for retail development on sites in town centres and outside such centres.
- 10 The impact of the proposed level of CIL on some types of retail use.
- 11 The need for clarity on when S106 contributions will be sought in respect of retail development following the adoption of CIL.
- 12 Whether there should be specific trigger points where a review of the levels of CIL should be required.
- 13 Whether the Council should reconsider its proposal not to grant discretionary relief from CIL.

- 14 Whether the Council should provide details of its proposed CIL administration costs and processes.
- 15 The proposed governance arrangements for allocation of CIL receipts to infrastructure projects.
- 16 The need to amend the Draft Charging Schedule to make clear that S106 contributions will be sought for travel planning, site access and on-site highway requirements.
- 17 Whether the Draft Charging Schedule makes adequate provision for off-site highway safety or access issues via S106 and S278.
- 18 How the Council proposes to comply with Paragraph 114 of the NPPF.
- 19 Whether the Draft Charging Schedule strike the appropriate balance between raising funds through CIL and the benefits of securing development.
- 20 Whether the proposed CIL rates make adequate allowance for site-specific matters such as ground contamination, infrastructure, opening up costs and abnormal costs.
- 21 Whether CIL will increase the cost of a standard house.
- 22 Do the CIL rates make adequate allowance for affordable housing, including affordable rent tenure and assumed affordable housing incomes.
- 23 Whether relief from CIL should be given on open market dwellings on rural exceptions sites.
- 24 Whether the particular needs of sheltered housing have been adequately taken into account.
- 25 Whether sufficient allowance has been made for non-saleable space in flatted developments.
- 26 Whether the rural CIL rate is too high.
- 27 The extent to which the charges proposed in Taunton Deane are comparable with those proposed by other authorities.
- 28 Whether the proposed CIL rates will result in sufficient funds being raised to meet the identified infrastructure requirement.
- 29 Whether the Council has made sufficient allowance for residual S106 contributions.
- 30 Whether the 13 case studies used in the Viability Appraisal are appropriate to the situation in Taunton Deane.

- 31 Whether assumption used in the Viability Appraisal in respect of density, sale prices, build costs and profit margins, gross:net development areas are correct.
- 32 Whether sufficient allowance has been made for reduced rates of sale.
- 33 The extent to which allowance has been made for the incorporation of a range of less profitable non-residential uses on strategic sites.
- 34 Whether the costs and planning risks associated with promotion of strategic greenfield sites should be allowed for.
- 35 Whether a 'viability buffer' should be applied.
- 36 The Draft Charging Schedule should adequately explain the way that CIL will operate in respect of the proposed urban extensions in Taunton and Wellington.
- 37 The need for a clear definition of 'buildings' in the Draft Charging Schedule to exclude railway operational development.