# NORTH DORSET COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY EXAMINATION

Examiner's questions, requests and points arising

North Dorset District Council's response to questions received on 9 November 2016

Document reference			
PHD.04			

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

### Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Council's response	4
	Question (i)	4
	Question (ii)	4

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

#### Introduction 1.

- 1.1 This statement is in response to further questions received by North Dorset District Council from the Examiner on 9 November 2016. The Examiner's further questions relate to the Council's answers<sup>1</sup> to the Examiner's original question 1(i) and are as follows:
  - i) I cannot see how the two figures for sales values per square metre for flats, of £2,300 and £2,400 (urban and rural respectively) are arrived at in Table 2.2 (although I note that additional sources are identified under Table 2.2). Please explain.
  - ii) Following from these points, there appears to be no table in Section 3 of the Update Report that shows headroom for a typology that is purely a flatted development. Please explain.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> North Dorset District Council's response to questions received on 25 October 2016. CIL Examination Document reference PHD.02.

# 2. Council's response

# Question 1(i)

2.1 As referred to in Paragraph 2.3 of the Council's response (PHD.02) to the Examiner's original questions, the data used to arrive at the sales values in Table 2.2 is set out in in Appendix A of SUB.10<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, discussions also took place between Peter Brett Associates (PBA) and local agents to arrive at the figures.

# Question (ii)

- 2.2 In updating the original viability report, PBA tested a 9 unit flatted scheme and a 20 unit flatted scheme. It was found that the headroom for each typology was negative. Consequently, PBA did not include a table in the report and instead added analysis in the text instead to indicate that there was no scope for a charge.
- 2.3 The results for each of the flatted developments have been summarised in a similar manner to the analysis to the discussion in Section 3 of the update report (SUB.10) and the viability headroom for each of the typologies is set out below in Table 1.

Table 1 – Viability headroom for flatted development.

Typology	Value area	Number of Units	Affordable Housing %	Headroom £ Per Ha	Headroom CIL liable £ Sq.m
Blandford Forum (9 flats)	Blandford Forum	9	0%	-£1,455,095	-£152
Blandford Forum (20 flats)		20	30%	-£2,694,048	-£402
Shaftesbury (9 flats)	Chaftachum	9	0%	-£1,455,095	-£152
Shaftesbury (20 flats)	Shaftesbury	20	30%	-£2,694,048	-£402
Sturminster Newton (9 flats)	Sturminster	9	0%	-£1,255,095	-£131
Sturminster Newton (20 flats)	Newton	20	25%	-£2,284,938	-£318
Gillingham (9 flats)	Cillia ale a ca	9	0%	-£1,105,095	-£115
Gillingham (20 flats)	Gillingham	20	25%	-£2,134,938	-£297

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> North Dorset Whole Plan Viability and CIL Study - Updated Viability Report, Peter Brett Associates (February 2016).