

Christine Self**Programme Officer**

Homefield House, Homefield Road
Saltford, Bristol BS31 3EG
Tel: 01225-872654
e-mail ac.self@blueyonder.co.uk

Mr Ed Gerry , Planning Policy Manager
Forward Planning Department
North Dorset District Council
Nordon
Salisbury Road
Blandford Forum DT11 7LL

From the Inspector:-

Dear Mr Gerry,

Examination of the North Dorset Draft Charging Schedule

1) I would like to make sure that I fully understand the content of the Viability Studies. For the most part I find them clear as to the assumptions used and the way that the analysis has been carried out. However, I would appreciate some additional clarification on the following points.

Residential

i) Flats

In Section 2 of the Update Report, Table 2.1 shows average sales values – it is the new flats average price that interests me, since CIL only affects new build. I understand that Blandford Forum and Sturminster Newton produce too small a sample size to be representative, but I do not understand how an average figure, at the bottom of the table, can be calculated which is more than 10% lower than the figures which can be quoted for Gillingham and Shaftsbury.

This then leads me to uncertainty as to how the price per square metre for sales values for flats is calculated. In Appendix A of the February Final Report, on page 58, dwelling floor areas assumptions are set out as (for flats) 59 sq m NIA and 62 sq m GIA. I assume that it is NIA that would be used to determine sales values, but if I am wrong, please explain. But whether it is NIA or GIA, 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.

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.

- 2) Moving to the consideration of representations, I wish to have comment on the points that follow.
- ii) Persimmon Homes South Coast makes points about the relationship between Starter Homes and the shared ownership element of affordable housing, and in particular the impact of the new Affordable Rent regime. Please respond to these points.
 - iii) Again Persimmon refers to the 123 List and claims that where generic types of infrastructure are included, section 106 contributions cannot be sought on any projects in that category, and that the wording should reflect the Government's Guidance on CIL. I am not sure whether this part of the representation would be met by the substitution of "and" for "or" mentioned in the final paragraph of the representation, but I wish to have the Council's comment on the representation as a whole. In addition, Savills, on behalf of Consortium of landowners and developers, makes a similar point in the third bullet point.

Leading on from this I note that on pages 5 and 6 of the Update Report the matter of Infrastructure costs specific to the Gillingham southern extension are addressed. Under paragraph 2.4.4b an explanation is given for assuming, for the purposes of the viability study, that the whole cost of infrastructure required for the southern extension will come from section 106/278 agreements.

Please confirm, as I assume, that the Council has made an assessment that these costs for infrastructure, amounting to an estimated £18m, are likely to be achievable bearing in mind the 'pooling' restrictions on s106 obligations. I ask this bearing in mind the content of the Policy 21 section of the adopted Local Plan Part 1 that shows 3 separate large areas for housing growth around Gillingham to the south and east, together with employment development, with the involvement of a number of separate landowners and developers and a development period up to 2031. In addition, this section of the Local Plan makes clear (paragraph 9.23) that the Council will look to secure financial contributions through CIL.

- iv) Savills, on behalf of Consortium of landowners and developers, makes a point about the delineation of the £30/£45 rates and that sites around the towns would pay the £45 rate, which is not supported by the viability report (bullet points 1 and 2). Comment please.
- v) Please also comment on the inadequate 'buffer' point and bullet points 4 and 5 of Savills representations.

Retail

- vi) Section 3 of the representation on behalf of Clemdell Ltd deals with the Town Centre Retail Changing Zone for Blandford Forum, questioning the appropriateness of Figure 6 in Appendix B of the Draft Charging Schedule. It suggests that the Zone has been wrongly delineated in terms of its extent and questions the use of this Plan in the Viability Report. I have some sympathy for the points made by the Jonathan Kamm Consultancy, and ask for the Council's response to the points made.

Please respond by close of business on Friday 4 November.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

Examiner