



**NORTH DORSET  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
COMMUNITY  
INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**



**STATEMENT OF  
CONSULTATION**





**NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL  
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

**STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT CIL  
CHARGING SCHEDULE FOR NORTH DORSET**

**September 2016**



# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 A Charging Authority is required to submit its proposed Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Rates for examination by an appropriate person. One of the documents which must be submitted to the Examiner<sup>1</sup> is a statement setting out that representations were properly made<sup>2</sup>, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations, or that no such representations were made. Copies of any properly made representations must be submitted.
- 1.2 North Dorset District Council has complied with the statutory requirements for consultation, as set out in subsequent sections of this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 19(1)(b) of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with Regulation 17 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

## 2. Consultation Undertaken

2.1 The Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) public consultation required by the Regulations<sup>3</sup> took place between 17 June and 29 July 2016 when the Council sought views on the CIL rates it proposed to charge across the District for different types of development:

Area/Use	Proposed CIL Rate (per square metre)
Residential development within Shaftesbury ♦	£30
Residential development within Blandford ♦	
Residential development within Sturminster Newton ♦	
Residential development within Gillingham ♦ (with the exception of the Strategic Site Allocation)	
Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation ♦♦	£0
Residential development within rural areas (outside the four main settlements set out above)	£45
Residential flatted developments	£0
Retirement properties ○	£30
Extra care properties and care homes ∞	£0
Retail development outside the town centre boundaries and the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation ♦♦♦	£70
All other forms of non-residential floorspace	£0

- ♦ For the purposes of the CIL, the charging zones will be those set out in Appendix B to this Draft Charging Schedule document. Residential flatted developments will be zero rated.
- ♦♦ For the purposes of the CIL, the boundary of the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation will be that shown in Figure 9.1 of the adopted Local Plan Part 1 and set out in Appendix B to this Draft Charging Schedule document.
- ♦♦♦ For the purposes of the CIL, town centre boundaries will be those set out in Appendix B to this Draft Charging Schedule document.
- Retirement properties (also known as sheltered housing) are essentially defined as groups of dwellings, often flats and bungalows, which provide independent, self-contained homes. There may well be some element of communal facilities, such as a lounge or warden.
- ∞ Extra care properties (also known as assisted living) are defined as schemes designed for an elderly population that may require further assistance with certain aspects of their day to day life. Such schemes will often have their own staff and may provide one or more meals per day. Care homes are defined as residential or nursing homes where 24 hour personal care and/or nursing care are provided together with all meals.

A series of charging zone maps accompanied the DCS.

2.2 Views were also sought on a Draft Instalments Policy:

CIL payable	Number of instalments	Instalments
Up to £30,000 (about 10 dwellings*)	3	1/3 payable 60 days from commencement** 1/3 payable 180 days from commencement 1/3 payable 270 days from commencement

<sup>3</sup> Regulations 16 and 17 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Between £30,000 and £60,000 (about 10 - 20 dwellings*)	3	1/3 payable 60 days from commencement 1/3 payable 270 days from commencement 1/3 payable 365 days from commencement
Between £60,000 and £150,000 (about 20 - 50 dwellings*)	4	1/4 payable 60 days from commencement 1/4 payable 180 days from commencement 1/4 payable 365 days from commencement 1/4 payable 420 days from commencement
More than £150,000 (more than about 50 dwellings*)	4	1/4 payable 60 days from commencement 1/4 payable 180 days from commencement 1/4 payable 365 days from commencement 1/4 payable 540 days from commencement

\* Dwelling numbers for illustrative purposes only.

\*\* Commencement is taken to be the earliest date on which any material operation is carried out as set out in Section 56(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

and on a Draft Regulation 123 List which is included in this document at Appendix A.

- 2.3 The DCS consultation was publicised on the Council's website and by advertisement in the Blackmore Vale Magazine (Appendix B). In addition, letters were sent out to the District's main libraries (Appendix C) together with a poster drawing the public's attention to the consultation (Appendix D). The various consultation documents, together with other supporting material, were available at the libraries as well as in the Council's main office in Blandford Forum and on the Council's website.
- 2.4 Respondents to the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS)<sup>4</sup> consultation, together with the consultation bodies<sup>5</sup>, were directly invited to comment on the DCS and received an e-mail or letter (Appendix E) advising them of the consultation.
- 2.5 The consultation and supporting documents were:
- The Consultation and the Next Stages
  - Statement of the Representations Procedure
  - Draft Charging Schedule
  - Draft Regulation 123 List
  - Draft Instalments Policy
  - Infrastructure Funding Gap
  - Section 106, CIL and Affordable Housing
  - PDCS Consultation Responses
  - Infrastructure Delivery Plan
  - North Dorset Whole Plan Viability and CIL Study Final Report
  - North Dorset Whole Plan Viability and CIL Study Update Report
- 2.6 The Council received 14 'duly made' representations by the closing date from

---

<sup>4</sup> Carried out between 24 July and 18 September 2015.

<sup>5</sup> Regulation 15(3) of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

organisations / individuals in accordance with CIL Regulation 17. There were no 'not duly made' representations. A full list of respondents may be found in the Table set out at Appendix F along with a summary of each of their comments.

- 2.7 There were five requests to be heard at any Hearing which might be arranged as part of the Examination of the Draft Charging Schedule.

### 3. Consultation Responses

- 3.1 The various responses received to the consultation on the DCS are summarised in Appendix F. Individual responses are to be found in full on the Council's website at: <https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/northdorsetcil>
- 3.2 The main points raised by respondents to the consultation are set out below:
- Starter homes not properly dealt with in cost and value assumptions and in relation to affordable rents
  - Development costs incorrect as do not take proper account of provision of service network, landscaping, etc. - only relate to actual construction
  - Proposed CIL rates set too low/high
  - Zero rating of Gillingham strategic site supported
  - Regulation 123 List should specify projects and not take generic approach
  - Regulation 123 List does not show apportionment of CIL funds to schemes
  - Instalments Policy supported
  - Council should implement discretionary reliefs
  - Council should commit to CIL review date
  - No rationale for town centre boundaries
  - Flooding alleviation and nitrogen reduction measures in Regulation 123 welcomed
  - Outdated information used for PDCS
  - Proposed rates show bias towards towns with retail charging zones - larger village centres should be treated the same as town centres.

## APPENDIX A

### Infrastructure Types to be funded by CIL in whole or in part

<b>Infrastructure type (funded by CIL in whole or in part )</b>	<b>Exclusions (funded by S106 or S278 payments* or alternative measures)</b>
<b>Transport infrastructure provision and improvement</b> (including the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of new and existing roads, highways, traffic management, public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes and other transport facilities).	Transport and highway improvements which are directly related to a development, including development specific mitigation works on, or directly related to, a development site in the context of a Transport Assessment (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Education facilities</b> (embracing the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of existing and new public education facilities (excluding sites which will be secured through S.106 Agreements).	Provision of education facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Sport, recreation and leisure facilities</b> (formal and informal, including pitches and accommodation, non-pitch facilities, leisure centres and swimming pools).	Provision of sport, recreation and leisure facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Health care facilities</b> (including the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of existing and new primary health care facilities).	Provision of health care facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Community care facilities</b> (including social care institutions providing for older people and people with mental health or learning disabilities).	Provision of community care facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> .
<b>Open space provision, amenity and environmental improvements</b> (including publicly accessible open space, allotments, nature reserves and Dorset Heathlands mitigation projects).	Provision of open space, amenity and environmental improvements which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Public realm enhancements</b> (including public art and landscaping).	Provision of public realm enhancements which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Public services facilities</b> (including emergency services and waste management).	Provision of public services facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>♦</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed

	to five or fewer developments.
<b>Community facilities</b> (libraries and community centres, meeting places and arts facilities but excluding places of worship).	Provision of community facilities which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>◆</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.
<b>Surface water, flood risk and water quality mitigation works</b> (strategic works only - excluding mitigation of surface water run-off back to greenfield sites but including mitigation measures for Poole Harbour in line with the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD).	Provision of surface water and flood risk mitigation works which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) <sup>◆</sup> or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.

\* Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980.

<sup>◆</sup>The boundary of the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation is shown in the Draft Charging Schedule.

**NB** The order of this list does not imply any preference or priority.

Advertisement placed in the Blackmore Vale Magazine 17 June 2016 issue.



**NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL -  
CONSULTATION ON COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE  
LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE**

**Statement of the Representations Procedure**

The Council has published a Draft Charging Schedule for consultation under Regulation 16 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

**The consultation period is from 17 June 2016 to 4.00pm on 29 July 2016.** Representations received after this date or anonymous representations will not be considered. Representations must therefore include a contact name and address (e-mail and/or postal). Providing a contact telephone number would also be helpful.

Further information and electronic copies of the Draft Charging Schedule and associated and supporting documents are available to view online via the following link:  
<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

The online submission of representations is encouraged and the response form can be found at:  
<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

Paper copies of the relevant documents can be viewed at the Council's offices in Blandford Forum (address detailed below) and the libraries within the District (located in Blandford Forum, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton) during normal opening hours throughout the consultation. Those wishing to comment are requested to use the standard response form provided. Comments should be sent to:  
Planning Policy Team, North Dorset District Council, Nordon, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum, Dorset, DT11 7LL  
or by e-mail to:  
[planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk)

Please note that any comments submitted will not be confidential and will be made publicly available but address and contact details will not be shown online.

Any person making representations on the Draft Charging Schedule may request the right to be heard by the examiner as part of the Examination of the Draft Charging Schedule. Anyone who wishes to be heard must make a request to North Dorset District Council by the end of the consultation period. There is tick box on the consultation response form which allows representors to indicate that they wish to be heard.

Representations may also be accompanied by a request to be notified, at a specified address, of any of the following:

- that the draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of the PA 2008;
- the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and
- the approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

CUX

**Letter sent to North Dorset District libraries**

**Planning Policy**

*Our Ref:* CIL/LIB/1

*Ask for:*

*Date:* 16 June 2016

To all Libraries in North Dorset:

Blandford Forum Library  
Gillingham Library  
Shaftesbury Library  
Stalbridge Community Library  
Sturminster Newton Library

Dear Librarian

**North Dorset District Council  
Community Infrastructure Levy – Draft Charging Schedule Consultation**

North Dorset District Council is currently making preparations for the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in the District. The Council is required under the regulations to invite representations on the Draft Charging Schedule from people who live, work or carry on business in the area, voluntary bodies and so on as well as statutory consultees. As such, we would be grateful if the library could display the enclosed A4 poster for the consultation period and make available on request the enclosed copies of the relevant documents, which are also available on the Council's web site.

Please note that this is a formal regulatory stage in the process of developing the CIL for North Dorset. If members of the public wish to make a representation on the proposed neighbourhood area they will need to send their comments to [planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk) or to Planning Policy, North Dorset District Council, Nordon, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum, Dorset DT11 7LL.

The consultation deadline is **4.00pm pm 29 July 2016**. All comments received will be made publicly available and therefore cannot be treated as confidential.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

**Dorset Councils Partnership**

Serving North Dorset District Council, West Dorset District Council  
and Weymouth & Portland Borough Council  
Enc. A4 Poster advertising the NDDC CIL Draft Charging Schedule consultation.

Poster accompanying letter sent to North Dorset District libraries

**NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**CONSULTATION ON COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**  
**DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE**

**Statement of the Representations Procedure**

The Council has published a Draft Charging Schedule for consultation under Regulation 16 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

**The consultation period is from 17 June 2016 to 4.00pm on 29 July 2016.** Representations received after this date or anonymous representations will not be considered. Representations must therefore include a contact name and address (e-mail and/or postal). Providing a contact telephone number would also be helpful.

Further information and electronic copies of the Draft Charging Schedule and associated and supporting documents are available to view online via the following link:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

The online submission of representations is encouraged and the response form can be found at:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

Paper copies of the relevant documents can be viewed at the Council's offices in Blandford Forum (address detailed below) and the libraries within the District (located in Blandford Forum, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Stalbridge and Sturminster Newton) during normal opening hours throughout the consultation. Those wishing to comment are requested to use the standard response form provided. Comments should be sent to:

Planning Policy Team, North Dorset District Council, Nordon, Salisbury Road, Blandford Forum, Dorset, DT11 7LL

or by e-mail to:

[planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@north-dorset.gov.uk)

Please note that any comments submitted will not be confidential and will be made publicly available but address and contact details will not be shown online.

Any person making representations on the Draft Charging Schedule may request the right to be heard by the examiner as part of the Examination of the Draft Charging Schedule. Anyone who wishes to be heard must make a request to North Dorset District Council by the end of the consultation period. There is tick box on the consultation response form which allows representors to indicate that they wish to be heard.

Representations may also be accompanied by a request to be notified, at a specified address, of any of the following:

- that the draft charging schedule has been submitted to the examiner in accordance with section 212 of the PA 2008;
- the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and
- the approval of the charging schedule by the charging authority.

**E-mail/Letter sent to consultees and consultation bodies**

**Planning Policy**

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Ask for: Ed Gerry

Date:

Dear

**NORTH DORSET DISTRICT COUNCIL – CONSULTATION ON COMMUNITY  
INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE**

You have received this email as you responded to the consultation on North Dorset District Council's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. For information the Council has now published a Draft Charging Schedule for consultation under Regulation 16 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Draft Charging Schedule, associated and supporting documents and details regarding how to respond to the consultation (including a Statement of the Representations Procedure) are available to view online via the following link:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

The consultation period is from **Friday 17<sup>th</sup> June to 4.00pm on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016.**

Please note that any representations received after 4.00pm on 29<sup>th</sup> July will not be considered.

If there are any matters relating to the consultation which you cannot resolve by reference to our website then please contact me directly.

Yours sincerely

**Ed Gerry**  
**Planning Policy Manager**

Email: [egerry@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:egerry@dorset.gov.uk)

Direct Line: 01258 484211

**Planning Policy**

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

Ask for: Ed Gerry

Date:

Dear

**COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE**

The Council has published for consultation purposes the Draft Charging Schedule for North Dorset's proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). I enclose a copy of this and the Consultation Document for your attention.

Additional information is available to view on the Council's website:

<https://www.dorsetforyou.com/northdorsetcil>

The consultation will extend from Friday 17<sup>th</sup> June to 4.00pm Friday 29<sup>th</sup> July 2016. Please note the deadline of 4.00pm on 29<sup>th</sup> July - any representations received later than this will not be considered.

If there are any matters relating to the CIL consultation which you cannot resolve by reference to our website then please contact me directly.

Yours sincerely

**Ed Gerry**  
**Planning Policy Manager**

*Email: [egerry@dorset.gov.uk](mailto:egerry@dorset.gov.uk)*

*Direct Line: 01258 484211*

**APPENDIX F**

**Summary of Representations Received on North Dorset District Council Draft Charging Schedule Consultation**

CIL Representor ID Number	Title	First Name	Last Name	Company	Representing	Summary of Comments
CIL 102	Mr	Steve	Hellier		Highways England	No specific comments.
CIL 107	Mr	Paul	Bedford		Persimmon Homes	<p><b>Viability Report</b>                      Starter Homes – Report looks at impact of Starter Homes initiative but assumption that Starter Homes will replace the shared ownership element of affordable Housing totally at odds with Government Advice. Intended Starter Homes will be at least 20% of the units on a site. However, accepts that implications of this for viability will be unclear until further advice issued. In previous consultation round Persimmon highlighted impact that new Affordable Rent regime was having on Affordable Incomes. Responses to previous consultation stated that PBA would update the costs and value assumptions. Can see no evidence of this in relation to Affordable Rents. Has been a significant fall in value of Affordable Units as a direct result of the new rent caps going forward this must have an impact on viability.</p> <p><b>Reg 123 List</b>                      CIL introduced partly so that developers were clear about authority's infrastructure needs and what developers will be expected to pay for through which route. 123 List fails completely in this respect. In effect every infrastructure type suggested will be funded by CIL or 106, apparently at local authority's discretion (subject to the five obligations test). Not how CIL is meant to work. CIL Guidance recognizes that some site specific</p>

						<p>impact mitigation may be necessary in order for development to be granted planning permission but when a charging authority introduces CIL, Section 106 requirements should be scaled back to those matters that are directly related to a specific site and are not set out in the 123 List. Where 123 List includes generic type of infrastructure (such as education or transport) Section 106 contributions should not be sought on any specific projects in that category. Throughout Draft 123 List the authority in the exclusion column include the words 'or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments'. Clearly contrary to Guidance. Contributions may only be pooled from up to five separate planning obligations for a specific item of infrastructure (eg local school) that is not included in the charging authority's infrastructure. Test not whether or not the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments but whether infrastructure already on 123 List to be funded by CIL, whether a generic type of infrastructure or project based. In exclusions column the word 'or' should be replaced with 'and'. Rest of text should reflect that exclusions would not apply to infrastructure covered by infrastructure type list (funded by CIL in whole or in part). Wording should accurately reflect Government's Guidance on CIL.</p>
<b>CIL 108</b>	Mr	Richard	Dodson		Dorset County Council	<p>Dorset County Council welcomes continuing progress towards introducing CIL for North Dorset. In view of large funding gap of just under £95 million between cost of infrastructure needed to support the policies of the North Dorset Local Plan and the funding otherwise available, CIL charge will be essential.</p> <p>DCC welcomes statement in paragraph 1.4 of the Reg 123 document that S106s may still be sought subject to Reg 122 criterion as detailed in Reg 123 list.</p> <p>Remains concerned that that proposed rates appear low, especially when compared to those in neighbouring authorities. Whilst difference in the charge in rural areas between Purbeck and NDDC is not significant elsewhere, in towns the difference is significant.</p>

					<p>Accepted that residual land values vary between and within District but noted that highest CIL charge in North Dorset of £45 m2 is well below that for Portland, for example, where land values amongst the lowest in Dorset.</p> <p>CIL charges for Portland (£80 m2), Weymouth (£93 m2) and the rest of West Dorset (£100 m2 ) recently introduced (18 July 2016). CIL Charges in Bere Regis are comparable but in Wareham compared with Blandford there is a £65 m2 difference. Raises concerns that the assessments may not be compatible, or headroom afforded results in inappropriately low charges in North Dorset, when, for example, similar levels of Affordable Housing are required elsewhere.</p> <p>NDDC may wish to reconsider proposed changes to its affordable housing policy that introduced in direct response to Government’s requirement on site size thresholds, as will also have implications for the viability of smaller sites and appropriate adjustments should be made to calculations.</p> <p>Bearing in mind large funding gap that exists, essential that realistic CIL charges are set in order that, as NPPF requires, 'there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion'.</p> <p>Zero rating of Gillingham Urban Extension for CIL welcomed. Clear that will be a significant quantum of site specific prerequisite associated with this particular development and charging CIL, albeit at a reduced rate, alongside S106 would be unhelpful. Should also simplify calculation of a CIL charge on all other sites.</p> <p>As a major provider of infrastructure DCC is concerned that, as far as possible, CIL charges across the County are comparable and maximise income from CIL to close the gap as far as reasonably possible without compromising development viability.</p> <p>Although not reiterated in the current document, whilst governance and prioritisation of future CIL spend is the responsibility of NDDC, in practice (and in line with statutory guidance) prioritisation of projects will need to be undertaken in partnership with other infrastructure providers, including</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						DCC. DCC welcomes opportunity to work with North Dorset on appropriate allocation of resources available.
<b>CIL 109</b>	Mr	Owen	Neal		Sport England	<p>Sport England recommends that Sports development be added to the list of developments exempt from paying CIL on page 4 of DCS. Draft 123 List sets out what CIL money will be spent on. Advises that CIL will be used to fund sport, recreation and leisure facilities (formal and informal, including pitches and accommodation, non-pitch facilities, leisure centres and swimming pools). Considered to be very general.</p> <p>Not clear how the evidence base has been used to inform 123 List. IDP identifies a number of sites for the delivery of sports projects but exact provision should be stated underpinned by a robust need and evidence base – something Sport England considers that Council does not have at this time.</p> <p>In order to increase likelihood of CIL being spent on sport, 123 List should detail specific projects for sport, rather than having a generic section relating to the provision of sport, recreation and leisure facilities as currently set out. Sport England would recommend that the Council list the sports projects in order of priority and in some detail.</p>

CIL 111	Mr	Sean	Lewis	Tetlow King	SW HARP Planning Consortium	<p><b>Impact of proposed Starter Homes Regulations upon CIL</b></p> <p>Council will be aware that Housing and Planning Act 2016 contains introduction of Starter Homes. Welcome the fresh viability evidence which acknowledges the Government's Starter Homes programme within the assessment but note that Updated Viability Report – published in February 2016 – predates the Government's Technical Consultation on Starter Homes Regulations (March 2016). The consultation contains critical information with regard to provision of Starter Homes which will inevitably impact upon CIL and provision of affordable housing across District. Important for Council to review evidence in light of Regulations, expected to be formally published by Autumn.</p> <p>Consultation document proposes uniform requirement of 20% provision on all sites of 10 units or more or 0.5 hectares. Will inevitably have direct impact on delivery of more 'traditional' forms of affordable housing highlighted in Annex 2 of the NPPF. Concerned that Updated Viability Report does not assess the full impact of the proposed threshold upon CIL viability and proposed charging rates.</p> <p>Following a review of the Updated Viability Report and the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS), it is evident that over a one year period national planning reforms – including the introduction of Starter Homes – have impacted on the CIL charging rates (eg proposed charging rates for District's main settlements decreased by £5/m<sup>2</sup>, whilst proposed rate for the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation dropped from the £18/m<sup>2</sup> (proposed in PDCS) to £0/m<sup>2</sup>, as presented in DCS.</p> <p>Envisaged that with 20% Starter Homes Requirement, coupled with targets of Policy 8 (Affordable Housing) in Local Plan Part 1, viability of development will be challenged. Will be detrimental to the future provision of other affordable tenures.</p> <p>Urge Council to consider assessing the viability impact of the requirement to provide 20% of Starter Homes on all development sites of 10 units / 0.5ha or more on its CIL. Failure to undertake this may seriously affect</p>
---------	----	------	-------	-------------	-----------------------------------	---

					<p>future delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p><b><u>Instalments Policy</u></b> Support inclusion of an Instalments Policy within the DCS.</p> <p><b><u>Relief from CIL</u></b> In line with our comments dated 17 September 2015 (reference M5/0108-09) still recommend DCS incorporates discretionary relief for social housing and exceptional circumstances.</p> <p><b><u>Exceptional Circumstances</u></b> Introduction of discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances remains important. Not strictly necessitate the entire CIL charge being afforded relief but that amount necessary to make development viable discounted. Important because exceptional circumstances can arise on all sites, irrespective of size. Clear that in some instances cross-subsidy required to bring forward development; market housing required for this should be minimum to make the development viable. However, if CIL is required to be paid on market element of a scheme may alter number of market units required to bring development forward, resulting in perverse situation of potentially requiring additional units to fund CIL. Experience with HARP developments elsewhere in South West highlighted importance of needing discretionary relief to avoid schemes stalling.</p> <p><b><u>Social Housing</u></b> Strongly recommend that DCS incorporates social housing relief. Whilst this type of housing would represent a small part of overall development across District, growing sector of affordable housing. Ability to provide affordable housing with nil-grant and outside scope of S106 provision means being embraced and encouraged across the South West. Also providing model for development whereby 100% affordable schemes consisting of just low cost homes for sale can come forward, both through a Registered Provider and through private sector or third sector developments. Council should be encouraging this delivery mode and allowing for discretionary relief. Recent examples of where social housing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>relief been implemented are within DCSs of Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury (published May 2016). Here, Councils – at their discretion – can 'allow relief from liability to pay a CIL charge to new market houses sold at no more than 80% of their market value'.</p> <p><b>CIL Review</b></p> <p>In line with comments in September 2015, still recommend that Council specifies when a review of CIL will be undertaken. Note the Council's response to our comments within its PDCS Consultation Responses document but review mechanism would provide clarity for local developer, land owners and others who have an interest in North Dorset's construction and property industries.</p> <p>Take the view that CIL review LPAs are reactive to an industry that constantly changing and represents good practice. Recent examples of other LPAs in the South West that have committed to a review include Stroud District and Plymouth City Councils, former commits to monitoring of CIL 'due to the uncertain market' (Stroud District Local Plan CIL Draft Charging Schedule – Public Consultation, April 2016).</p>
<b>CIL 113</b>	Mr	Jonathan	Kamm	Jonathan Kamm Consultancy	Clemdell Ltd	<p>Proposal that 'flatted development' is to have a zero rate for CIL charging generally supported.</p> <p>Proposes that plan presently Figure 6 in Appendix B of the Draft Charging Schedule – June 2016 is replaced by plan identified in the Local Plan Part 1 as that to be used for development management purposes. Detailed arguments presented (see full representations) include view that DCS contains no source or rationale for the boundary used, therefore direct conflict with national policy as set out in NPPF and PPG. Would mean that parts of the retail area PSA in the heart of the Town Centre factually, and for national and local policy, and for development management purposes, would be treated as outside the Town Centre for CIL.</p> <p>Argues that no evidence that PBA assessed the viability of retail development in the residential areas (such as River Mews) of the present</p>

						Figure 6.
<b>CIL 118</b>	Mr	John	Stobart		Natural England	<p>Natural England comments on draft 123 list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fully supports the inclusion of 'Open space provision, amenity and environmental improvements', and specific reference to provision for nature reserves and Dorset Heathland mitigation projects. Recommend that specific reference made to delivery of the Gillingham Royal Forest proposals, as set out in adopted Local Plan.</li> <li>• recommends specific mention made of climate change adaptation measures (i.e. measures designed to reduce the effects of climate change) and measures for establishment of coherent ecological networks (as required by NPPF) within 'Open space provision, amenity and environmental improvements' category. Green infrastructure and resilient ecological networks play important role in aiding climate change adaptation, while tree planting can help to moderate heat island effects, particularly along water courses and urban areas.</li> <li>• notes and welcomes the inclusion of 'Surface water, flood risk and water quality mitigation works' category and specific mention of the Poole Harbour nitrogen reduction measures. Should also include specific mention of measures to reduce flood risk through river catchment management (i.e. measures to reduce flood risk through changes to rural land management).</li> </ul> <p>Natural England comments on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for measures to reduce flood risk through changes to rural management within River Stour catchment (i.e. the promotion of a whole-catchment approach to flood alleviation) should be included in 'Land drainage (including rivers and flooding)' section.</li> <li>• Welcome inclusion of projects under Nature Reserves, Natural/semi-natural greenspace, Green Corridors and Heathland Mitigation Projects under the environment section. Category 'Green Corridor' might be amended to 'Green corridor / ecological networks' to reflect the</li> </ul>

						<p>requirement of NPPF and mention of establishing coherent ecological networks should be made under the 'Infrastructure proposed / needed'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends that Gillingham Royal Forest Project (see above) is included within Environmental section.</li> </ul>
<b>CIL 119</b>	Mr	Michael	Holm		Environment Agency	<p>Pleased to see strategic flood risk management identified in the Regulation 123 list. As any development that is allowed by the authority in flood risk areas should contribute to any future improvements that it would rely on within its lifetime, any development that falls within the catchment of Poole Harbour must contribute towards offsetting of nutrient increases so should consider draft Nitrogen Reduction Supplementary Planning document (as published by the Borough of Poole) and may need to consider if green infrastructure needs to include reference to contributions for nutrient offsetting.</p>
<b>CIL 122</b>	Mr	Justin	Milward		Woodland Trust	<p>Q3 Draft Regulation 123 List - Section 2.1 table 'Open space provision, amenity and environmental improvements' heading. WT like to see this heading include reference to woods and trees for benefits they deliver for green infrastructure and environmental improvements. DCLG has now published revised (February 2016) green infrastructure planning guidance as part of national PPG which confirms that woodland and street trees should form part of green infrastructure provision.</p>
						<p>Draft Regulation 123 List - Section 2.1 table 'Public realm enhancements' heading. Like to see similar wording to that proposed in Cheltenham Borough Council's Public Realm, Art and Culture Regulation 123 heading: <i>Off-site provision, enhancements and management including tree planting, wider environmental enhancements, street furniture and signage. Interpretation of arts and culture in line with Cheltenham public arts strategy and tourism strategy.</i> This would fit with national policy on trees and woodland in the public realm.</p>

						Draft Regulation 123 List - Section 2.1 table 'Surface water, flood risk and water quality mitigation works' heading. Like to see reference in this heading to role of natural environment in flood and water management, specifically woods and trees. WT believes that trees and woodlands can deliver major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues, particularly those resulting from climate change like flooding and the water quality implications caused by extreme weather events. So looking for wording in the 'Surface water, flood risk and water quality mitigation works' heading amended to (upper case amendments) – 'Provision of surface water and flood risk mitigation works which are directly related to a development (including the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation (SSA)) such as trees and woodlands or where the requirement can be attributed to five or fewer developments.'
<b>CIL 123</b>		Linda	Scott-Giles		Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 1 – Although Local Plan has been adopted initial report relied on out of date information. Update report has used more recent information. Question 2 – Unable to make any comments as not sufficient information to be able to answer this. Question 3 – Degree of flexibility in report does not show how the Blandford + area will receive appropriate amount of CIL required to fund the infrastructure needed. Disappointing to see way CIL is proposed to be spent. Report or evidence did not take regard of any Neighbourhood Plans in progress or those already adopted. Question 4 – Policy does not include implementation and monitoring processes of proposed instalments.

<b>CIL 124</b>	Mrs	Nicola	Philips		Bryanston Parish Council	<p>Q1 Concerned data used by PBA is already out of date (2015)</p> <p>Q2 CIL rate of £30.00 too low. Insufficient information about latest build costs and sales to arrive at £30.00. Costs for infrastructure rising, not falling!</p> <p>Q3 Impossible to comment on a list, no indication of relative apportionment of CIL funds to each category listed.</p> <p>No account of infrastructure in emerging Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Q4 NDDC has considered assisting developers in managing their finances but not developers of the infrastructure projects who may also need to manage their finances.</p>
<b>CIL 125</b>	Mr	Michael	Hopper		Milborne St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan Group	<p>1.DCS as proposed clearly favours market towns to the detriment of rural areas. Whilst understanding that much smaller need for housing development in the rural area, amount set does not match main development areas and there is a clear bias.</p> <p>2. Retail development charge outside town centres again shows a bias towards towns. Rural community already severely disadvantaged, with cuts to public transport, and obliged to pay for parking. Local towns people have more public transport links and can walk to retail outlets.</p> <p>3. Town centres within main development areas have areas rated at zero for retail development, whilst all areas outside charged at £70 (subject to size etc.). More equitable to have the central areas of larger villages given same opportunity of having a nil charge area to encourage retail within that area. Could have benefit of reducing our carbon footprint and number of road trips. Issue of need to build the infrastructure to cater for these developments is responsibility of any developer and should not be used to discourage needs of the rural community.</p> <p>4. Proposed areas of zero charging for villagers should be agreed with relevant Town and Parish Councils. It is clearly understood that retail development in the villages will be low but again it should be encouraged. Current charging proposals do nothing for the rural community.</p> <p>5. These proposals, along with others made by DCC, are further isolating</p>

						the rural communities and will continue to allow them to wither. 6. Where charges are appropriate, note and agree with DCC's view that are somewhat low.
<b>CIL 126</b>	Mrs	Jenny	Balcon		Milborne St Andrew Parish Council	Parish Council fully endorses and supports the views submitted by Chairman of the Parish Neighbourhood Planning Group in response to this consultation.
<b>CIL 127</b>	Mr	Tim	Hoskinson	Savills	Consortium of landowners and developers	<p>Whilst rates proposed are not comparable with other adopted CIL Charging Schedules in Dorset, residential values lower in North Dorset and build costs potentially higher. Clear from PBA report that currently suggested CIL rates not allowing appropriate margin of viability for future development in North Dorset. Appears to be limited viability buffer for certain types of development to give confidence that proposed rates of CIL would not impact on overall plan viability/delivery across North Dorset. Relationship between residential values and build costs, as expressed, would not provide developers with enough of a viability buffer to deliver number and sizes of schemes required to meet North Dorset's housing targets for current plan period.</p> <p>The specific areas of concern are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- areas for £30/£45/sq m rates are delineated based on Local Plan Part 1 defined development boundaries (carried over from the 2003 Local Plan). Means that sites around towns that are outside this area (including those identified in the recently adopted Local Plan Part 1 north of Shaftesbury, south and west of Blandford, north and east of Sturminster Newton) would pay the £45/sq m rate even though NDDC's viability report only supports £30/sq m.</li> <li>- Additionally, land allocated in submitted Neighbourhood Plans, such as the Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan, recently submitted to the Council, is also excluded from the £30/sq m zone.</li> </ul>

					<p>– Reg 123 list appears to overlap infrastructure to be funded by CIL and Section 106 by seeking Section 106 pooled contributions for infrastructure already covered by CIL. Results in ‘double dipping’ and contributions at a level much higher than £1,800 per dwelling assumed in PBA viability appraisal.</p> <p>- Construction Costs – the BCIS costs used not take into account external costs associated with development of new home (eg only internal services located within building are included in estimates of cost and so significant costs of providing the service network for an entire development ignored). Other costs not taken into account include landscaping, roads/access, car parking, and professional fees as well as abnormal fees which occur in the majority of developments). Such additional costs associated cannot be ignored so estimate of build costs used by PBA can be viewed as unrealistically low. Table C1 (p30) within report shows a sensitivity analysis based upon increased build costs. Once costs are increased by 9%, most scenarios/locations shown to be unviable. Typically seeing build cost rates of £120-£150 per sq ft (depending on quality/location and type of build) as opposed to £90 - £104 per sq ft rates shown within the report. Largest house builders able to operate at the lower end of the scale, small/medium builders cannot, so applying proposed CIL rate under the expectation of lower than realistic build costs may lead to many small/medium developments becoming unviable.</p> <p>- In respect of tiered system of payments to reflect the scale of development, at present the draft charging schedule shows differential rates based on location and the type of development but does not account for the scale. It would seem unrealistic to expect a 1 unit scheme to pay the same rate as a 250 unit scheme.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Appears to be limited viability buffer for certain types of development to give confidence that proposed rates of CIL would not impact on overall plan viability/delivery. Margins of viability are so slight that factors such as</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						post-Brexit uncertainty, which could affect predicted growth in house prices in short to medium term, and continuing rise in the costs of construction, particularly with a lower pound, could easily sway the balance of viability, resulting in significant slowdown of development activity, other than sites of 10 units and under, where there is no affordable housing requirement. Will affect the delivery of market housing and affordable housing, which comes as part of mix, and associated infrastructure payments.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--