

**Summary of responses to publication of draft CIL charging schedule and priorities for spending 2018**

Name/ organisation	Oppose or support	Comments on schedule	Comments on priorities for spending	Other	Officer comment
<b>Local Access Forum</b>	unspecified		Include completion and promotion of cycle route to complete Poole Harbour Trails, as heathland mitigation project to reduce impact on heaths of off-road cycling.	receive	Cycle route around the edge of the harbour is unlikely to receive Natural England support due to the disturbance in the SPA. The preferred Poole Harbour Trails would also be very costly - beyond the means of CIL funding. The Regulation 123 list does not prevent access projects being brought forward where considered to be appropriate.
<b>Dorset County Council</b>	support	Should the rates be higher, headroom seems a little high, should be maximising income from CIL.			The reduced rates at Lytchett Matravers and Upton are for the allocated green field sites only, to allow for the site specific requirements to meet Habitats Regulations requirements of SANG provision and nitrogen neutrality. The full CIL rates apply to windfall/infill and small sites in these areas.

Name/ organisation	Oppose or support	Comments on schedule	Comments on priorities for spending	Other	Officer comment
		Need clarification on CIL funded and Section 106 funded projects /infrastructure to avoid developers 'slipping through the net'.			The Regulation 123 list is very limited and the possibility of there being any confusion / avoidance of payment is considered to be unlikely.
<b>Southwestern Railway</b>	support			Investment in infrastructure is essential to making developments sustainable and attractive to live in. Improvements to the railway cannot be wholly funded from Government or rail industry sources - local match funding contributions are essential.	There is unlikely to be any capacity within CIL to fund railway improvements but it may be appropriate to seek contributions through S106 agreements for larger local plan allocated sites.
				The proposals in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are generally supported. It is essential that railway investments are planned well ahead of time so that industry sources can be planned alongside and cost effective schemes designed.	Noted

Name/ organisation	Oppose or support	Comments on schedule	Comments on priorities for spending	Other	Officer comment
<b>Steve Smith</b>	oppose	Zero rating for developments over 200 dwellings means parish will not receive any CIL.			CIL has been zero rated so that development is better able to afford s106 payments that specifically address the effects of the development, i.e. provide infrastructure locally. The CIL scheme is set nationally to enable expenditure on strategic projects within the district, not projects local to the development.
<b>Martin Hiles</b>	oppose	By zero rating CIL for larger developments there is no local CIL for the community to spend.			
<b>Wool Parish Council</b>	oppose	By zero rating CIL for larger developments there is no local CIL for the community to spend.	Priorities for spending should be reviewed per area and per development		
<b>Studland Parish Council</b>	oppose	Increased reliance on CIL means the financial benefits may end up outside the parish. Significant rebuild in the parish has resulted in no CIL because they are rebuilds but there are significant increases in footprint. Should tighten schedule to prevent developers avoiding their obligations.			Concern noted and understood but the Council is not able to influence this as CIL payment exemptions are set in national policy, not at a local level.
<b>Rob Holden</b>	support	Key to map needs amending - should say Purbeck Centre not Purbeck. Colours don't match very well between map and key.			Map amended

Name/ organisation	Oppose or support	Comments on schedule	Comments on priorities for spending	Other	Officer comment
<b>Tetlow King for SW HARP Planning Consortium</b>	unspecified	Need to clarify small sites		Need to clarify small sites (H8 Local Plan).Need an instalments policy and encourage discretionary relief and have regular reviews.	Noted. The Council has considered various policies and reliefs and have an adopted instalments policy, allows discretionary relief on affordable housing and reviews the CIL Regulation 123 list annually to determine if there is a need to update it.
<b>Wyatt Homes Upton</b>	support	Supports the overall CIL proposed rates as far as they relates to Upton sites, they have some concerns in relation to the technical viability evidence			Noted.
<b>Wyatt Homes Lytchett Matravers</b>	support	Supports the overall CIL proposed rates as far as they relates to Lytchett Matravers sites, they have some concerns in relation to the technical viability evidence.			Noted
<b>Savills for Lulworth Estate, Redwood Partnership, Mr A.Jackson</b>	oppose	Support the confirmation that the Wool allocation under policy H5 (as an allocated residential site in the Wareham & Purbeck Rural Centre of 200 or more dwellings) is proposed to be 'nil rated' for CIL.	Need to include information on Section 106 to avoid double dipping.		The Regulation 123 list is very limited and therefore the potential for double dipping is highly unlikely, especially as both CIL and S106 expenditure

Name/ organisation	Oppose or support	Comments on schedule	Comments on priorities for spending	Other	Officer comment
					are reported on annually.
<b>Natural England</b>	support		Supports the intention to secure avoidance and mitigation measures set out in the Regulation 123 list.		Noted