

# **Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule**

## **Statement of Pre-Submission Consultation and Summary of Representations**

**Regulation 15 of the Community Infrastructure Levy  
Regulations 2010 (as amended)**

**October 2015**



## CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Period of Consultation
- 3.0 Bodies invited to make representations
- 4.0 Invitation to make representations
- 5.0 Summary of the main issues raised by the representations
- 6.0 Changes to the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule as a result of consultation

## LIST OF APPENDICES

- A List of specific and general bodies and persons the Council invited to make representations & table indicating consultation method.
- B News articles
- C Newsletter - *Plan-it Bradford*
- D Council's Website
- E Summary of Representations and Council Responses

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a tool for local authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of the area. The levy came into force in April 2010 and local authorities wishing to utilise CIL to raise funds for infrastructure are required to develop a charging schedule.
- 1.2 A Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) is a document which sets out the charging authority's initial proposals for the levy, for public consultation. The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (the Council) is a charging authority under the CIL Legislation. This report will summarise the consultation process carried out for the PDCS, to introduce it to interested parties and prepare the document for the Draft Charging Schedule stage.
- 1.3 The Council will consider the comments received when producing the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS). The DCS will then be subject of further consultation before being submitted for examination.

### **Purpose of this document**

- 1.4 This document summarises the entire consultation process which has been undertaken for the PDCS together with supporting evidence consisting of:
- CIL Economic Viability Evidence
  - Local Infrastructure Plan Evidence
- 1.5 This consultation stage should be referred to as the pre-submission consultation as it will lead to a Draft Charging Schedule being submitted to the CIL examiner.
- 1.6 This Statement of Pre-submission Consultation and Summary of Representations will provide detail of those consulted and methods of consultation. The report will then provide a summary of the issues raised by those making representations and the Council's response to those issues.

-

## 2.0 PERIOD OF CONSULTATION

2.1 The consultation lasted for 6 weeks. Starting on Friday 31 July 2015 and running until 5pm on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

## 3.0 BODIES INVITED TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 The Council's main consultation lists comprises a number of bodies and persons of which is made up of the specific and general bodies outlined in Table 1 below, and those persons who wish to be notified about the preparation of the Local Plan. Appendix A provides a list of those invited to make representations to the PDCS stage and also the numbers informed by email and by letter.

3.2 The consultation lists accords with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (*Submission SCI 2006 and adopted SCI July 2008*) which also sets out the specific, general and other consultation bodies would be consulted during the preparation of Local Plan related reports.

<b>Specific (Statutory) Bodies</b>	(a)	the <b>Coal Authority</b>
	(b)	the <b>Environment Agency</b>
	(c)	the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as <b>English Heritage</b> )
	(d)	the Marine Management Organisation ( <i>Not applicable</i> )
	(e)	<b>Natural England</b>
	(f)	<b>Network Rail</b> Infrastructure Limited
	(g)	the <b>Highways Agency</b> ,
	(h)	a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area –
	(i)	<b>Calderdale, Craven, Harrogate, Kirklees, Leeds, North</b>

-

	<p>(ii) <b>Yorkshire County Council, Pendle, Wakefield</b> - 18 <b>Town &amp; Parish Council's</b> - 17 <b>Adjoining Town &amp; Parish Councils</b></p> <p>(iii) <b>West Yorkshire Police</b></p>
	<p>(i) any person—</p> <p>(i) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and</p> <p>(ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the local planning authority's area, <b>British Telecom &amp; Telewest Communications</b></p>
	<p>(j) if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority's area—</p> <p>(i) - a <b>Primary Care Trust</b> established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006</p> <p>(ii) - a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989 –</p> <p>(iii) <b>National Grid</b> - a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986 – <b>National Grid</b></p>

	(iv)	a sewerage undertaker – <b>Yorkshire Water</b>
	(v)	a water undertaker – <b>Yorkshire Water</b>
	(k)	the <b>Homes and Communities Agency</b>
<b>General Bodies</b>		<p>Bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area, including those that represent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• voluntary bodies</li> <li>• the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups</li> <li>• the interests of different religious groups</li> <li>• the interests of disabled persons</li> <li>• the interests of persons carrying on business</li> </ul>

#### 4.0 INVITATION TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The Council used a number of methods to invite people to make written representations and comments. The methods used by the Council are summarised in Table 2 below:

<b>Table 2 – How bodies and persons were invited to make representations</b>	
<b>Pre-Submission Consultation (2015)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation letters/emails to bodies and persons (see Appendix A)</li> <li>• Via a Representation Form</li> <li>• Via information included in news articles (see appendix B)</li> <li>• Issue 23 of the e-Newsletter - <i>Plan-it Bradford</i> - July2015 (extract in Appendix C)</li> <li>• Consultation information at deposit locations</li> <li>• Consultation information on the Council's website (see Appendix D)</li> </ul>

4.2 The Council requested representations be sent either by post or E-mail to the address specified in the consultation document and/or the representation form.

## 5.0 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ISSUES RAISED BY THE REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 A total of 46 representations were received from specific and general bodies and individuals. This is summarised in Table 3 below.

<b>Table 3. Summary table of comments received categorised into relevant consultation groups / bodies:</b>		
<b>Comments received from:</b>	<b>Number of comments received:</b>	<b>Details:</b>
Residents / individuals	20	
Developers, Consultants	6	The Brookhouse Group Ltd, Turley, Taylor Wimpey, Vernon & Co, Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes, How Planning/CrUVL
Statutory Consultees (Government/ Consultation Bodies)	3	Historic England, Sport England, Natural England
Local Planning Authorities / Councils	2	Leeds City Council, Wakefield Council
Town, Parish and Community Councils	5	Silsden TC, Wilsden PC, Steeton with Eastburn PC, Burley PC, Addingham PC
Councillors	3	
Specific Organisations	5	Country Land and Business Association Limited, WY Police, Theatre Trust, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
General Organisations (Groups / Societies)	2	Holme Christian Community, Ilkley Design Statement Group
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	



## **Summary of Issues Raised**

5.2 Those informed of the Pre-Submission consultation were invited to comment on the following reports:

- CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
- CIL Economic Viability Evidence
- Local Infrastructure Plan Evidence

5.3 The main issues raised are summarised below together with the Council's response. A number of comments and issues raised were not relevant to the three reports listed above, but were relevant to other parts of the Local Plan for Bradford. These unrelated issues are not included in the summary below. A full summary of representations and council responses are set out in Appendix E.

### **5.4 CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – Summary of Main Issues**

#### **Issue 1: General Support for CIL**

**Council's Response:** Support for introducing CIL welcomed. The Government's aim for CIL is to promote a fairer, faster and more transparent system for funding new infrastructure. The council consider the introduction of the CIL will be beneficial for the Bradford District for the reasons set out in the CIL background Report.

#### **Issue 2: Proposed CIL charging rates including:**

- retail warehousing rate is too high and does not reflect range of retail warehouse developments across the district
- the nominal £5 residential charge is not consistent with the viability evidence
- general support for the proposed rates
- the proposed rates will not address the infrastructure shortfalls
- the CIL may result in a further disincentive for developers
- the £20 in Zone 3 rate is too low compared to zones 1 (£100) and 2 (£50)
- CIL rates should be decreased to allow for increased S106 for affordable housing and to deliver more homes in areas of need
- general support for different residential charges for different zones in the District
- the impact on key regeneration sites needs to be considered

**Council's Response:** The council consider the proposed residential CIL rates are based on appropriate evidence and strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council will review CIL

-

rates in relation to updated viability and infrastructure evidence in light of comments received.

**Issue 3:** CIL Residential Charging zone map including:

- the map and boundaries are unclear and a more detailed map needs to be produced
- the charging zones are very diverse and include more affluent areas as well as less affluent areas. The area wide model adopted masks these variations
- the boundaries to the zones appear arbitrary and average house prices based on postcodes areas are not appropriate to define residential charging zones

**Council's Response:** National Planning Practice Guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the CIL charge. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values within zones; however it is considered the residential charging zones have been informed by robust and appropriate evidence in the District wide Viability Assessment.

A more detailed map will be provided at the Draft Charging Schedule stage in accordance with CIL Regulations.

**Issue 4:** Spending of CIL monies including:

- more CIL monies should be retained in the local area where development occurs
- habitat mitigation must be sufficiently funded through CIL/planning obligations or other mechanisms to comply with requirements of the European Habitats Directives
- CIL should be used to fund green infrastructure
- further detail on the relationship between S106 and CIL needs to be provided

**Council's Response:** The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is primarily concerned with the rates the CIL is to be set at, rather than the specific infrastructure items it will contribute towards. The council will provide further detail on the relationship between S106 and CIL as part of the Draft Charging Schedule.

The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped inform the Draft Regulation 123 List. The Regulation 123 List sets out the items of infrastructure the council may fund through the CIL.

The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL receipts to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. The Council has not yet made any decisions on any further local ring fencing. This is outside the remit of the Charging Schedule itself.

**Issue 5:** Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) evidence

-

- various comments relating to specific issues and infrastructure items in the LIP evidence

**Council's Response:** The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider comments as part of the LIP update.

**Issue 6:** CIL Viability Assessment evidence including

- the approach to retail warehousing rates
- querying of certain viability testing assumptions
- charging zone boundaries
- CIL headroom allowance

**Council's Response:** The council consider the viability assessment is robust and provides appropriate evidence. However, the Council will consider these comments in determining if further viability evidence is required in relation to inform the CIL Draft Charging Schedule.

**Issue 6:** The Regulation 123 List including:

- The 123 list is very broad and should be more specific and prioritise projects and needs to say how monies raised will be allocated
- The 123 List should include a list of matters which will continue to be addressed via Section 106
- Concern over double dipping of items on the list and S106 (e.g education)

**Council's Response:** The Regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL.

The Draft 123 List has been prepared in line with the CIL Regulations and it is not considered appropriate at this time for the Council to be any more specific, for instance, it is not the role of the R123 list to identify spending priorities within it.

S106 will not be sought for items on the R123 List in accordance with CIL Regulations. The relationship between S106 and CIL will be set out in the Draft Charging Schedule.

The council will consider comments when producing the Draft Regulation 123 List

**Issue 7:** Detailed questions raised regarding CIL implementation, spending, collecting and reporting

**Council's Response:** Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting and reporting is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.

**Issue 8:** General support for instalments policy and exceptions policy.

-

**Council's Response:** Support noted. The Council are considering introducing an instalments and exceptional circumstances policy, under CIL Regulations. A draft policy will be provided for comment as part of the Draft Charging Schedule Consultation This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be published separately to the CIL.

**Issue 9:** CIL process including:

- CIL must be based on a relevant plan, the Core Strategy has not yet been adopted so CIL should not be produced in advance of this
- Some concern raised over consultation process and that further consultation with communities needs to be undertaken

**Council's Response:** Consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule has been undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

The relevant plan is the Local Plan. The Local Plan Core Strategy is currently being considered through an Examination in Public. The CIL PDCS has been worked up alongside the production of the Bradford District Local Plan Core Strategy in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance. The council considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations.

## **6.0 CHANGES TO PRILIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AS A RESULT OF CONSULTATION**

6.1 Comments received at the Pre-Submission stage, provided a basis to help inform the preparation of the Draft Charging Schedule document. The comments were considered and reviewed by the Council's Local Plan Team. A Draft Charging Schedule will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as a way forward, in due course.

6.2 Changes from CIL PDCS to DCS include the following:

- Retail warehousing- rate lowered and geographically defined to Central Bradford in response to comments received and further viability testing
- More detailed charging zone map provided, residential charging zone boundaries have been aligned to O/S features
- Regulation 123 List amended in response to comments received including redefining sustainable transport schemes, education and community safety and health projects and inclusion of habitat

-

mitigation on the list. The Regulation 123 is now provided in a separate document to the DCS and statement on continued use of S106 has been added for clarity.

- The Draft Instalments policy is included as separate document to DCS
- The Draft Exceptional Circumstances policy is included as separate document to DCS

## APPENDIX A - List of specific and general bodies and persons the Council invited to make representations.

### SPECIFIC CONSULTEES

- Airedale NHS Foundation Trust
- Bradford & Airedale Teaching Primary Care Trust
- Bradford Hospitals NHS Trust
- British Telecom
- C/o National Grid
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- Highways Agency, Yorkshire & Humber
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- NHS Airedale, Wharfedale and Craven Clinical Commissioning Group
- NHS Bradford City and Bradford Districts Clinical Commissioning Group
- NHS Property Services Ltd
- Telewest Communications
- The Coal Authority
- West Yorkshire Police
- West Yorkshire Police Crime Prevention
- Yorkshire Water

### SPECIFIC CONSULTEES – adjoining Planning Authorities

- Borough of Pendle Council
- Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council
- City of Wakefield M D C
- Craven District Council
- Harrogate District Council
- Kirklees Metropolitan Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Leeds City Council
- North Yorkshire County Council

### SPECIFIC CONSULTEES – Town and Parish Councils within Bradford District

- Addingham Parish Council
- Baildon Town Council
- Bradford Trident Community Council
- Burley Parish Council
- Clayton Parish Council
- Cullingworth Parish Council
- Denholme Town Council
- Harden Parish Council
- Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury Parish Council
- Ilkley Parish Council
- Keighley Town Council
- Menston Parish Council
- Oxenhope Parish Council
- Sandy Lane Parish Council
- Silsden Town Council
- Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council
- Wilsden Parish Council
- Wrose Parish Council

-

## SPECIFIC CONSULTEES – Neighbouring Town and Parish Councils

- Bradleys Both Parish Council
- Cononley Parish Council
- Cowling Parish Council
- Denton Parish Council
- Draughton Parish Council
- Drighlington Parish Council
- Farnhill Parish Council
- Gildersome Parish Council
- Glusburn and Cross Hills Parish Council
- Laneshaw Bridge Parish Council
- Middleton Parish Council
- Nesfield with Langbar Parish Council
- Otley Town Council
- Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Trawden Forest Parish Council
- Wadsworth Parish Council
- Weston Parish Council

## GENERAL CONSULTEES – Local Organisations

- Activity and Recreation Centre
- Aldersgate Parent / Toddler Group
- All Saints Landmark Centre
- Allerton Community Association
- Anand Milan Centre
- Anchor Housing Association
- Apperley Bridge Development Residents Association
- Asian Business Forum
- Asian Trades Link
- Attock Community Association
- Baildon & District Residents Association
- Baildon Community Council
- Baildon Community Link
- Bangladeshi Community Association - Bradford
- Bangladeshi Community Association - Keighley
- Bankfoot Partnership
- Bedale Centre
- Bierley Community Centre
- Bierley Community Association & Bethel Community Church
- Bingley CVS
- Bingley Labour Party
- Black Mountain Millennium Green/Brunel Community Association
- Black Women's Support Project
- Bolton Villas HUB Project
- Bolton Woods Community Association
- Bracken Bank & District Community Association (Sue Belcher Centre)
- Bradford & District Coalition of Disabled People
- Bradford & Ilkley College
- Bradford & Northern Housing Association
- Bradford and District Association of Deaf People
- Bradford Association of Visually Impaired People & Centre for Deaf People
- Bradford Botany Group
- Bradford Cathedral
- Bradford City Farm Association Ltd
- Bradford Civic Society
- Bradford Community Environment Project
- Bradford Community Health Trust
- Bradford CVS
- Bradford East Area Federation
- Bradford Joint Training Board
- Bradford Khalifa Muslim Society (Heaton Community Centre)
- Bradford Lesbian and Gay Youth
- Bradford Night Stop
- Bradford Older People's Alliance
- Bradford Ornithological Group
- Bradford Ramblers Association Group
- Bradford Retail Action Group
- Bradford Urban Wildlife Group
- Bradford Youth Africa
- Braithwaite People's Association
- Brunel Support Works
- Buttershaw Christian Family Centre
- Cafe West
- Canterbury Youth and Community Centre

- Cathedral Centre Project
- CBMDC - Strategic Disability Partnership
- Checkpoint / Bradford West Indian Community Centre Association
- Claremont Community Trust
- Clarke Foley Centre
- Clayton Village Hall Community Centre
- CNet
- Community Service Volunteers
- Community Team Learning Disabilities
- Communityworks
- Cottingley Cornerstone
- Crossflats Village Society
- DDA Task Team
- Delius Arts and Cultural Centre
- Denholme Community Association
- Denholme Residents Action Group (DRAG)
- Dial Bradford
- Disability Support (DS)
- Drovers Way Residents Group
- Eccleshill Youth And Community Association Ltd
- Eldwick & Gilstead Horticultural Society
- Eldwick Village Society
- Fagley Lane Action Committee
- Fagley Youth and Community Centre
- Friends of The Gateway
- Frizinghall Community Centre
- Girdlington Action Partnership
- Girdlington Community Association
- Goitside Regeneration Partnership
- Grange Interlink Community Centre
- Greenhill Action Group
- Greenway Amenity Group
- Hainworth Wood Community Centre
- Harden Village Society
- Haworth & Oxenhope District Bridleways Group
- Haworth Community Centre
- Hazel Beck Action Group
- Heaton St Barnabas Village Hall
- Heaton Woods Trust
- Highfield Community Centre
- Hopes Centre
- Idle Cricket Field Company Ltd
- Ilkley Design Statement Group
- Incommunities
- Iyss Localities West
- KADAL
- Karmand Community Centre
- Keighley College
- Keighley Disabled People's Centre
- Kirkland Community Centre
- Labrys Trust
- Laisterdyke Trinity Community Centre
- Leeds Bradford 20-30's Ramblers Group
- Lidget Green Community Partnership
- Light of The World Community Centre
- Long Lee Village Hall
- Lowerfields Primary School
- Manningham & Girdlington SRB
- Manningham Community Development Centre
- Manningham Mills Community Association
- Margaret McMillan Adventure Playground Association
- Marshfield Community Association
- Masts
- Menston Cares
- Menston Community Association
- Micklethwaite Village Society
- Millan Centre
- Mobility Planning Group
- National Media Museum
- Newton Street Day Centre
- North Community Centre
- North East Windhill Community Association
- Oakdale Residents Association
- Oakworth Village Society
- Oxenhope Social Club
- PACT
- Pakistan Community Neighbourhood Association
- Pan African Arts and Cultural Group
- Parkside Community Centre
- Plevna Area Resident's Association
- Polish Community Centre - Friday Group
- Princeville Community Association
- Queensbury Community Centre
- Queensbury Community Programme
- Ravenscliffe & Greengates Community Forum
- Ravenscliffe Community Association
- Ravenscliffe Youth Centre
- Rockwell Centre
- Royds Advice Service
- Royds Community Association
- Rural Solutions
- Ryecroft Community Centre
- Saltaire Village Society
- Salvation Army - Holmewood



- Sangat Community Association
- Save Us Pub
- Scholemoor Community Association
- Shipley and Bingley Voluntary Services - Bingley branch
- Shipley College Library
- Shipley Constituency Area Panel Advisory Group (SCAPAG)
- Shipley CVS
- Shop Mobility
- Shree Krishna Community Centre
- Silsden Town Action Group
- Slensingford Area Residents Association
- South Square Centre
- Springfield Youth And Community Centre
- St Christopher's Youth Project
- St Francis Village Hall / St Peters PCC
- St John's Luncheon Club
- St Mary's New Horizons Care in the Community
- St Oswald's West End Centre
- Stockbridge Neighbourhood Development Group
- The Bradford City Centre Project
- The Diamond Community Cafe
- The Girlington Centre
- The Khidmat Centre
- The Kirkgate Centre
- The St Hugh's Centre
- The Vine Trust
- Thornbury Centre
- Thornbury Youth Association
- Thornton Community Partnership
- Thorpe Edge Community Forum & RCDP
- Thorpe Edge Community Project
- Throstle Nest RDA Group
- Tong -& Holme Wood Parochial Church Council
- Tong Village Community Association
- Touchstone Project
- Transport 2000
- University of Bradford
- Victor Road Community Project
- Visual Disability Services
- Walker Morris
- West Central Area District Federation Tenants & Residents
- Wilsden Village Hall
- Woodhouse & Springbank NF
- Woodlands Cricket Club - Oakenshaw
- Woodside Action Group
- Wyke Armature Rugby League Club
- Wyke Christian Fellowship
- Wyke Community And Children's Centre Ltd
- Wyke Manor Community Centre

#### GENERAL CONCLUTEES – Others (non local)

- A A Planning Services
- A Furness
- Addingham Civic Society
- Age Concern
- Aggregate Industries UK
- Ainscough Strategic Land
- Aireborough Planning Services
- Aldersgate Estates Ltd
- Al-Farouq Associates
- Allison & MacRae Ltd
- Alyn Nicholls and Associates
- Alzheimers Society
- Ancient Monuments Society
- Antony Aspbury Associates
- Archi-Structure - A Al-Samarraie
- Arrowsmith Associates
- Arts Team
- ASHLAR stone products
- Aspinall Verdi
- Associated Waste Management Limited
- B K Designs
- Baildon Civic Society
- Banks Long & Co
- Banks Renewables
- Barker & Jordan Architects
- Barrat Homes (Northern)
- Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West
- Barton Wilmore
- Beckwith Design Associates
- Bedminster International
- Bellway
- Belmont Design Services
- Bingley Civic Trust
- Bioregional Quintain Developments
- Birks Royd Stone Ltd
- BJ Design Services
- Blue Room Properties
- Bowman Riley Partnership
- Bradford Chamber of Commerce & Industry

- Bradford Civic Society
- Bradford District Chamber of Trade
- Bradley Natural Stone Products
- Bradley Stankler Planning
- Brewster Bye Architects
- Brooke Properties
- Brookhouse Group
- Brother Investments (Yorkshire) Ltd
- Burnett Planning & Development
- Butterfield Signs Limited
- CABA
- Caddick Development
- Cala Homes Yorkshire
- Calder Architectural Services Limited
- Campaign for Real Ale
- Canal River Trust
- Carter Jonas
- CEMEX UK Operations
- Chatsworth Settlement Trustees – Bolton Abbey
- Checkley Planning
- Chris Eyres Design
- Chris Thomas Ltd
- CJS Designs
- Clayax Yorkstone Ltd
- Clear Designs
- CLR Architects
- Colas Ltd
- Combined Masonry Supplies
- Commercial Developments Projects Limited
- Commercial Estates Group
- Contract Services
- Council for British Archaeology
- Council For Mosques
- Countryside Properties (Northern) Ltd
- CPRE Bradford District
- CPRE West Yorkshire
- Craven Design Partnership
- Cunningham Planning
- Dacres
- Dacres Commercial
- Dales Design And Developments
- Darrington Quarries Ltd
- David Beighton Architects
- David Hill LLP
- David R Bamford & Associates
- Deloitte
- Depol Associates
- Design Council Caba
- Dev Plan
- Dialogue Communicating Planning
- Dickman Associates Ltd
- Diocesan Board of Finance
- Directions Planning Consultancy
- DJ Richards
- DLA Architecture
- DLP Planning Consultants
- Dolmens
- Donaldsons
- DPDS Consulting Group
- Dr H Salman
- Drivers Jonas
- DTZ
- Dunlop Haywards Planning
- E&M Batley Chartered Architects & Surveyor
- Eddisons Commercial
- EnergieKontor
- Ennstone Johnstone
- Eric Breare Design
- Eye 4 Design
- F And W Drawing Services
- F M Lister & Son
- F S K Architectural Services
- Fairhurst
- Farrell and Clark
- Firebird Homes
- First
- First Bradford
- Firstplan
- Forestry Commission
- Foresight Bradford
- Forward Planning & Design
- Four Square Drawing Services
- Fox Land & Property
- G L Hearn Property Consultants
- G R Morris Town Planning Consultant
- G Sutton
- G W P Architects
- GA Sorsby - Graphic Architecture
- George E Wright
- George F White
- George Wimpey Northern Yorkshire Ltd
- George Wimpey West Yorkshire Ltd
- George Wright
- GL Hearn
- Gladman Developments
- Golden Cross House
- Goldfinch Estates Ltd
- GP Planning And Building Services
- Gregory Properties
- Hackney Carriage Proprietors Association
- Hainworth Shaw Quarries

- Hallam Land Management Limited
- Halliday Clark
- Halton Homes
- Ham Group
- Hanson UK
- Hard York Quarries Ltd
- Harrom Homes
- Hartley Planning Consultants
- Healy Associates
- Heritage Planning Design
- Holdgate Consulting
- Home Builders Federation
- How Planning
- Hurstwood Group
- Husband and Brown Limited
- Iain Bath Planning
- ID Planning
- IHC Planning
- Ilkley Civic Society
- Indigo Planning
- Inland Waterways Association
- Islamic Relief
- J C Redmile
- J G Nolan
- J O Steel Consulting
- J R Wharton Architect
- J S Wright
- J Slater
- Jacobs
- Janus Architecture
- Jeff McQuillan Consulting
- Jeff Redmile
- Jefferson Sheard Architects
- Jennings Nicholson Associates
- John Thornton Chartered Architect
- Jones Day
- Jones Lang LaSalle
- Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust
- Just West Yorkshire
- JWPC Limited
- Keighley Community Transport
- Keighley Local Enterprise Agency
- Keighley Voluntary Services
- Kelly Architectural Design
- KeyLand Developments
- Khawaja Planning Services
- Kirkwells - Town Planning & Sustainable Development Consultants
- Lafarge Aggregates & Concrete UK
- Lambert Smith Hampton
- Landtask
- Langtree
- Leeds / Bradford International Airport
- Leeds Friends of the Earth
- Leeds Gypsy and Traveller Exchange
- Leith Planning Ltd
- Linden Homes
- Littman Robeson
- M & G Stone Ltd
- M & M Stone
- Malcolm Bayliss
- Malcolm Scott Consultants
- Mark Wogden Architect
- Martin Smith Designs
- Martin Walsh Associates
- McCarthy & Stone
- McGinnis Development
- Metro
- Michael Beaumont
- Michael Hall Associates
- Michael Hudson
- Midgeham Cliff End Quarry Ltd
- Miller Homes Limited – Yorkshire
- MNB Partnership
- Mobile Operators Association
- Morley Borough Independents
- MSS Architectural Design Services
- Myers Group
- NAM Programme Manager
- Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
- National Farmers Union
- National Farmers Union - North East
- National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
- National Trust
- Nature After Minerals (RSPB)
- Nature After Minerals Planning Adviser
- Naylor Hill Quarry
- New Close Farm
- New Horizons
- Newmason Properties
- Nexus Planning Ltd
- NFU North East
- Nook Cottage
- North Country Homes Group Ltd
- Northern Trust
- Npower Renewables
- Nuttal Yarwood and Partners
- Nuttall Yarwood And Partners
- Otergraft Planning Services
- Orion Homes
- P Casey (Enviro) Limited
- P J Draughting Services Ltd
- P M Coote
- P N Bakes Architectural Consultancy

- Parkgate Design
- Parkinson Spencer Refractories Ltd
- Patchett Homes Ltd
- PB Planning Ltd
- PDS
- Peacock and Smith
- Permission Homes
- Peter Brett Associates
- Phillip Summers Groundworks Ltd
- Planning And Design
- Planning Bureau
- Planning Inspectorate
- Planning Matters
- Planning Potential
- Planning Prospects Ltd
- Plot of Gold Ltd
- Prince's Foundation
- Priority Sites Ltd
- Provizion First Architecture
- Purearth PLC
- Quarry Products Association
- Quod
- Ramblers - Lower Wharfedale
- Ramblers Association
- Ramblers Association, Bradford Group
- Rance Booth & Smith
- Randfield Associates
- Rapleys LLP
- Renaissance Planning
- Rex, Procter & Partners
- Robinson Architects
- Rollinson Planning Consultancy
- Rone Design
- Rosedale Draughting Services
- Royal Mail Property Holdings
- Royal Town Planning Institute
- RPS Planning
- RSPB
- RSPB North England Region
- Rural Action Yorkshire
- Rural Solutions Consulting
- Rural Yorkshire
- Russell Stone Merchants
- S M Building Products
- S R Design
- Safer City – Bradford & District
- Sanderson Weatherall
- Savills
- Schofield Sweeney Solicitors
- Scott Wilson
- SDS Consultancy
- Sense of Space
- Shipley Stone Sales
- Sibelco UK
- Skipton Properties LTD
- Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
- South Pennines Association
- South Pennines Packhorse Trail Trust
- Spawforth Planning Associates
- Sport England
- SSA Planning Limited
- Stainton Planning
- Star Keys Estate Agents, Valuers & Surveyors
- Stephen F Walker
- Steve Hesmond Halgh & Associates
- Stocksfield Construction Ltd
- Stone Federation Great Britain
- Strategic Services
- Strutt & Parker
- SWG Planning Services
- Taylor Wimpey UK Limited
- The Abbeyfield Society
- The Arley Consulting Company Ltd
- The British Aggregates Association
- The British Horse Society
- The Courthouse Planning Consultancy
- The Craven Trust
- The Design Works
- The Drawing Board (UK) Ltd
- The Emerson Group
- The Garden History Society
- The Georgian Group
- The Green Mineral Company
- The Lawn Tennis Association
- The Moravian Manse
- The Planning Bureau Ltd
- The Salvation Army
- The Theatres Trust
- The Twentieth Century Society
- The Victorian Society
- The Woodlands Trust
- Thomas Eggar
- Thomas Eggar
- Tony Plowman
- Tribal MJP
- Turley Associates
- Turner Associates
- Urban Splash
- Vernon and Co
- Vincent and Goring Ltd
- Vista Environmental Limited
- VJ Associates

- W E Leach (Shipley) Ltd
- Walker Morris
- Waller and Partners
- Walton & Co
- Watson Batty
- Webb Seeger Moorhouse Partnership Limited
- West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service
- West Yorkshire Ecology
- West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive & Authority
- Westfield Shoppingtown Ltd
- White Young Green
- White Young Green Planning
- WHP Wilkinson Helsby
- William Walker Partnership
- Woodcrown Ltd
- Woodhall Planning & Conservation
- Working Architects Co-Op Limited
- Yorkshire Aggregates Ltd
- Yorkshire Gardens Trust
- Yorkshire Greenspace Alliance
- Yorkshire Riding Centre
- Yorkshire Union of Golf Clubs
- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
- Zero Architecture Ltd

**NOTIFICATIONS – those individuals and organisations requesting inclusion in consultation**

Additional to those organisations listed above there were 1526 individual notifications sent out to interested parties and organisation who had previously requested to be included in Local Plan consultations. These mainly consisted of local residents from the District.

**Table of numbers consulted as at 28/07/2015**

<b>Form of Consultation</b>	<b>No of emails</b>	<b>No of letters</b>
SPECIFIC CONSULTEES	81	11
GENERAL CONSULTEES – LOCAL ORGS	129	193
OTHER CONSULTEES & AGENTS – including Minerals and Waste	278	166
BRADFORD COUNCILLORS & MP'S	95	0
NOTIFICATION REQUESTS	888	648
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1471</b>	<b>1018</b>

## Appendix B – News Articles

The following articles were placed in local newspapers, inviting interested parties to comment on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

- **KEIGHLEY NEWS** “Have a say on Building price” - Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2015.
- **Telegraph & Argus** “Public get their say on how much developers pay towards schools and roads” – Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015.

## Appendix C – Plan-it Bradford

Plan-it Bradford is the e-newsletter that keeps you up to date with the latest planning policy news and the progress being made on the Local Plan for the Bradford District. The following article appeared in issue 23 of Plan-it Bradford.

### Bradford District CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

**The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a tool for local authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of the area. The CIL is a discretionary tariff introduced by the 2008 Planning Act which local authorities can charge on each net additional square metre of development.**

The CIL allows local authorities to raise funds from development to help pay towards the infrastructure needs arising from the anticipated development of their areas.

The Bradford District CIL is intended as a means of contributing to the funding of infrastructure required to deliver the policies and proposals in Local Plan, including the Core Strategy and other Development Plan Documents. The Government’s aim for CIL is to promote a fairer, faster and more transparent system for funding new infrastructure.

### Public Consultation

**The Bradford District Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was approved at Executive on 21st July and has now been published for a 6 week public consultation from Friday 31st July to Friday 11th September 2015.**

The Council will consider all comments received and any updated evidence where applicable before issuing a Draft Charging Schedule (DCS), for further public consultation for a minimum of 6 weeks prior to submission to government for examination.

The Council envisages an examination in public on the CIL Charging Schedule in early 2016 with adoption of CIL by Full Council by April 2016.

The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and background evidence can be found at **[www.bradford.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.bradford.gov.uk/planningpolicy)**.

For further information on the Bradford District Community Infrastructure Levy contact Alex Bartle, Planning Officer on **[alex.bartle@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:alex.bartle@bradford.gov.uk)**.

## Appendix D – Council’s Web Site

Bradford Council has a web site containing links to all the services provided. The following information page was included in the web site and could be accessed via various links including the Development Plan page and the Council’s main Consultations webpage.

### Community Infrastructure Levy

#### What is the Community Infrastructure Levy?

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a levy which the Council may charge on new developments in the District.

The money raised will help the Council pay for infrastructure such as schools, transport, parks, open spaces and other community facilities required to support new housing and economic development in the District.

The Bradford District CIL is being prepared by the Council alongside the Local Plan for Bradford.

#### Public Consultation – CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (July– September 2015)

The Council is consulting on the first stage of introducing a charge on new development - a **Community Infrastructure Levy** - to support the delivery of essential infrastructure across the District. This stage is called the **Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**.

The consultation is focussed on the proposed charge rates in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. A Background Report has also been prepared by way of further explanation. The following supporting evidence base documents are also being made available for comment:

- Bradford CIL - Economic Viability Evidence
- Local Infrastructure Plan Evidence

### How to comment

Comments should be returned to the Council by using the comment form below.

Completed forms should be sent preferably by email, to the Development Plans Team by:

**Email to:**

[planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk)

**Post to:**

Development Plans  
City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council  
2nd Floor (South)  
Jacobs Well,  
Nelson Street,  
Bradford, BD1 5RW

Comments should be received within the 6 week consultation period which will run from Friday 31 July 2015 until **5pm on Friday 11 September 2015.**

**Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential and a schedule of all representations received will be published.**

### What happens next?

Once the Council has considered all the representations received, it will produce a Draft Charging Schedule, which will be subject to a further round of consultation before being submitted for Examination. The Council anticipates adopting the CIL charging rates during 2016.

### How can I find out more?

If you have any questions please contact the Development Plans team on 01274 433679 or email [planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk).



The Planning Advisory Service website provides further useful information on CIL

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>

## **Appendix E – Summary of Representations and Responses**

## Appendix E – Summary of Representations and Responses

Ref	Name	Organisation	Comment (Summarised by the City of Bradford MDC)	Council's Response
<b>General Support for CIL</b>				
0001	Mr McGibbon	Local Resident	Support the ideas behind the CIL charging schedule.	Comment of support noted
0002	Ms Hirst	Local Resident	Fully support a levy on house builders to ensure that local infrastructure is developed to support the extra families moving into the area. We need more good housing in Bradford and this should ensure that parents can get their children into the local school and that adequate transport links are in place.	Comment of support noted.
0003	Mr Rawcliffe	Local Resident	Overall support the CIL charging proposals.	Comment of support noted
0021	Ms Batterley	Wilsden Parish Council	Wilsden Parish Council supports the adoption of CIL by BMDC as the means of managing developer contributions to infrastructure	Comment of support noted.
0030	Ms Kershaw	Local Resident	Agree that there is a need for such a levy	Comment noted.
0031	Ms Robson	Turley	Support the general principle of introducing CIL in Bradford provided that the appropriate viability assessments have been undertaken.	Support noted. A Viability Assessment has been undertaken to support the CIL PDCS.
<b>PDCS CIL Rates</b>				
0001	Mr McGibbon	Local Resident	<p>1. Encourage the council to scale up the differential to the point where developers choose to build on brownfield instead of greenfield and choose to build where people have to travel less far to work.</p> <p>2. Encourage the council to use CIL as a lever to discourage building where the houses will be too expensive for all but those on high incomes. Support the way that the policy recognises the impact of commuting to town centres from outlying areas. Also the impact on countryside areas that are a valuable asset for recreational use by all Bradford residents.</p>	<p>1. The CIL regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence.</p> <p>2. See previous comment.</p>

0005	Mr Foakes	Holme Christian Community	The burden of charging Third Sector organisations for planning permissions should be at a discounted rate in comparison with normal commercial operations. Consideration should be given as an incentive for Third Sector organisations in the shape of concessional rates for planning applications.	<p>CIL cannot be used as a mechanism to encourage or discourage development. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations set out that there are some kinds of development which do not pay the levy. This includes charitable development that meets the relief criteria and types of development which the council have decided should be subject to a 'zero' rate in their charging schedules.</p> <p>In addition the Council may decide to introduce a policy for giving discretionary charitable investment relief, under CIL Regulation 44. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule. The Council will consider these comments when considering the introduction of any discretionary relief policy.</p>
------	-----------	---------------------------------	---	--

0010	Ms Harrison	Rural Advisor - CLA	<p>1. Concern that the levies proposed for residential use in Zones 1-4 covers all residential development. Rural dwellings are required to accommodate those employed in agriculture, horticulture forestry and other rural businesses properties should be considered separately, based on a suitable viability assessment, or classified with affordable housing for CIL purposes. CIL should not apply to these dwellings.</p> <p>Evidence is emerging councils are reducing CIL rates to £0/sq m on agricultural dwellings. South Lakeland BC and West Lancashire BC are listed as examples of authorities setting zero rates for Agricultural Workers Dwellings. Both these CILs are now adopted.</p> <p>2. Agree that the CIL rate for all other uses should be £0 per sq m.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. The charges proposed are set based on economic viability evidence. There is no current available evidence to justify a separate rate for rural dwellings.</p> <p>No viability evidence has been submitted to support why the proposed CIL rates would make this type of development unviable.</p> <p>There are exemptions in the CIL Regulations, which include affordable housing and self-build dwellings. Where agricultural tied dwellings meet this criteria they would be exempt from CIL.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p>
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	<p>1. Zone 1 (Ilkley) and retail warehousing at £100 m<sup>2</sup> seems punitive in respect of development costs and will limit needed development in terms of housing and jobs. Consider £ 60/ m<sup>2</sup> more likely to succeed Zone 2 This is also high, consider £40 m<sup>2</sup> more likely to create more development. Zone 3. No change. Zone 4, This should be higher to reduce green belt incursion. We consider £10 m<sup>2</sup> to be more relevant.</p> <p>2. The current balance for the proposed CIL levy would appear to benefit the most deprived communities the least</p>	<p>1. The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence and are considered robust based on available evidence.</p> <p>No viability evidence has been submitted to support why the proposed CIL rates are incorrect or to justify the different rates proposed.</p>

				<p>The CIL regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives such as reducing greenbelt incursion.</p> <p>2. CIL rates have been set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives. CIL monies will be pooled to contribute to infrastructure needed to support growth in the District and will thereby benefit communities across the District.</p>
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p>Given that rates must be set based on viability evidence and not planning policy objectives, should the rate for development for Silsden be higher than £20? Or is the reduce rate part of the tactic to encourage 1200 houses within the Silsden for development by Bradford Council bearing in mind such a number of houses will require and large investment in infrastructure.</p>	<p>The charges proposed are set based on economic viability evidence and are not to promote or discourage development in a particular area. The recommended CIL rates allow for a viability buffer– in accordance with the Government’s National Planning Practice Guidance and are considered robust.</p>

0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p><u>Individual Councillors responses: Cllr P Robinson c/o Silsden Town Council</u>          Opposed to this levy been raised in this way. Grants are available from central government towards new schools providing specific criteria are met. What worries me about applying a levy on developers is that the council is seeking to expand Silsden by approx 1000 new homes surely a levy would be a deterrent. If these homes were to be built surely then this extra cost would be passed on to the purchaser by way of inferior fittings or higher priced homes so defeating the object of affordable homes. Surely when homes are built they generate income by way of council tax band levy. Different towns within the Bradford area are to have different levy bands surely this would allow developers to cherry pick</p>	<p>CIL has been introduced by Government to contribute to the provision of infrastructure and support growth. The Government's aim for CIL is to promote a fairer, faster and more transparent system for funding new infrastructure. The council consider the introduction of the CIL will be beneficial for the Bradford District for the reasons set out in Section 3 of the CIL Background Report.</p> <p>The charges proposed are set based on economic viability evidence and therefore should not promote or discourage development in a particular area as the rates are considered viable in all areas. It is the intention that once CIL charge is set this will be factored into the land value and should not therefore impact house prices. Affordable housing which meets the relief criteria will not be liable for CIL.</p>
0017	Ms Hughes	Leeds City Council	<p>Leeds City Council has considered the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, particularly with reference to any potential cross boundary issues. It is considered that the rates proposed are reasonable and no cross-boundary issues are identified. Each authority has to set its rates on its own evidence and circumstances and to gain broad</p>	<p>Comment of supported noted.</p>

			zones across the whole District. Therefore despite some differences between Leeds and Bradford CIL rates for certain types of development, and particularly those between the proposed residential rates adjoining the Leeds District and those within Leeds, the Bradford rates are considered appropriate in their own context.	
0018	Mr Anthony	Theatres Trust	Support the setting of a nil rate for 'all other uses' as D1, D2 and some sui generis uses (e.g. theatres) often do not generate sufficient income streams to cover their costs. Consequently, they require some form of subsidy to operate and this type of facility is very unlikely to be built by the private sector as they are not viable in developer terms, but are essential social infrastructure for the health and cultural wellbeing of the local community.	Comment of supported noted
0020	Ms Parsons	The Brookhouse Group Ltd c/o Alyn Nicholls & Associates	<p>The Draft Charging Rate for retail warehouse development (£100 per square metre) will put development at risk and would render development unviable.</p> <p>Beyond existing development and approvals, no new large scale retail warehouse development is promoted by the Core Strategy. Consequently, retail development is likely to be small scale. The Draft Charging Rate would render such development uneconomic and undeliverable.</p> <p>The representation raises matters of concern arising from the viability appraisal for retail warehouse development which underpin the preliminary draft charging rate in regards to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. retail warehousing" is treated as a homogenous type of development</li> <li>2. whilst the rental levels and commercial yields adopted within the analysis may be achievable in some circumstances; for many others they will be far too optimistic.</li> <li>3. the build cost utilised for retail warehouse development is too low and does not reflect a "real world" scenario</li> </ol> <p>A range of examples are provided in the representation to support these concerns.</p>	<p>The CIL rates in the PDCS have been set in relation to viability evidence.</p> <p>The Council will consider these comments in relation to the supporting viability evidence for retail warehousing rates when producing the Draft Charging Schedule.</p> <p>Viability evidence has been reviewed in the light of representations made and some adjustments have been made to the Charging Schedule to ensure consistency with the evidence. This has resulted in a reduction in the retail warehouse CIL rate and geographical limitation to the City of Bradford.</p>



0022	Mr King	Natural England	Natural England does not comment on the charges proposed within charging schedules.	Comment noted.
0023	Cllr Mullen	Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council	<p>1. The proposed charging schedule shows the great inequality between districts, it is going to force housing growth in to areas that are already destined to receive a large number of new dwellings. for example, Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden, have been allocated a minimum of over 2000 new properties. This is going to almost double the size of the settlements. The settlements are already vastly underprovided for with infrastructure</p> <p>2. The proposed charging schedule will not give us the funds that are needed to address these shortfalls, we believe that the settlements that are having to take large amounts of housing growth should be much higher up the charging bands, in fact should be in Zone 1.</p>	<p>1. The CIL Regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed CIL residential rates have been set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives and are considered viable across the District.</p> <p>2. CIL will help fund infrastructure to support growth, however the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across</p>

				the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.
0024	Mr Stuart	West Yorkshire Police	West Yorkshire police have no comment to make on the level of charges proposed in the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, or suggested distribution of those charges.	Comment noted.
0025	Cllr Smith	Conservative Party	Supermarkets' are in turmoil so where will the CIL be received from this sector?	CIL is considered viable on larger supermarket development based on the CIL viability evidence.
0026	Ms Ledger	Sport England	Not all sports clubs are registered charities, although many are; can we seek CIL exception for sports clubs run entirely for the benefit of sport where any profits are reinvested back into the sports and primary ancillary facilities? The council may also consider making schools and colleges CIL exempt or reduce their fees where they provide community use of facilities for the same reason.	<p>The CIL Regulations set out that there are some kinds of development which do not pay the levy. This includes charitable development that meets the relief criteria and types of development which the council have decided should be subject to a 'zero' rate in their charging schedules. The PDCS proposes a nil CIL rate for 'all other uses' which includes sports/education.</p> <p>The Council may decide to introduce an exceptional circumstances relief policy and policy for giving discretionary charitable investment relief, under CIL Regulation 44. This</p>

				is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately after the introduction of CIL
0027	Councillor Sykes	Bradford Councillor	<p>1. Far too much weight given to the need to protect developer profitability</p> <p>2. The appropriate balance has not been achieved. The scheme is set to deliver £36 million over the 15 year plan period – at just over £2 million per year this will go nowhere near the infrastructure requirements of the proposed Local Development Plan. The CIL regulations state that the Council should strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure and development viability – the proposed scheme does not achieve that balance and will result in insufficient funding being realised</p>	<p>1. The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence. This includes allowing a sufficient viability buffer in accordance with national planning guidance. No alternative evidence has been provided on why the profit assumptions used in the viability model is incorrect or what an alternative level of profit should be.</p> <p>2. The council consider it has struck an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development.</p> <p>For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will contribute to infrastructure required across the District to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding</p>

				<p>source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>CIL rates must also be viable and not be set at a level which will put the delivery of development at risk.</p>
0029	Ms Holland	Wakefield Council	<p>1. The methodology and approach to setting the assumptions and rates is considered compatible with the approach taken at Wakefield, therefore Wakefield Council are in support of them</p> <p>2. It is considered that the rates are reflective of the viability evidence specific to Bradford; they are reasonably comparable to Wakefield in terms of the development types considered to be viable and the proposed rates.</p>	<p>1. Support welcomed</p> <p>2. Comment noted</p>
0030	Ms Kershaw	Local Resident	<p>1. It is very unfair that the Wharfe Valley charge is so high whilst the areas of highest density housing, such as inner city Bradford, is levy free. Whilst the Wharfe Valley has very many wealthy people, not everyone is rich. It is impossible for many people who have grown up in the area to buy locally and they are forced to move to different areas in order to buy a house. The high levy proposed is going to make it even more difficult for these young people to get on the housing ladder here as the levy will be passed to buyers thus raising already very high house prices.</p> <p>2. From my understanding of the CIL it would appear that the inner city areas are going to be the main beneficiaries of this levy therefore would it not be fairer to charge a basic amount, such as £5-10 for those areas which are at present levy free and thus reduce the top level a little?</p>	<p>1. The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence and are considered robust based on available evidence. Wharfedale is identified as the highest charging zone based on the average house prices and sales values. A nominal £5 rate has been set in inner Bradford as viability evidence indicates this area cannot support higher CIL charge.</p> <p>It is the intention that once a CIL charge is set this will be factored into the land value</p>

				<p>and should not therefore impact house prices. Affordable housing which meets the relief criteria will not be liable for CIL.</p> <p>2. In order to strike an appropriate balance a nominal £5 CIL rate is proposed in value area 4 as set out in Table 1 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.</p>
0031	Ms Robson	Turley	<p>1. Due regard should be given to the potential for development to be diverted from Bradford towards Leeds if the Council does not take a proactive approach to encouraging development in the District by introducing an appropriate level of charge thereby making the District a more financially attractive investment location.</p> <p>2. Significant concerns regarding the proposal to introduce a £5 CIL charge on development in Bradford and Keighley urban areas where viability is a significant issue. The current proposed CIL rates are not supported by robust viability evidence and it is considered a Planning Inspector would find CIL unsound at examination.</p> <p>The representation provides further detailed comments to support this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposed CIL rates should not contradict and should be supported by CIL viability evidence base as set out in PPG and CIL Regulation 14 balance test</li> <li>- lack of evidence in DTZ viability assessment underpinning the proposed rate in zone 4/5, specifically reference to paragraph 7.4, figure 7.1 in the DTZ Viability Evidence</li> <li>- the viability evidence demonstrates a nominate £5 rate cannot be provided and would fail to introduce a viability buffer</li> <li>- reference to the Trafford CIL Examination concluding a nominal rate in low/nil viability areas which could not support proposed CIL rates was at odds with both Legislation and Guidance. This should be recognised as a material consideration by the Council.</li> </ul>	<p>1. The CIL regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence and are considered viable across the District.</p> <p>2. Concerns noted. CIL Regulations require the Council to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure through CIL and impact on viability of evidence.</p>

			<p>BE Boys has a significant land holding in Keighley which it intends to redevelop in the near future. However, any application of a CIL levy in this location would create significant hurdles that would possibly render their redevelopment intentions unviable.</p>	<p>The DTZ Viability Report (paragraph 7.4) states small variations may be capable of justification particularly where they support the principle of achieving a 'balance' between the infrastructure funding need and viability.</p> <p>As set out in the Background report in view of the very small proportion of development costs and large infrastructure funding gap and critical infrastructure issues identified within in the main urban areas, on balance a nominal CIL charge of £5 for residential development is considered justified in the lower value zones. A levy of £5psm is considered a nominal charge which will not realistically put delivery risk.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	<p>Given the lack of developer interest in the District throughout the last 10 years we consider that the CIL may result in a further disincentive for developers, whom may decide to concentrate development elsewhere in adjoining authorities. This concern applies across the District in the various proposed charging zones where the proposed CIL rates may put off developers.</p>	<p>The CIL regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence and considered viable. In addition other authorities in the Leeds City Region including Leeds and Wakefield have or are in the process of adopting CIL.</p>
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	<p>1. Question the £100 per sq m in zone 1 and consider this is too high and may render some sites unviable and undeliverable. The high value areas within Leeds, which are similar to the high value areas in Bradford have a residential CIL rate of £90. This would be recommended for Zone 1 within Bradford.</p> <p>2. Question the justification for the £5 per sq m 'nominal charge' in zone 4 for residential development, despite the EVA suggesting nil charge. The reason for the nominal charge is explained briefly in the Background Report (para 5.29 – 5.31). Paragraph 5.31 of the Background Report states that based on the EVA indicating that a nominal charge would be unlikely to put delivery at risk, that a nominal CIL charge of £5 for residential development is justified in the lower value zones. The EVA however recommends £0 in zone 4 throughout the document and concludes at section 8 that in respect of residential, CIL is "only realistically possible in the high to mid value areas of the District." We therefore suggest the residential CIL charge in zone 4 is £0.</p>	<p>1. The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence and are considered robust based on available evidence. Each authority has to set CIL rates based on its own evidence and circumstances. Therefore despite some differences between Leeds and Bradford CIL rates adjoining the District Boundaries, the council considers the proposed Bradford CIL rates are appropriate and justified in their own context. It is also noted that there has been</p>

				<p>significant market improvement between when the viability reports supporting the respective charging schedules were produced. The market strength of the £100psm charge zone in Bradford is comparable to the Leeds £90psm zone, however it should be noted that the Leeds zone carries a higher affordable housing requirement (35%) compared to the Bradford high charge zone (30%) and given the relatively greater impact of affordable housing requirements than CIL on viability, the aggregate impact on viability in the Leeds high charge zone is higher than in Bradford.</p> <p>No further viability evidence has been submitted to support lowering the rate to £90.</p> <p>2. CIL Regulations require the Council to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure through CIL and impact on viability of evidence. The DTZ Viability Report</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>(paragraph 7.4) states small variations may be capable of justification particularly where they support the principle of achieving a 'balance' between the infrastructure funding need and viability.</p> <p>As set out in the Background report in view of the very small proportion of development costs and large infrastructure funding gap and critical infrastructure issues particular in the city of Bradford, on balance a nominal CIL charge of £5 for residential development is considered justified in the lower value zones.</p>
0033	Ms Bagley	Vernon & Co	<p>The DTZ Economic Viability Assessment recommends four residential charging zones. The CIL Residential Charging Zone Map at page 11 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) concurs with the DTZ map. The DTZ recommendation is for nil charge in respect of Zone 4, yet the PDCS proposes £5psm for the same area, a figure which therefore is not in accordance with the evidence base</p>	<p>CIL Regulations require the Council to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure through CIL and impact on viability of evidence. The DTZ Viability Report (paragraph 7.4) states small variations may be capable of justification particularly where they support the principle of achieving a 'balance' between the infrastructure funding need and viability.</p>

				As set out in the Background report in view of the very small proportion of development costs and large infrastructure funding gap and critical infrastructure issues particular in the city of Bradford, on balance a nominal CIL charge of £5 for residential development is considered justified in the lower value zones. Fundamentally, at such a low level it is not considered realistically likely to put delivery at risk in these areas.																								
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	<p>Raise three key areas of concern associated with the identified PDCS</p> <p>1. misalignment with the Council's own evidence base. It is clear that the CIL Viability Evidence concludes that in Zone 4 no CIL charge should be identified, whereas the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule identifies a charge of £5 per sq.m in this area. Such an approach is therefore not consistent with the Council's evidence base and should be amended.</p> <p>2. Consider the identified rates to be too high in some locations when considered against the rates being set by other local authorities in the Yorkshire region. The table below identifies the adopted and proposed CIL rates for each of the Yorkshire local authorities.</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>Local Authority</b></th> <th><b>CIL Rate Range</b></th> <th><b>Local Authority</b></th> <th><b>CIL Rate Range</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bradford</td> <td>Proposed £5 to £100</td> <td>Rotherham</td> <td>Proposed - £15 to £55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sheffield</td> <td>Adopted - £0 to £80</td> <td>Kirklees</td> <td>In Preparation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wakefield</td> <td>Proposed - £0 to £55</td> <td>Leeds</td> <td>Adopted - £5 to £90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Selby</td> <td>Proposed - £10 to £50</td> <td>Doncaster</td> <td>In Preparation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harrogate</td> <td>Proposed - £45 to £85</td> <td>Hambleton</td> <td>Adopted - £55</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>CIL Rate Range</b>	<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>CIL Rate Range</b>	Bradford	Proposed £5 to £100	Rotherham	Proposed - £15 to £55	Sheffield	Adopted - £0 to £80	Kirklees	In Preparation	Wakefield	Proposed - £0 to £55	Leeds	Adopted - £5 to £90	Selby	Proposed - £10 to £50	Doncaster	In Preparation	Harrogate	Proposed - £45 to £85	Hambleton	Adopted - £55	<p>1. In view of the very small proportion of development costs and large infrastructure funding gap and critical infrastructure issues, on balance a nominal CIL charge of £5 for residential development is considered justified in the lower value zones.</p> <p>2. The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence and are considered robust based on available evidence. Each authority has to set CIL rates based on its own evidence</p>
<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>CIL Rate Range</b>	<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>CIL Rate Range</b>																									
Bradford	Proposed £5 to £100	Rotherham	Proposed - £15 to £55																									
Sheffield	Adopted - £0 to £80	Kirklees	In Preparation																									
Wakefield	Proposed - £0 to £55	Leeds	Adopted - £5 to £90																									
Selby	Proposed - £10 to £50	Doncaster	In Preparation																									
Harrogate	Proposed - £45 to £85	Hambleton	Adopted - £55																									

			<p>Scarborough In Preparation  Craven In Preparation  Barnsley Proposed £0 to £100  Richmondshire In Preparation  Hull Proposed £18  North East Lincolnshire</p>	<p>Ryedale Proposed £55 to £70  Calderdale In Preparation  East Riding In Preparation  York In Preparation  North Lincolnshire In Preparation</p>	<p>and circumstances. Therefore, the council considers the proposed Bradford CIL rates are appropriate and justified in their own context.</p> <p>The highest charge rate applies only in Wharfedale which is an area with some of the highest house prices in the region. Many of the authorities listed are not realistically comparable.</p> <p>In respect of Leeds and Harrogate, both have higher affordable housing requirements (35% and 40% compared with 30% in Wharfedale) which are likely to make the aggregate impact of CIL and affordable housing on viability less in Wharfedale than in these other locations.</p> <p>No further viability evidence has been submitted to support lowering the proposed CIL rates in zone 1 and 2.</p> <p>The CIL regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development</p>			
<p>The table above clearly identifies that Bradford are proposing to set their higher CIL rates at a level above all of Yorkshire’s local authorities where a figure has either been adopted or proposed, other than Barnsley</p>								
<p>The representation identifies rates for Zone 1 are higher than adjacent areas of Leeds and Harrogate which share similar housing market characteristics. Argue housing market characteristics of zone 2 to 4 are more challenging than those located in neighbouring authorities. This provides a clear message that Bradford’s CIL rates need to be reconsidered.</p>								
<p>Concerned that developers will seek to ask the question of “<i>why would we invest in Bradford when we can get more return on our investment in other surrounding local authority areas?</i>” Market forces and planning opportunities are major factors which influence whether developers to seek to identify land interests within certain areas, however, return on investment is a huge driver, if not the biggest. Therefore, we are concerned that the Council’s current approach may seek to push developers to other authorities where they may consider better development opportunities may exist.</p>								
<p>3. The CIL Viability Evidence is clear in that the proposed identified rates within the document are a “maximum”. Concerned that the setting of the rates at the maximum level could have an adverse impact on those schemes where viability is in the balance, as a one size fits all rate cannot take into account site specific viability issues. It is our belief that a reduction in the proposed CIL rates for Zone 1 &amp; Zone 2 areas should be provided to afford some “headroom” and flexibility. If no reduction to the identified rates are provided we consider that such an approach will more often than not lead to a request by developers to seek to reduce the level of affordable housing being delivered</p>								

			within development schemes.	<p>or development in certain areas, nor do they suggest that rates should be set as a result of benchmarking neighbouring Districts. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence.</p> <p>3. The proposed CIL rates in the viability evidence are not maximum rates. Section 7.2 of the CIL viability Report sets out viability proofing accounting for a viability buffer in accordance with national planning practice guidance.</p>
0035	Ms Odwyer	Local Resident	Setting a rate as low as £20 per sqm seems incredibly low (based on based DTZ Viability Evidence) in comparison the Wharfe Valley rates (£100/sqm) would be more appropriate. Note Leeds CIL has been approved with justification document identifying £200/sq m would be sustainable.	<p>1. The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence. The council consider the proposed rates strike an appropriate balance between the need to fund infrastructure and impact on viability of development. This has been informed by the LIP and Viability Assessment. This includes allowing a sufficient viability buffer in accordance</p>

				<p>with national CIL planning Guidance.</p> <p>The highest CIL charge for residential uses in the adopted Leeds CIL is 93/sq m. Despite some differences between Leeds and Bradford CIL rates adjoining the District Boundaries, the council considers the proposed Bradford CIL rates are appropriate and justified in their own context.</p>
0036	Ms Thompson	Local resident	<p>Some sub areas, generally around communities in the greenbelt and particularly within communities in Wharfedale, show house prices holding up. It is doubtful whether greenbelt releases could be justified here given the data underpinning the plan. However, there is PDL land within prosperous communities that could be exploited more effectively to deliver genuinely affordable housing in areas of high need within the City of Bradford and the town of Keighley. Ilkley may have space for as many as 550 homes on PDL. It also has significantly higher property prices than other areas. This might be exploited by limiting development to PDL, decreasing CIL, increasing Section 106 funding for affordable housing and transferring the Section 106 housing receipts to sites in Keighley or Bradford where it could deliver far more homes and where there is genuine housing need.</p>	<p>The CIL Regulations do not permit setting a charge rate to encourage or discourage certain types of development or development in certain areas. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence.</p>
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>1. The proposal as published, while containing some good provisions, is fundamentally flawed and will lead to a distortion of forthcoming development. The Proposal needs completely re-thinking and not to dogmatically follow the findings of a consultancy report focusing solely on so called "viability". It also opens up too much opportunity for political decision making which poses uncertainty for the community and developers.</p> <p>2. The use of averages for particular spatial Zones of Bradford is the source of much of</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of</p>

		<p>the inadequacy regarding the proposed CIL on residential development. As proposed a low value (relative to the average) residential unit in, say, Ilkley will be penalised by a relatively high CIL, whereas a high value (relative to the average) residential unit in central Bradford would attract no CIL.</p> <p>A perverse market signal is thus proposed to be set of encouraging high value residential units to be developed in central Bradford when more low value residential units are required, and for low value residential units not to be developed in Ilkley when it is just that type of new residential units that are needed there. <i>It is submitted that any differential in the CIL for residential development should be based on the unit value of the proposed residential units, not where they are located.</i></p> <p>3. How the relative proposed CIL levels for residential units as opposed to retail warehousing and large supermarkets were chosen is unclear.</p> <p>4. The rationale is unclear for the total exclusion of all other non-residential development apart from retail warehousing and large supermarkets. CILs should not be set solely on the basis of viability analysis and need to be related to the costs of required infrastructure required for all types of development.</p> <p>Retail and retail warehousing do not lead to peak demands that need to be catered for by increase transport infrastructure It is office and service related employment that is much more likely to lead to demands for additional transport infrastructure capacity from new development, yet the proposal is that these should contribute nil in terms of CIL despite being the main generator of the incremental need for infrastructure and main beneficiaries! <i>There is a lack of accordance between the proposed types of non-residential development on which to levy a CIL and the demands those types of development create for additional infrastructure.</i> For legitimacy and to avoid introducing further inefficient economic development, this lack of accordance needs rectifying. Developments need to experience their full costs to the community.</p>	<p>development. The council therefore considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives</p> <p>2. National Planning Practice guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the CIL charge. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones. CIL Regulations only allow for setting of differential rates for different geographical zones in which development would be situated or by reference to the type and/or scale of development</p> <p>3. The Proposed CIL rates are based on Economic Viability</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>5. The CIL needs to be set much more on what is the social value to the community of a development type rather than its commercial profitability to the private developer which is what sole consideration of the “viability” criterion does.</p>	<p>Evidence. This is set out in the DTZ CIL Viability Assessment.</p> <p>CIL Regulations permit setting different CIL chargers based on area or type of development CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives. The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence.</p> <p>4. The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. Only residential, large supermarkets and retail warehousing are considered viable for CIL. CIL is not considered viability on office uses and other non residential uses.</p> <p>5. The Council is required to, in setting CIL rates, ‘strike an appropriate balance between’ the desirability of funding</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>infrastructure from the levy and the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area</p> <p>CIL Regulations and National Planning Practice guidance require CIL rates to be informed by viability evidence. The effect of this should be to make the CIL rate equally affordable in different parts of the District.</p>
0039	Ms Whitaker	Local resident	<p>Object to the way the proposed CIL charges have been unfairly calculated for Silsden.</p> <p>Appears to be a huge imbalance in the proposed charging schedule, between the different areas of Bradford. Locally, Silsden, Steeton and Eastburn will only be able to charge developers £20 fee per sq metre and yet our neighbouring village and town, Addingham and Ilkley, will be able to charge £100 fee per sq metre. This shows a great inequality and I don't believe that the monies raised through the CIL will realise the amount needed to pay for the infrastructure which is desperately required in Silsden.</p> <p>Suggest Bradford reconsiders its proposed charging schedule and addresses the very real situation which Silsden faces</p>	<p>For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will contribute to infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across</p>



				<p>the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p> <p>The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. Different residential charging zones have been identified based on evidence of average house prices mapped against postcode zones. Higher CIL charge is proposed in higher value zones. Differential CIL rates must be justified in relation to viability. The council therefore considers that the proposed CIL rates are viable.</p> <p>No alternative viability evidence has been presented to justify why a different residential rate should be set.</p>
0040	Mr Robinson	How Planning on behalf of Canal Road	Whilst CRUVL does not object to the imposition of CIL <i>per se</i> , attention is drawn towards the potential for the CIL Charging Schedule to prevent specific schemes with marginal viability from being delivered – such as the proposed mixed-use development	The council recognise the importance of large scale sites such as New Bolton Woods to

		Urban Village Limited	<p>at New Bolton Woods.</p> <p>Whilst different charges for different zones is suggested (and this approach is supported by CRUVL), this nevertheless takes no account of site specific factors. Whilst it is appreciated that the inclusion of this level of detail is impractical within a CIL Charging Schedule, it is necessarily a fact that sites with high assembly costs can easily become marginal.</p> <p>The imposition of CIL on already marginal sites can be a contributory factor in the inability to bring forward important redevelopment or regeneration schemes within the District - such as at New Bolton Woods. The need to ensure that sites with marginal viability are not hindered by the Levy was specifically highlighted by the Inspector examining the Hertsmere Borough Council CIL Charging Schedule.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the PPG continues to enforce the need to avoid setting rates at the margins of what is viable, and reinforces the need to take a pragmatic approach <i>“to ensure that a ‘buffer’ or margin is included, so that the levy rate is able to support development when economic circumstances adjust.”</i> Furthermore, PPG is clear that if specific strategic sites have low or zero viability, the charging authority should consider setting a low or zero levy rate in that area. It is noted that the New Bolton Woods site is within the lowest charging zone for residential development. This is supported in principle but should be considered with flexibility if the viability of this important scheme becomes threatened.</p>	<p>the delivery of the Local Plan. The proposed CIL rates and charging zones have been informed by viability evidence. The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council therefore considers that the proposed CIL rates are robust.</p> <p>The council recognise the need for flexibility in the CIL to ensure delivery. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage. The 2014 Amendment Regulations also allow planning permissions to be phased for the purposes of the CIL, which will support delivery of large scale schemes in particular. .</p>
0041	Ms Gott	Local Resident	<p>The Majority of new development is detached or semi detached meaning the figure used for the predominately detached area would be more appropriate namely £100 per square metre.</p> <p>To suddenly jump from £100 to £20 in the adjoining areas which have similar house</p>	<p>The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of</p>

			<p>prices seems illogical.</p> <p>Silsden needs a gigantic infrastructure investment in comparison to what the CIL will provide at anything less than £100 per square metre.</p> <p>The adjoining documents indicate £100 per square metre is viable and considerable headroom above that is possible reference the DTZ document.</p>	<p>funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development.</p> <p>Differential CIL rates must be justified in relation to viability. Different residential charging zones have been identified based on evidence of average house prices mapped against postcode zones. A higher CIL charge is proposed in higher value zones. The council therefore considers that the proposed CIL rates are robust.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates are based on the findings from the Viability Assessment which include sales values assumptions based on new build and a viability buffer in accordance with National Planning Guidance. It is not considered that the viability evidence supports £100 per/sq for Silsden</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>1. Page 10 shows a considerable difference between Zones 1, 2 and 3, no boundary lines are distinctly apparent on the map on page 11.</p> <p>2. A fairer option would be to set the CIL taking into account THE IMMEDIATE local area needs, to support existing community needs and the number of dwellings proposed. The economic viability modelling indicates that a £100 per sq metre would</p>	<p>1. The proposed CIL residential charging zones map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode</p>

			<p>be viable for the proposed developments in both Silsden and Steeton as proposed for Addingham.</p> <p>There is a significant funding gap that necessitates the highest level of CIL to be applied in SILSDEN. Para 6.7 - The available evidence suggests £100 sq metre would be viable in the proposed areas of development on Greenfield sites in Silsden.</p>	<p>areas A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>2. The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates are based on the findings from the Viability Assessment which include viability buffer from the maximum CIL rate in accordance with National Planning Guidance. It is not considered that the viability evidence supports £100 per/sq for zone 2 and 3.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>Conversion of buildings that are no longer in lawful use, surely this discourages <b>refurbishment of existing properties and Brownfield sites</b> or do the council; plan to impose a nil CIL on such developments which should be encouraged in preference to developing Greenfield sites.</p>	<p>The CIL Regulations set out what development will and will not be liable for the levy, this includes the conversion of building no longer in lawful use.</p>

0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	<p>1. £100 per square metre is viable in most zone 2 and 3 areas in particular those adjoining the dark blue of Ilkley and the zone 4 areas are unclear.</p> <p>2. Charging rates: no specific rate is shown for retirement housing or does this feature in all other uses not cited above at £0?</p> <p>3. It would appear viable to impose a charge of £100 square metre plus the new homes bonus to finance the infrastructure improvements in Silsden to minimise the funding gap for such improvements.</p>	<p>1. The proposed CIL rates are based on the findings from the Viability Assessment which include a viability buffer in accordance with National Planning Guidance. It is not considered that the viability evidence supports £100 per/sq for zone 2 and 3.</p> <p>2. The CIL residential rates apply to residential development including retirement housing falling under the C3 use class. Retirement housing or care homes falling under other use classes such as C2, will not be liable to pay the levy under the proposed PDCS.</p> <p>3. The council consider the CIL rates and charging zones</p>
------	-----------------	----------------	--	---

				<p>proposed strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development based on the available evidence.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates are based on the findings from the Viability Assessment which include a viability buffer in accordance with National Planning Guidance. It is not considered that the viability evidence supports £100 per/sq for zone 2 and 3.</p>
0044	Mr Smith	Historic England	<p>1. no comment to make regarding the rates of CIL which it is proposed to charge for residential developments. In terms of our area of interest, the suggested rates of CIL seem unlikely to impact upon future investment in developments which could help secure the future of the heritage assets of the District.</p> <p>2. Welcome the intention not to charge CIL for A1 retail and other developments within Bradford City Centre and the town centres of the District's other settlements. This will help to ensure that continued investment into the heart of the main retail areas is not threatened by an unrealistic CIL rate (especially given the changes that are happening in the retail sector). This will also assist in encouraging investment into, and a sustainable future for the numerous historic buildings within the historic cores of those settlements.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Noted. CIL rates have been set in relation to viability evidence. The PDCS sets out that the proposed CIL rates which include Retail warehousing (open A1 consent) £100 Large Supermarket (&gt;2000 sq m) £50 across the District. All other uses have a proposed charge of £0.</p>

0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	Given that rates must be set based on viability evidence and not planning policy objectives, should the rate for development for Silsden be higher than £20	<p>The proposed CIL residential rates have been set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives. The proposed CIL rates are based on the findings from the Viability Assessment which include a viability buffer in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The council consider the CIL rates strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development based on the available evidence</p>
<b>CIL Residential Charging Zones</b>				
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	<p>1. The charging bands per square metre for the CIL are too wide and looking at the map provided ambiguous and incomplete. The boundary of the areas seems to be devised by a shotgun approach. This Parish Council feels much finer tuning is required to provide CIL ratings that properly relate to land values across the district.</p> <p>2. The map provided is unclear. There are four zones for CIL residential charging, but Zone 3 has a number of darker green areas – what do these represent? We note that central Keighley, Shipley and Bradford are shaded in grey – are these area exempt from CIL payments?</p> <p>3. There is a risk that the current banding may well encourage developers to look towards rural areas with low band costs.</p>	<p>1. The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode areas. It is considered that the broad District wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. The grey areas outline the urban areas in the District; these areas are</p>

				<p>not exempt from CIL. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>3. The proposed CIL residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence and considered viable across the District and therefore should not promote or discourage development in a particular area.</p>
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p>1. The clarity and detail on the maps indicating payment areas is totally insufficient as a consultation document, no boundaries or street areas are viewable.</p> <p>2. What criterion is used to define zones 2 and 3? Question whether or not it is truly representative given the varying nature of housing developments in Silsden. Does this take into account rural workers with tied agricultural properties?</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>2. The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones. Charging zones were identified using Land Registry average house prices mapped against postcode areas.</p> <p>National Planning practice guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the</p>



				<p>charge. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>The viability assessments set out the assumptions used in relation to residential rates. This does not include rural workers with tied agricultural properties and is based on a range of hypothetical housing schemes and site specific testing.</p> <p>There are exemptions in the CIL Regulations, which include affordable housing and self-build dwellings. Where agricultural tied dwellings meet this criteria they would be exempt from CIL.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

0021	Ms Batterley	Wilsden Parish Council	<p>1. Do not support aspects of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. While we support the proposal to levy CIL by means of variable tariffs there are aspects of the way that the Residential Charging Zone boundaries have been drawn that has not achieved the appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure and the viability of development.</p> <p>The DTZ CIL Viability Evidence Report acknowledges that “The recommendations are intended as a guide, but small variations could be justified” (p.8). Wilsden Parish Council is seeking such a small variation. There is compelling evidence to do so, especially as it will support the key principle of achieving a ‘balance’ between the infrastructure funding need and viability.</p> <p>The charging zone is very diverse and includes more affluent areas as well as less affluent areas. The area wide model adopted masks these variations, and underplays the justification to introduce a higher charging rate in some parts of the charging zone, such as Wilsden.</p> <p>The DTZ report uses the description of “high value rural villages and towns” and “low value rural villages and towns” and places Harden and Wilsden in the low value category. This is contradicted by data such as the Indices of Multiple Deprivation which puts much of the area of these villages in the 10% least deprived in the UK, comparable with much of Wharfedale. More data is given in the representation. The evidence of the SHLAA illustrates the willingness of landowners to put forward sites around villages such as Wilsden and confirms that developers view this as a desirable area.</p> <p>The representation provides supporting evidence on the Crack Lane development to indicate that the actual development could support more than £62 per sq. m.</p> <p>2. Note that the Charging Schedule has much in common to neighbouring authorities such as Leeds although the area covered by their highest charging zone is much more extensive than in the Bradford district. There are whole areas where the Bradford £50 per sq. m. and £20 per sq. m. zones are contiguous with the Leeds £95 per sq. m. and we find it difficult to understand how the economic value assessment is so different</p>	<p>1. The proposed CIL charging zones have been simplified into 4 main charging zones which reflect the viability evidence. The proposed zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data, over a defined period. It is considered the economic viability evidence justifies the differential charging zone approach.</p> <p>National Planning Practice guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the charge. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>The Council will consider these comments in relation to the supporting viability evidence for site specific viability testing when producing the Draft Charging</p>
------	-----------------	---------------------------	---	---

			between the two authorities.	Schedule.  2. Each authority has to set CIL rates based on its own evidence and circumstances. Therefore despite some differences between Leeds and Bradford CIL rates adjoining the District Boundaries, the council considers the proposed Bradford CIL rates are appropriate and justified in their own context.
0031	Ms Robson	Turley	The Map 1 on page 11 of the Preliminary Charging Schedule should be made clearer. The map as it currently stands is ambiguous in that it is not clear if the urban area of Bradford City and Keighley are within Zone 4 or excluded from it.	Noted. A more detailed map will be provided at the Draft Charging Schedule Stage
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	<p>1. The residential charging zone map splits Queensbury between Zone 3 and Zone 4 which differs from £20 per sq m (Zone 3) and £5 per sq m (Zone 4). It is understood that this zoning is based on postcodes however a clearer boundary map is required. It would be more logical to include the whole of Queensbury within one zone rather than splitting it.</p> <p>2. There is some discrepancy between the zones identified in the CIL document and the EVA. The EVA identifies 5 residential value areas (see table 7.2 on page 50 of EVA) with area 4 and 5 with a proposed CIL rate of £0 per sq m. However, the Residential Charging Zones map (on page 9) only shows 4 zones.</p>	<p>1. Noted. The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode areas. No additional viability evidence has been presented to justify why the value area boundaries should be changed.</p> <p>A more detailed map will be provided at the Draft Charging Schedule Stage.</p> <p>2. For the purposes on simplicity the CIL Economic Viability Assessment has</p>

				merged zones 4 and 5 in the recommend charging zone map identified in figure 7.1 of the viability report.
0033	Ms Bagley	Vernon & Co	Riddlesden falls within Zone 3 alongside East Morton and Bingley in both the Viability Assessment and PDCS. Whilst these settlements are geographically close, in market terms they are very different. Riddlesden simply does not generate the same market values as dwellings in East Morton and Bingley, or indeed Thornton, which falls within Zone 4. The Zone 4 around Keighley should be extended to include Riddlesden	The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode areas. No additional viability evidence has been submitted to support the proposed change to CIL charging zones
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	The identified map of the charging schedule should be provided at a more detailed scale in order for people to be able to accurately identify the boundaries of each of the individual sub-areas. In this regard it is requested that an individual plan for each sub-area is provided within future iterations of the documentation.	Comment noted. A more detailed map will be provided at the Draft Charging Schedule Stage.
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>1. Distortions of development at <b>boundaries</b> between proposed Zones are likely to occur with different Zones of Bradford. This can be avoided by not designating geographical boundaries. Wakefield council's parking standards and the District boundary with Leeds are given as examples of boundaries distorting developments.</p> <p>The 'administrative' choice of gradations in the CIL by proposed Zones is too coarse and being based on averages does not reflect the gradations in viability of different developments within each proposed Zone. Shifting to a CIL based on the unit value of development would avoid penalising (and holding back) marginal developments in Zones proposed to have high levels of CIL. A CIL based on a unit value of development should have more gradations of levy and no zero rate.</p> <p>2. As CIL is to be pooled for infrastructure provision potentially far from the developments in question, the Zone differentials in CIL will just act as a further mechanism to suck monies out of the periphery of the District to be spent in central Bradford, not least because much of the need for infrastructure arises on arterial</p>	<p>1. The proposed CIL charging zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data, over a defined period. The proposed Bradford CIL rates approach of setting different CIL charges to reflect different value areas is appropriate and justified in the context of the Bradford District.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area</p>

			<p>routes that serve movements to and from central Bradford. There is already deep resentment of the concentration of Council expenditure in central Bradford and this current CIL proposal would fan that resentment. The political complexion of Zones with higher proposed residential CILs relative to the political complexions of those with proposed zero residential CILs has all the hallmarks of political gerrymandering.</p>	<p>as evidence to inform the charge. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones. CIL Regulations only allow for setting of differential rates for different geographical zones in which development would be situated or by reference to the type and/or scale of development</p> <p>2. CIL rates must be set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives. The proposed residential rates are set based on economic viability evidence and not political decisions. CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. The remaining CIL monies will be pooled centrally to contribute to strategic infrastructure to</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				support growth across the district
0041	Ms Gott	Local Resident	The map provided fails to give an accurate position of where the zone changes are. To suddenly jump from £100 to £20 in the adjoining areas which have similar house prices seems illogical.	<p>Comment noted. The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode areas. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	A detailed map of the charging zone boundaries should be provided for guidance to all concerned.	Comment noted. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	<p>1. Map 1 Proposed CIL Residential Charging zone map is similar to, but not the same as the map in the DTZ Documents. It shows no clear dividing lines (e.g. street where change of zone occurs). Indeed Silsden appears to be divided in 2, it is clear that ILKLEY is in zone 1.</p> <p>2. The zone 1 area should be expanded taking into account the infrastructure requirements of the adjoining areas and the key features in those areas needing</p>	<p>1. The map is based on the DTZ CIL Viability Evidence (2015) residential charging zones mapped against postcode areas. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging</p>

			support and good transport links (Hospital A&E).	<p>Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>2. The council consider the CIL rates and charging zones proposed strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development based on the available evidence.</p> <p>No additional viability evidence has been submitted to support a change in the CIL levy rates proposed.</p>
0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	<p>1. The clarity and detail on the maps indicating payment areas is totally insufficient as a consultation document no boundaries or street areas are viewable.</p> <p>2. What criteria is used to define zones 1 and 2 whilst we understand the based on average house price we question whether or not it is truly representative given the varying nature of housing developments in both Addingham and Silsden. Does this take into account rural workers with tied agricultural properties?</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. A more detailed map will be provided alongside the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>2. National Planning Practice Guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the charge. The CIL Viability Assessment sets out the viability modelling assumptions used. Average house prices have been used to inform CIL</p>

				<p>residential charging zones. The council recognise that there may be local variations in values; however it is considered the district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>The viability assessments set out the assumptions used in relation to residential rates. This does not include rural workers with tied agricultural properties and is based on a range of hypothetical housing schemes and site specific testing There are exemptions in the CIL Regulations, which include affordable housing and self-build dwellings. Where agricultural tied dwellings meet this criteria they would be exempt from CIL.</p>
<b>Spending CIL</b>				
008	Mr Emmott	Local Resident	<p>Ilkley is located in the most expensive charging zone (zone 1). Provisions should ensure that the levy income derived from developments in Zone 1 should be retained and spent in (and only in) Zone 1 by the provision of much needed improvements to highways, school facilities and car parking etc. Such income should not be placed in a district wide fund to be expended in the metropolitan district as a whole.</p>	<p>The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15%</p>



				<p>of the neighbourhood portion of CIL recipes (or 25%, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made).</p> <p>The monies raised other than the neighbourhood portion will go into a central pot to contribute to infrastructure across the District. The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made any decisions on any further local ring fencing. This is outside the remit of the Charging Schedule itself.</p>
0012	Mr Shaw	Local Resident	<p>S.106 Agreements are unsatisfactory because they involve Planning Officers in often lengthy negotiations to agree an equitable charge. The difficulty of CIL will arise in where the funds raised are needed. S106 appear to be essentially local, but under CIL, funds raised in Ilkley could for example be used to alleviate poverty elsewhere in the District. Suggest the Council agree that at least 50% of funds could be expended in the area where they were raised.</p>	<p>The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15% of the neighbourhood portion of CIL recipes (or 25%, if a</p>

				<p>neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made).</p> <p>The remaining CIL monies will be pooled centrally to contribute to strategic infrastructure to support growth across the district.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made any decisions on any further local ring fencing. This is outside the remit of the Charging Schedule itself.</p>
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	<p>CIL monies could be “pooled”. There is no explanation of what this could mean, how it would be administered and how it would affect the communities concerned. This needs clarification.</p>	<p>The CIL allows the council to raise funds from development to help pay for the infrastructure needs arising from development in their areas. The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>The monies raised other than the neighbourhood portion will go into a central pot to contribute to infrastructure across the district. The council must spend the levy on</p>

				<p>infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p> <p>To ensure that the levy is open and transparent The CIL regulations require reporting of the monies so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent</p>
0014	Ms Monaghan	Local resident	There is a lack of green spaces in Menston, providing a park outside the sub area will not benefit local residents.	<p>Comment noted. The CIL allows the council to raise funds from development to help pay for the infrastructure needs arising from development in their areas.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion can be spent on local priorities, which may include green spaces.</p>

0016	Ms Brown	Ilkley Design Statement Group	<p>Any monies raised should be spent in the area where the development is taking place to ensure that the infrastructure can be put into place to support that development. Monies raised from development in Ilkley should be spent in Ilkley and not elsewhere in the District. The report talks about the “area” but is not clear whether this is the whole of the Bradford Met area or that where development is taking place. This needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15% of the neighbourhood portion of CIL recipes (or 25%, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made).</p> <p>The monies raised other than the neighbourhood portion will go into a central pot to contribute to infrastructure across the District. The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of the District, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made any decisions on any further local ring fencing. This is outside the remit of the Charging Schedule itself.</p>
------	----------	-------------------------------	--	---

0022	Mr King	Natural England	<p>Encourage the council to ensure that the avoidance/mitigation measures identified within Core Strategy policy SC8 are sufficiently funded either CIL, S106 Agreement or other mechanism. As S106 contributions for strategic mitigation are restricted to 5 developments, CIL offers a mechanism for funding new greenspace required to avoid adverse effects on Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Certainty in the delivery of policy SC8's mitigation is required in order to comply with requirements of the European Habitats Directives and Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).The prioritisation of costed alternative greenspace mitigation in the 7km zone around the South Pennine Moors Natura 2000 site should therefore be explicit within the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List. This approach is set out in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance</p>	The Draft Regulation 123 list includes Green Infrastructure items. The council recognise the importance of ensuring suitable mitigation to comply with the European Habitats Regulations and will consider these comments when producing the Draft Regulation 123 List.
0037	Ms Garside	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is of the opinion that CIL contributions should be used to fund green infrastructure and nature conservation projects in the area.</p> <p>The representation sets out detailed justification for this including wide variety of benefits for local area such as sustainable transport, flood alleviation and control, health education and creation benefits and resilience to climate change. Funding from a CIL contribution for GI could act as match funding for further contributions to maintaining and expanding the GI network. The value of CIL contributions could therefore be much greater than the actual amount provided.</p>	Agree. Green infrastructure and public greenspace is included on the Regulation 123 List which sets out the items of infrastructure the council may fund through the CIL.
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>1. The principle embodied in S106 and S258 Planning Obligations that payments should be made for infrastructure provision required to facilitate the development only in the local area needs to be much more fully embodied in the CIL PDCS. Most of the development impact of a new development is on the local schools, local transport system, and other local public facilities. Hence the proposed CIL levy needs to be more closely tied to being pooled for infrastructure provision in the local area, so it is suggested that CILs raised should be ring-fenced for expenditure on infrastructure located partly or wholly within 3km of the development on which the CIL is being applied.</p> <p>2. The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is unclear as to how it is related to monies raised through the New Housing Bonus, West Yorkshire Transport Fund, LEP</p>	<p>1. CIL will only replace S106 for pooled contributions. S106 and S278 will remain for site specific issues. The council must spend the CIL on infrastructure needed to support the development of the District, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p> <p>The Council's Local</p>

			<p>Growing Places Fund, or the Leeds City Region Revolving (or is it Regional) Investment Fund, or the Leeds City Region City Deal, Prudential Funding. Until that is clarified, there is no basis for setting any particular level of CIL.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>CIL Regulations also require a proportion of CIL receipts to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The Council has not yet made any decisions on any further local ring fencing. This is outside the remit of the Charging Schedule itself.</p> <p>2. For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p> <p>The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council therefore considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	My understanding is that with S106 Planning Obligations it is possible to require a commuted sum to be set aside for downstream maintenance of any infrastructure provided. The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule appears to be barred from making any <b>provision for the recurrent costs</b> of any infrastructure provided, but this is a major deficiency (be it required by central Government guidance).	<p>The Council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed.</p> <p>The levy is intended to focus on the provision of new infrastructure and should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development.</p>
0041	Ms Gott	Local Resident	Part of the proposed levy should be apportioned to local Parish Council. When will the Parish Council get this money in relation to the start of any development on start up, part way through or on completion? The amount apportioned not the instalment provisions the council have shown in the bock chart.	<p>Charges will become due from the date that a chargeable development is commenced in accordance with any payments policy.</p> <p>CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15% of the neighbourhood portion of CIL recipes (or 25%, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made). The</p>



				<p>CIL Regulations (as amended) set out the legal framework for the duty to pass CIL to local councils and calculating, collecting and spending the levy.</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be produced in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	No indication is given of where the CIL monies will be spent and how apportionment will be applied in neighbouring areas of the district, for example where a charging zone in one area is reliant on key features in other areas of the district.	<p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>

Local Infrastructure Plan evidence (LIP)				
0003	Mr Rawcliffe	Local Resident	<p>Representation made on Section 5.4.2 of the Local Infrastructure Plan relating to the following issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paragraph three in terms references to Airedale rail connections to Lancashire and high quality electric rolling stock. Lancashire is rather meaningless and was probably intended to say 'the Lancashire coast' or 'the north of Lancashire'. Secondly, there is no "modern, high quality electric rolling-stock" on the connection as it is served largely by obsolete DMUs.</li> <li>• paragraph four in terms of increased transport demand and the pressing need to reconnect Colne and Skipton by rail. This connection is missing from Table 5.1 in section 5.7.1.1 and should be included there.</li> <li>• paragraph seven in terms of plans for a Keighley gyratory and dualling of Hard Ings Road. These proposals will not address the traffic problems of Keighley and the funding they would use would be better applied in making a complete Keighley gyratory system using existing roads. Detailed alternative traffic and road improvements set out.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The CIL PDCS is primarily concerned with the rates the CIL is to be set at, rather than the specific infrastructure items it will contribute towards. The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.</p>

006	Ms Cadamarteri	Local Resident	<p>1. The Economic Viability and Local Infrastructure Plan reports provide little information about the strategic development plans to the drainage, public transportation, educational and health care provisions needed to support the proposed 700 homes within Thornton.</p> <p>2. The reports admit that “New housing development will create demand for additional primary and secondary school places and that new school places will be funded by the Basic Needs Allocation (capital funding for education provided to CBMDC) and developer contributions (through either CIL or S106). However, there is little acknowledgement of how the District will deal with a shortfall in funding when or if the current national government continues to cut these educational funds. Therefore, the assessment of risk is inadequate.</p> <p>There is little indication of how the District will improve health care and educational facilities to the most vulnerable in our community, especially where central government continues to make cuts to these vital services. To rely on “capital funding” is short sighted. The council provides little evidence or discussion about how it will invest to improve these facilities to cope with current and future demand of vital educational and health provisions.</p>	<p>1. Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP and the planned distribution and scale of growth for the District are set out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p> <p>Site or area specific planning issues will be considered through the Local Plan Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>2. For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p>
-----	-------------------	----------------	--	---

				Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.
0011	Mr Stuart	West Yorkshire Police	<p>References made to the police in the supporting documentation need amending. The Policing Plan for 201-2015 has largely been superseded by events and the ongoing strategic review of the West Yorkshire Police Estate. The relevant text therefore requires amendment, with a substantial number of deletions.</p> <p>The comment suggests opening a dialogue with the council to consider the best way to proceed.</p>	Comment noted. The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p>1. Given the proposed increase of 1200 plus houses in Silsden it is noticeable that no masterplan exists for Silsden. This is a major deficiency as the current infrastructure is barely able to cope with current demand especially transport and education issues.</p> <p>2. Specific comments raised in relation to the Airedale overview of Silsden in the LIP including challenging the concept of good access to railway station due to crossing of busy bypass with out safe pedestrian crossing facilities, question where Silsden bus interchange is exactly, table 4.3 only highway to the east of Silsden has been identified, Sewers. Electricity, Education failed to be mentioned.</p> <p>Specific infrastructure issues in Silsden raised including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the Bus interchange is actually only a proposed scheme,</li> <li>- electricity- only 100 new homes can be built <u>AFTER</u> an upgrade to the power station, yet CIL payments can be phased – how does the necessary investment infrastructure take place prior to building?</li> <li>- Water –confirmed from Yorkshire water that the Aire Valley truck sewer is <u>at capacity</u>;</li> </ul>	<p>1. This comment in regards to masterplan for Silsden is not considered relevant to CIL PDCS consultation. Site or area specific planning issues will be considered through the Local Plan Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped</p>

			<p>again how will the CIL provide improvements prior to any new building, as there is currently no time scale for any future investment by Yorkshire water.  - no mention of the need for primary school provision in Silsden, yet already reached capacity</p> <p>3. The town council welcomes a prompt response to these questions along with an indication for how the £20 million gap for essential infrastructure in Airedale will be met, in order for them to respond in depth to the CIL as a whole and not just the draft charging schedule currently being consulted on.</p>	<p>identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>2. The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.</p> <p>3. CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.
0024	Mr Stuart	West Yorkshire Police	Various references relating to policing in the Local Infrastructure Plan are now out of date and require updating, and this will be carried out in conjunction with officers of Bradford Council in due course	The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.
0026	Ms Ledger	Sport England	<p>Welcome inclusion of separate section on Sport and Recreation and reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and strategic built sports facilities. The LIP refers to the draft PPS, which has now been finalised and adopted by the council. The final version includes a detailed and site specific action plan of investment priorities across the district. Such research and recommendations should be at the heart of the LIP.</p> <p>ERROR: p. 136 – Please note we are SPORT ENGLAND and not <i>Sports England</i>. We fund community sport projects only and therefore should be listed under the Sports, Leisure and Recreation section rather than Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Section 6.5- please note the PPS also identified very significant pitch deficits for cricket. Welcome inclusion of references to indoor sports facilities. As this research and investment decisions evolve they need to be kept up to date in the LIP and draft regulation 123 list.</p>	The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	Welcome reference as part of the 'Local Context' at paragraph 1.3 of the importance to considering "options for Local Green Belt release and growth areas around Canal Road corridor, Bradford City Centre, an urban extension at Holme Wood and	The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local

			Queensbury, Menston, and Silsden and Steeton with Eastburn.”  We welcome reference to the Local Infrastructure Plan being a ‘live’ document which will be updated. Following the receipt of the Core Strategy Inspector’s Report and further progression of the Core Strategy this plan will need to be updated to reflect any changes to the housing requirement and proportion split between settlements.	communities and infrastructure providers.
0036	Ms Thompson	Local resident	Based on the justification given the CIL and the Infrastructure Plan CIL cannot be delivered but it is also clear that house building at the volume proposed is neither feasible nor necessary; therefore some of the infrastructure is not needed. However, the evidence shows that Bradford has a serious problem in relation to the delivery of new housing in that property prices in many sub areas are substantially below those required to attract commercial developers.	Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.  The CIL is not a plan providing policies for the scale and location for growth / housing delivery. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document  The council consider the proposed rates strike an appropriate balance between the need to fund infrastructure and impact on viability of development. This has been informed by the LIP and Viability Assessment

0037	Ms Garside	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	The authority can work at a local, district and regional level to create, and join up natural greenspace. The representation lists the GI evidence base to help inform this. It would improve the evidence base if mapping to show what accessible open space is available for the residents of Bradford District and what shortfall is likely if the proposed new developments are built. Funding for this work should be built into CIL strategy to ensure that up-to-date evidence of need and opportunity is provided. The Yorkshire Wildlife Trust would be able to assist the Authority in implementing this work.	The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The Council will consider these comments as part of the LIP update.
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>1. In the Local Infrastructure Plan Update the costing estimates for Green Infrastructure, Open Spaces and Public Space are stated to be unknown. These are claimed to be covered by CIL allocations in the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule but how can it be known if the appropriate coverage and level of CIL has been set to fund the provision of Green Infrastructure, Open Spaces and Public Space when their cost is unknown?</p> <p>2. The Local Infrastructure Plan Update (October 2013) states that overall the funding gap is £469.5m for transport schemes that are classified as essential, £283m for transport schemes that are classified as desirable, £88m is required for primary school places, and £113m is required for secondary school places. The proposed CIL PDCS is forecast "to generate approximately £36million over the 15 year plan period" (ie about £2.4m a year). There would be a huge unfunded gap even if all the CIL was devoted to education provision which both the Local Infrastructure Plan Update and the proposed CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule identify as the key infrastructure provision shortfall in Bradford. The lack of any remote accordance between the sums the proposed CIL PDCS would raise and the sums identified as gaps in infrastructure renders the validity of the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule as being close to nil. <i>The overall funding of all the gaps in transport, education and Green Infrastructure, Open Spaces and Public Space infrastructure funding needs much greater clarity and certainty before any particular CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is adopted.</i></p>	<p>1. The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. It should be noted that, National Planning Practice Guidance recognises there will be uncertainties in pinpointing infrastructure funding sources and CIL charging authorities should focus on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to put in place the levy (paragraph 016 ID 25-016-20140612). Whilst such evidence can only ever represent a point in time, the Council considers that the LIP satisfies the guidance, in terms of demonstrating the aggregate funding gap.</p> <p>CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the</p>



				<p>Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>2. Noted. For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure</p>
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>It needs to be recognised that much cheaper approaches often exist to the transport infrastructure capacity increase schemes identified in the Local Infrastructure Plan Update (October 2013) in the form of traffic management and travel behaviour influencing schemes, but these appear to be precluded by the central Government guidelines regarding the introduction of CILs and also appear to have been ignored in the Local Infrastructure Plan Update (October 2013). Their use is likely to reduce very substantially the need and cost of transport infrastructure capacity increase schemes, and so the levels and coverage required for any CIL. This, however, should not be ignored.</p>	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. The LIP has been produced in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers. The council's approach to traffic management and travel behaviour influencing schemes is set out in the Local Plan Core Strategy transport policies.</p>

Economic Viability evidence				
0010	Ms Harrison	Rural Advisor - CLA	The DTZ Viability Assessment fails to consider situations where new rural dwellings are required to accommodate those employed in agriculture, horticulture forestry and other rural businesses. Such properties are not sold for development gain and are often restricted by occupancy S106 conditions. Therefore the proposed CIL rates would add addition costs and is likely to render many such projects unviable.	<p>The CIL Viability Assessment sets out the assumptions used in relation to residential rates. This does not include rural workers with tied agricultural properties and is based on a range of hypothetical housing schemes and site specific testing. There are exemptions in the CIL Regulations, which include affordable housing and self-build dwellings. Where agricultural tied dwellings meet this criteria they would be exempt from CIL.</p> <p>It is considered the broad district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>The CIL charges proposed are set based on economic viability evidence. There is no current evidence to justify a separate rate. No viability evidence has been submitted to support why the proposed CIL rates would make this type of development unviable.</p>
0020	Ms Parsons	The Brookhouse	Comment raises matters of concern arising from the viability appraisal for retail warehouse development which underpin the PDCS rate. This includes the following	It is acknowledged that retail warehousing is a diverse

		<p>Group Ltd c/o Alyn Nicholls &amp; Associates</p>	<p>concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that “retail warehousing” is treated as a homogenous type of development.</li> <li>- whilst the rental levels and commercial yields adopted within the analysis may be achievable in some circumstances; for many others they will be far too optimistic. Irrespective, the proposed charging rate does not reflect the evidence of the DTZ appraisal.</li> <li>- the build cost utilised for retail warehouse development is too low and does not reflect a “real world” scenario.</li> </ul> <p>The evidence to support the Preliminary Draft Charging Rate for retail warehouse development assumes that the retail warehouse market is homogenous and it looks to the best performing developments for indicators of rental levels and yields. It does not acknowledge the sub-sectors which DTZ identify in the retail warehouse market. Irrespective, the definition of “retail warehouse” is imprecise. In addition, an important part of the retail warehouse market serves retailers whose business model is dependent upon low cost accommodation. The rental levels and yields utilised within the development appraisal to support the Preliminary Draft Charging Rate ignores this sector of the market and in doing so, renders new development uneconomic.</p> <p>The comment refers to specific evidence in supporting appendices to justify the concerns raised in relation to the Retail Warehousing viability assumptions and proposed rate.</p>	<p>property classification, however the Council has sought to avoid over complication in the approach to rate setting - limitations with the availability of evidence restrict the reliability of seeking to subdivide the retail warehousing sector.</p> <p>The rents and yields selected were based on ‘appropriate available’ evidence of retail warehousing activity across the District and were intended to be representative of typical circumstances.</p> <p>However, in reviewing the evidence it has been acknowledged that the rental levels used are most representative of the City of Bradford, and less of the rest of the District and as a result adjustments have been made to the charging schedule which limits the geographical application of the rate to the City of Bradford.</p> <p>In respect of build costs, the costs are based on BCIS rebased for the Yorkshire</p>
--	--	---	---	---

				region. An update to the costs has been included based on the latest BCIS data which together with uplifts for externals and abnormals equates to a cost comparable with the evidence submitted by the representor. These costs have informed a reappraisal of viability and a revised rate.
0021	Ms Batterley	Wilsden Parish Council	<p>1 The overall methodology used in the Viability Assessment by DTZ to calculate the level of CIL appears to be soundly based although question some of the baseline data used to reach these conclusions. Flaws in baseline data are illustrated in the example of section 6.2 of DTZ Viability Assessment and “Crack Lane Wilsden”. The representation refers to more recent data on the Crack Lane development that indicates the development could support a higher CIL charge.</p> <p>2. The representation refers to data in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation which it is argued shows places such as Wilsden and Harden are comparable with much of Wharfedale and should therefore not be classed as “low value rural villages and towns” The DTZ report uses the description of “high value rural villages and towns” and “low value rural villages and towns” and places Harden and Wilsden in the low value category. Also evidence in the SHLAA illustrates the willingness of landowners to put forward sites around villages such as Wilsden and confirms that developers view this as a desirable area.</p> <p>3. The charging zone boundaries are incorrect primarily as a result of flawed assumptions The primary reason why the Charging Zone boundaries are incorrect is a result of from the residential value areas in section 4.1 of the DTZ Viability Evidence. Using average house price bands assumes the future housing mix will be directly related with the historic housing mix. In many of the villages such as Harden and Wilsden there is a much higher proportion of older terrace properties that have a significantly lower prices than the new properties built in recent years. This is illustrated in the Crack Lane example given and confirmed by supporting Council Tax band data</p>	<p>1. Noted. The Council will consider these comments in determining if further viability evidence is required in relation to site specific viability testing. The Viability assessment will be updated to inform the Draft Charging Schedule.</p> <p>2. The proposed charging zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data, over a defined period. This indicates that Wharfedale is a higher value area based on average house prices. It is considered the District wide viability assessment provides robust and proportionate evidence to inform the charging zones.</p> <p>The IMD data and SHLAA are not considered appropriate to</p>

			<p>provided as part of the representation.</p> <p>4. In summary the Residential Charging Zone boundary proposals are flawed and villages such as Harden and Wilsden should be subject to a substantially higher rate of CIL than is proposed, as a minimum in Zone 2. We believe the way that the way the Viability Assessment gathers evidence to support this and then proposes that these villages are in Zone 3 is perverse. If the Charging Zone boundaries are not completely reviewed the developer contributions towards infrastructure both district wide and to individual communities will be dramatically reduced to the detriment of everyone.</p>	<p>justify setting CIL rates, which must be set in relation to economic viability evidence as set out in the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>3. The proposed zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data. The council recognise that within the same charging zone there may be areas where sales values may be higher or lower than the average values assessed in the Viability Report. However it is considered the broad district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones. New build sales value assumptions for each value area have been used to inform sales value assumptions in the area wide development scheme viability testing and the proposed CIL rates. The council will consider if further data on new build sales values is required as part of the viability assessment.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. The</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				council consider the CIL rates and charging zones proposed are based on appropriate data and the charges strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development.
0027	Councillor Sykes	Bradford Councillor	The discounted rates for the nominated residential zones are unacceptable given the stated headroom available Zone 1 Discount 81.2% Zone 2 Discount 78.07% Zone 3 Discount 60% The proposed CIL rates should be higher	The CIL charges proposed are based on economic viability evidence and are considered robust based on available evidence. This includes allowing a sufficient viability buffer in accordance with national planning practice guidance to ensure rates are not set up to the margins of viability.  No viability evidence has been submitted to support at what level an alternative viability buffer should be.
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	Object to the unit sizes (at 4.1.3) and suggest the following sizes (per square foot). Suggested House type Size (figure in brackets is the EVA size) 1 bed flat 550 (549) 2 bed flat 645 (700) 2 bed house 700 (829) 3 bed house 900 (1001) 4 bed house 1200 (1238) 5 bed house 1475 (1475)	The unit size assumptions used in the viability testing were considered in 2012 and 2014 to test and refine the approach and assumptions behind the viability modelling. They were based on a combination of developer consultation and consideration

			<p>Assume that the unit sizes set out at 4.1.3 of the EVA will be revised by those making representations to the Bradford CIL, to ensure their standard unit size is presented in the table. We also accept that our standard 4 bed house (between 1150sq ft and 1250sq ft) unit size will be larger and in some cases smaller than those being built by our competitors. Suggest the Council makes it clear that the unit sizes set out at 4.1.3 are for indicative purposes only and will not be rigidly applied.</p> <p>Consider the Professional Fees should be increased from 6% to a minimum of 8% on brownfield sites and remain as 6% on greenfield sites. Welcome the Developer's profit at 20% GDV for market units; however object to a 6% GDV for affordable units. There should be no differentiation between market and affordable units and there should be an overall 20% GDV for development sites. 20% GDV on residential schemes is recognised as acceptable in recent Appeal Decisions.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the 20% GDV developers profit this is not borne out in the table at 4.1.8 where the blended rate GDV ranges from 17.53% to 18.56%. As stated previously, the GDV should be 20% for residential schemes. We object to the affordable housing discount (from Market Value) at 50% in Value area 1. This is based on a 2009 Scrutiny of Affordable Housing Report (2009) which is now out of date. We consider the discount should be 35% across the District.</p>	<p>of emerging planning policy in respect of unit sizes.</p> <p>As an area wide study it is inevitable that the unit sizes will not exactly match all house builder models. However, alongside the unit density (dwellings per ha) and the mix, these variables generate a site cover of between 14,000-15,000 sq ft per acre which understood to be the density targeted by the large majority of house builders. This measure is a key performance indicator which drives viability in the area wide model and therefore whilst small variations on unit sizes may exist, these must be considered alongside other variables the overall effect of which is to provide some consistency with house builder models.</p> <p>Unit size assumptions have been used in the residual viability model and are not policy requirements. Therefore it is accepted that these are not rigid requirements and the Council is happy to provide</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>clarification as suggested.</p> <p>Regarding professional fees, the recommendation is noted however with a contingency allowance of 5% of cost, it is considered this would accommodate any variation in fees on such sites.</p> <p>Profit levels. A lower profit level on affordable units is justified on the basis that such units are effectively delivered on a pre-sale basis and therefore the risk profile is completely different to that of market units. This is recognised by the HCA DAT model guidance which states “[profit rate on affordable houses] should be moderate to reflect low risk of this activity. Note BCIS costs include contractors’ profit, therefore should be zero when based on BCIS costs”</p> <p>Transfer values. This policy document, whilst dated, is still used as the basis for determining viability negotiations. An increased transfer price in Wharfedale is</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				not considered realistically likely to reflect the prices that RPs would be able to pay for units in this location. The effect of making the discount from market rate in Wharfedale consistent with the rest of the District level would also be to substantially increase the CIL headroom indicated – suggesting a much higher CIL tariff which would place a greater CIL burden on development at the expense of affordable housing.
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	<p><b>1 Value Areas</b>  Raise no immediate concerns with the value areas identified within the Viability Evidence.</p> <p><b>Scheme Selection &amp; Density</b>  Though there are geographical differences associated with density, for the purposes of the initial viability assessment they are content for a figure of 35dph 'net' density to be utilised.</p> <p><b>Unit Sizes</b>  The identified size of a two bedroom house exceeds the size of property that they usually deliver within their development schemes. They consider that a more appropriate size would be between 670sq.ft. &amp; 700sq.ft</p> <p><b>Sales Values</b>  No immediate concerns with the sales values identified within the Viability Evidence.</p> <p><b>Build Costs.</b> Concern that the assessment will utilise BCIS data rebased for Yorkshire &amp; Humber rather than specifically for the Bradford area. Request that this element of the assessment is amended prior to the preparation of the next stages of CIL documentation.</p> <p>Build Costs are considered to be too low. the identified build costs should be increased</p>	<p>1. The unit size assumptions used in the viability testing were considered in 2012 and 2014 to test and refine the approach and assumptions behind the viability modelling. They were based on a combination of developer consultation and consideration of emerging planning policy in respect of unit sizes.</p> <p>As an area wide study it is inevitable that the unit sizes will not exactly match all house builder models. However, alongside the unit density (dwellings per ha) and the mix, these variables generate a site</p>

		<p>to £100sq.ft to more realistically reflect more up to date housing market conditions as of September 2015. Content with the proposed additional 15% uplift in value associated with externals works.</p> <p><b>2. Phasing Assumptions</b>  <i>Lead In &amp; Construction/Sales</i>  Content with the identified timescales on the basis that they are considered holistically i.e. there is a lead in time of 9 to 12 months between receipt of planning permission and first completion/sale on site. If this is not the case then we request that the identified timescales are amended appropriately.  Given the nature of Bradford’s potential residential development sites, specific phasing assumption could be given to the redevelopment of previously developed site within the City on account of issues such as remediation. This matter, along with other issues associated with the delivery of such sites could increase the lead in time by 6 to 12 months. This presents two potential options, either the singular “catch all” lead in time is increased to 12 to 15 months or two separate phasing assumptions are used such as 9 to 12 months for Greenfield sites and 15 to 18 months for previously developed sites.</p> <p><i>Sales Rates</i>  Our client agrees that the anticipated sales rate for each outlet should be 30 dwellings per annum. However, with regard to larger sites where there are multiple selling outlets, our client is of the view that this figure cannot be simply extrapolated. A more realistic figure for developments which contain two selling outlets would be 50 dwellings per annum on the basis that each selling outlet would effectively be in competition with one other. Indeed, this is the approach that BDW use within their cash flow forecasting.</p> <p><b>3. Other Development Costs</b>  <i>Section 106 Agreement</i>  Object to the identified figure of £1,000 per unit for Section 106 costs. This figure should be increased to £4,000 per unit to ensure that it realistically reflects recent S106 obligations prescribed by the Council.</p>	<p>cover of between 14,000-15,000 sq ft per acre which understood to be the density targeted by the large majority of house builders. This measure is a key performance indicator which drives viability in the area wide model and therefore whilst small variations on unit sizes may exist, these must be considered alongside other variables the overall effect of which is to provide some consistency with house builder models.</p> <p>Build costs – regional rebasing is considered appropriate to enable appropriate sample of data. Cushman and Wakefield is currently seeing build costs of £85 psf inclusive of external works on bids from house builders for sites at regional level. Therefore the suggestion that build costs should be £100 plus 15% for externals is substantially beyond what is considered to be typical.</p> <p>2. Cushman and Wakefield consider a 3 month lead in</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p><i>Professional Fees</i> Consider that these fees should be 10%, which is consistent with the independent viability assessment work that our client has undertaken in respect of recent development schemes. There are also a number of case law examples on this matter, evidence which can be substantiated on request.</p> <p><i>Marketing, Sales Agent and Legal Fees</i> consider that these fees should be 4% (based on an evidenced range of 3.75% and 4.25%) which is consistent with the independent viability assessment work that our client has undertaken in respect of recent development schemes. There are also a number of case law examples on this matter, evidence which can be substantiated on request.</p> <p><i>Purchaser's Costs</i> Figure agreed.</p> <p><i>Finance</i> Consider that these fees should be increased to 7%. Again, this figure is consistent with the independent viability assessment work that our client has undertaken in respect of recent development schemes. There are also a number of case law examples on this matter, evidence which can be substantiated on request.</p> <p><i>Developer's Profit</i> Our client wishes to object to the identified treatment of Developer's Profit. The viability assessment should be based on 20% of GDV for both market and affordable dwellings. A key reason for this is associated with the fact that Registered Providers are not assigned to any development scheme until after planning permission has been granted. Indeed 20% of GDV is also the minimum on which finance could ordinarily be obtained. Such an approach would result in a high level of risk for a developer associated with securing a Registered Provider, which our client believes does not warrant the use of a separate, significantly reduced, GDV for the affordable dwellings. There are a number of case law examples on this matter, evidence which can be substantiated on request.</p>	<p>time to house build starts with a staggered programme of house sales is appropriate for the majority of sites with an increased lead in time of 6 months for larger or more difficult sites. This is consistent with the evidence. On cases where there is a longer lead in time, this is considered exceptional and any additional financing costs that result would be accommodated within the allowance for abnormals in the appraisals.</p> <p>3. The assumptions used in the viability testing were considered in 2012 and 2014 to test and refine the approach and assumptions behind the viability modelling are therefore considered robust. CIL will replace part of S106 not directly related to development. Therefore the council do not agree the £1000 S106 should be increased based on recent S106 obligations.</p> <p>Regarding professional fees, the recommendation is noted</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p><b>4. Land Value</b>  Prior to providing comments in respect of land values, our client would like to know whether the figures identified relate to either 'gross' or 'net' land values. Therefore our client reserves the right to comment until further clarification is provided by the Council.</p> <p>5. Without the suggested amendments we are unsure whether the proposed CIL rates are appropriate in respect of them being collectively tested against all of the financial implications that current and emerging local planning guidance propose. Particularly in respect of affordable housing.</p>	<p>however with a contingency allowance of 5% of cost, it is considered this would accommodate any variation in fees on such sites.</p> <p>Finance rate is considered appropriate on the basis of a debt structure and with increasing availability of debt and equity these rates have the potential to be reduced.</p> <p>Profit levels. A lower profit level on affordable units is justified on the basis that such units are effectively delivered on a pre-sale basis and therefore the risk profile is completely different to that of market units. This is recognised by the HCA DAT model guidance which states "[profit rate on affordable houses] should be moderate to reflect low risk of this activity. Note BCIS costs include contractors' profit, therefore should be zero when based on BCIS costs"</p> <p>4. Land value benchmarks are based on net developable areas.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				5. The council will consider these comments when producing the Draft charging schedule which will be subject to further statutory consultation.
0036	Ms Thompson	Local resident	<p>Misinterpretation of the Bradford housing market and land values Property prices across the District and, by extension, the value of the local property market, have been overestimated. the DTZ report (p.60) states that: 'The average house price in Bradford currently stands at circa £149,000' (referring to Q3 2014)</p> <p>This is over 50% higher than the Land Registry estimates for the same year which range from £92,500 to £97,151. DTZ appears to have taken sold prices from the Land Registry database and calculated the mean sold price rather than using the Land Registry estimates. This is an inappropriate method for estimating property prices and price changes over time, primarily because it is subject to transactional bias. The representation sets out the justification for this, including in a supporting Appendix). The number of transactions taking place in areas with low property prices fall dramatically while transactions in higher value areas hold up. At the same time house prices fall across the board but those in lower value areas fall the most</p> <p>The evidence shows clearly that DTZ has substantially overestimated property prices and overlooked negative equity in the local market. Inaccurate estimates of property prices can have implications including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estimates regarding the value of land and potential uplift from development</li> <li>- Viability estimates in relation to development</li> <li>- Potential CIL receipts and infrastructure plans based on them</li> </ul> <p>Property prices impact on land values, on the uplift that can be achieved through development and on the value that can be extracted through the CIL therefore accuracy in estimating them is crucial.</p>	<p>Comments noted. National Planning Practice Guidance states the council should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the charge.</p> <p>The proposed charging zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data. The council recognise that within the same charging zone there may be areas where sales values may be higher or lower than the average values assessed in the Viability Report. However it is considered the broad district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones. New build sales value assumptions for each value area have been used to inform sales value assumptions in the area wide</p>

			<p>However, there is a further problem with DTZ's estimates of prices that impacts even more directly on the CIL: in the absence of hard evidence from land transactions DTZ simply asked property developers and land owners to give their views of land prices in Bradford District to provide a foundation for calculations regarding uplift. This is not acceptable. HMRC has a methodology which is not based on land transactions per se.</p> <p>Reliance on developers' estimates in this situation may place the Local Authority and the people of Bradford at a disadvantage in securing best value in relation to the CIL and/or may adversely affect prices where compulsory purchase orders are implemented or land is disposed of by the Council.</p> <p>The Council is asked to ascertain what methodology was implemented by HMRC and adopt it or an acceptably rigorous and transparent alternative, bearing in mind that falling house prices across the District will have adversely affected the underlying value and potential cost of development land with the effect being particularly strong in the sub-areas with the weakest markets.</p> <p>Detailed evidence presented relating to projected jobs growth in relation to house building, Population Growth and Housing Requirements citing evidence in the Bradford Housing Requirement Study.</p>	<p>development scheme viability testing and the proposed CIL rates. The council will consider if further data on new build sales values is required as part of the updated viability assessment.</p> <p>Details of the residential market evidence on sales values are set out at Appendix A of the DTZ Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The CIL Viability Assessment uses a range of site value thresholds intended to be representative of typical net land prices in different parts of the District. Although evidence of transaction data is limited the DTZ viability assessment reviewed VOA Property Market reports and have consulted land agents, land owners and developers in arriving at the benchmarks used below. In accordance with RICS guidance, it has discounted the site value benchmarks to allow for the impact of CIL.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	A further more comprehensive analysis should be provided to justify the charging levels. A CIL of £100 sq metre would be viable in Silsden on Greenfield development	National Planning Practice Guidance states the council

			<p>sites given the estimated profit margins, scope for savings and headroom shown in the DTZ document and taking into account the infrastructure funding gap identified.</p> <p>The detail provided to date could be unsound, a small number of sites have been used as a benchmark and a reliance on average house prices appears not to take into account the predominance of a particular house type in that particular area . Terraced housing in one area and Detached in another.</p>	<p>should use an area based approach involving a broad test of viability across the area as evidence to inform the charge.</p> <p>The proposed charging zones are based on postcode sectors and average house price data. The council recognise that within the same charging zone there may be areas where sales values may be higher or lower than the average values assessed in the Viability Report. However it is considered the broad district wide viability assessment provides robust and appropriate evidence to inform the charging zones. New build sales value assumptions for each value area have been used to inform sales value assumptions in the area wide development scheme viability testing and the proposed CIL rates.</p> <p>In addition to the area wide viability model it is considered that the viability assessment samples an appropriate range of types of sites across the</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>District in accordance with National Planning practice Guidance.</p> <p>The council consider the CIL rates and charging zones proposed strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development based on the available evidence.</p>
<b>Infrastructure Issues</b>				
0019	Mr & Mrs Grint	Local Resident	<p>1. There should be no further development of housing in areas in which the infrastructure is already under pressure. In areas where there is opportunity for further development then consideration should be given to payments by installation and no development should be allowed to commence until the levy is actually in the Councils bank account and is earmarked for spending only on infrastructure projects i.e. roads, schools, nursery places and medical support i.e. doctors, hospitals, dentist.</p> <p>2. It is becoming increasingly obvious for the need to provide more car parking spaces and commuter provisions.</p>	<p>1. Noted. CIL has been introduced by the Government to contribute to the provision of infrastructure and support growth. CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The CIL is not a plan providing policies or proposals for the scale and location for growth / development in the District. This will be considered</p>



				<p>through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL</p>
0023	Cllr Mullen	Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council	Steeton, Eastburn and Silsden are already vastly underprovided for with infrastructure The proposed charging schedule will in no way give us the funds that are needed to address these shortfalls	<p>CIL will help fund infrastructure to support growth however the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local</p>

				Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.
0035	Ms Odwyer	Local Resident	Silsden needs between £25 to £45 Million infrastructure investment. A substantial proportion will have to be provided from income generated by new housing development. No accurate costing of the infrastructure needs have been provided to support the rate setting to date. How can an accurate CIL figure be set without the council running the risk of a serious future shortfall?	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p>
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	The CIL PDCS is <b>unclear</b> as to how will be used for pre-funding infrastructure construction in conjunction when a CIL is expected to be paid in phases. This needs clarification for certainty by all parties concerned. Also it needs to be clear that infrastructure often needs to be provided and operational at the <b>start</b> of a development, not only by the completion time of the development.	The intent of the CIL is to help fund infrastructure to support growth across the whole District and not to support individual development sites. CIL will contribute to strategic infrastructure. Other mechanisms such as S106/S288 will still be used to deliver site specific improvements required to make a development acceptable in planning terms

				<p>CIL Regulations provide for payment by instalment. The council may decide to introduce a policy setting out approach to instalments and phasing. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>
0039	Ms Whitaker	Local resident	<p>Silsden is expected to take at least an additional 1000 dwelling, maybe substantially more, yet its infrastructure is already woefully inadequate. Comment refers to specific infrastructure issues in Silsden including road congestion, schools being full, sewers at capacity, lack of medical provision and flooding. A new footbridge across A629 and Silsden Eastern Bypass are required.</p>	<p>For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL</p>

				<p>receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p>
0041	Ms Gott	Local Resident	<p>Silsden needs a gigantic infrastructure investment in comparison to what the CIL will provide at anything less than £100 per square metre. The development of 1000 houses is a non starter unless sufficient capital can be raised for infrastructure, funding should also come from the new homes bonus.</p> <p>The Development plan highlights significant issues on developing Silsden:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ DRAINAGE</li> <li>❖ FLOODING</li> <li>❖ ELETRIC POWER SUPPLIES (THE ONLY AREA IN THE FRADFORD DISTRICT WHERE THIS CONSTRAINT OCURS)</li> <li>❖ HIGHWAYS – RELIEF ROAD NEEDED</li> <li>❖ PRIMARY SCHOOL IS FULL</li> <li>❖ ACCESS TO RAIL CNNECTIONS IS POOR – BRIDGE AND FOOTPATH IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED</li> </ul>	<p>For a CIL to be introduced an infrastructure funding gap has to be identified. This is set out in the LIP. The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered</p>

			<p>Building these dwellings in areas that have adequate electricity, drainage, roads and interconnecting commuter routes would offer a faster economic gain for the Council through the new homes bonus.</p> <p>The priority for Silsden should be a relief road funded through the CIL</p>	<p>through an Examination in Public.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>The proposed levy notwithstanding the possible other sources of funding such as the New Homes Bonus etc would appear to fall far short of the estimates for essential infrastructure improvements needed in Silsden.</p>	<p>The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p>

0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	<p>Considerable road improvements and schooling in particular are essential in Silsden to ensure the viability and sustainability of new dwellings.</p> <p>Council working with key partners, local communities is mentioned and local and strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>There is obviously a large funding gap, to set the CIL in isolation based on what a particular site considers viable could be manipulated to create a downward spiral and rather than targeting to close the funding gap widen the gap to a level that creates severe economic problems.</p>	<p>The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure issues are identified in the LIP. The approach to infrastructure funding and delivery across the District is out in the Local Plan Core Strategy, which is currently being considered through an Examination in Public.</p> <p>In setting CIL rates the council must consider the impact on the viability of development.</p>
0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	<p>1. Given the proposed increase of 1000 plus houses in Ilkley and Addingham it is noticeable that despite calls from members of various planning committees including regulatory that NO masterplan exists for Wharfedale. This would appear to be a major deficiency as the current infrastructure is barely able to cope with current demand especially transport and education issues.</p> <p>2. There is no real plan or funding identified for secondary school provision in Wharfedale this has to be addressed prior to development taking place.</p>	<p>1. This comment regarding the masterplan is not considered relevant to CIL consultation. Site or area specific planning issues will be considered through the Local Plan Allocations Development Plan Document</p> <p>The Council's Local</p>

				<p>Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>2. Noted. The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District including education. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers.</p> <p>The monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure, including education.
<b>Regulation 123 List</b>				
005	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	Appendix C Does the 123 list cover the need in Silsden for a by-pass and if so under what heading.	The Regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that the council intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL. Major road schemes are not currently identified on the 123 list as it is considered that these will be delivered primarily through alternative funding mechanisms including Section 278 and S106 agreements and Government/Regional transport funding. However the council will continue to review and update the 123 list once CIL is adopted.
0024	Mr Stuart	West Yorkshire Police	Police costs do not have a specific mention in the PDCS. Policing costs will inevitably increase, as the population rises, therefore specific mention of those costs need to be included in the CIL PDCS. CIL funding to help meet those costs must be subject of consideration as and when the need arises.	The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.



				The council will consider these comments in relation to the 123 List which will be revised and updated for the CIL DCS stage
0026	Ms Ledger	Sport England	Welcome the reference to the proposal to redevelop the former Wyke manor school as a community sports hub. This is directly referenced in the PPS as strategic priority. Discussions have recently stalled. Possibly if it was explicitly identified on the Regulation 123 List this would create added impetus to get the project moving again.	Community sports and recreation facilities are included on the 123 List. The council will consider these comments in relation to the 123 List which will be revised and updated for the CIL DCS Stage, however it is not considered appropriate at this time for the Council to be any more specific
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	It would be useful if the Regulation 123 List could include a list of matters which will continue to be addressed via Section 106. This clarity would be useful to developers. The Leeds CIL (November 2014) adopts this approach and lists ongoing matters which will continue to be addressed through S106 and S278 agreements.	Noted. The council will set out a statement clarifying the continued use of S106 when producing the Draft Regulation 123 List alongside the DCS.

0033	Ms Bagley	Vernon & Co	<p>The Regulation 123 List identifies a number of items (primary &amp; secondary education, community sports &amp; recreation facilities, cultural facilities, public realm improvements and environmental improvements) which may be partly or wholly funded by CIL unless directly related to a development (in terms of primary education, large scale residential development “will be expected to provide primary schools either as an integral part of the development or as the result of no more than 5 separate planning obligations”). If a particular development is providing such facilities will CIL be reduced accordingly in order to ensure no double counting between CIL &amp; S106?</p>	<p>As drafted CIL will contribute to Primary and Secondary school education infrastructure except for large scale residential developments which will be expected to provide schools either as an integral part of the development or as the result of no more than 5 separate planning obligations. The Regulation 123 list reflects this to make it clear there is no double dipping; however the council will consider these comments when producing the Draft Regulation 123 List alongside the DCS.</p>
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	<p>Acknowledge that the Council will seek to update the Regulation 123 List, however concerned that at this stage the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule only provides broad proposals for the levy on the basis that the schedule and the draft Infrastructure Plan have not been linked in detail at this stage.</p> <p>Raise the issue with the Spending of CIL/Indicative Regulation 123 List associated with the proposed approach to funding towards improvements to educational facilities. The schedule seeks to use CIL for improvements towards education facilities and also makes reference to future developments paying additional contributions towards improvements to education facilities where required.</p> <p>The educational infrastructure requirements for the District and those requirements associated with future developments/allocations (whether this is the need for a new school or an increase in capacity of existing schools) should be identified and known</p>	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The council will consider these comments in relation to the 123 List which will be revised</p>

			<p>through the work taking place as part of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>For this reason we would consider any contributions requested for further improvements towards education facilities in addition to CIL to be considered “double dipping” and would have an undue impact on the viability of development schemes. We believe that such an approach would not comply with Paragraph: 094 Reference ID: 25-094-20140612 of the NPPG, which also references Paragraph 173 of the NPPF</p> <p>Believe that this approach would more often than not lead to a request of developers to seek to reduce the level of affordable housing being delivered within development schemes. Furthermore, this approach could also potentially result in future issues associated with the pooling of S106 contributions towards specific schools of the District.</p>	and updated for the CIL DCS stage.
0035	Ms Odwyer	Local Resident	<p>Adequate funding must be provided for existing and new developments. Whilst CIL provides clarity for developers and agents, it is critical that an accurate shopping list of the immediate area infrastructure requirements is provided. Without such there is a danger serious funding shortfall will occur in the future</p>	<p>Monies from CIL will help pay for infrastructure required across the district to support growth. However, the CIL is not intended to be the only funding source for infrastructure and therefore the Council will not be relying solely on CIL receipts for the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p>

				<p>The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p> <p>CIL Regulations also require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place.</p>
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>The CIL PDCS needs to say how monies raised will be <b>allocated</b> between Education, Transport Infrastructure and Green Infrastructure/Open Spaces/Public Space Infrastructure. At the moment it is completely silent on this allocation matter. This will open up far too much political decision-making: how much will ever get allocated to Green Infrastructure/ Open Spaces/Public Space Infrastructure as opposed to the other two categories, or to Transport Infrastructure when Education is a competing head of expenditure? <b><i>Proportions prior allocated in the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule to each main head are recommended to obviate this avenue for wasteful allocations and political horse-trading.</i></b></p> <p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule needs greater <b>clarity</b> as to how infrastructure costs will be <b>apportioned between the retained S106</b> Planning Obligation <b>and the proposed CIL</b> when both sources of funding are permitted by central Government guidance on the CIL.</p>	<p>The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed.</p> <p>The regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL.</p> <p>The Draft 123 list has been prepared in line with the regulations and it is not considered appropriate at this time for the Council to be any more specific, for instance, it is not the role of the R123 list to identify spending priorities</p>

				<p>within it.</p> <p>To ensure that the levy is open and transparent the CIL regulations require reporting of the monies so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p> <p>The relationship between S106 and CIL will be set out in the Draft Charging Schedule</p>
--	--	--	--	---

0040	Mr Robinson	How Planning on behalf of Canal Road Urban Village Limited	<p>A further matter of importance is that of continuing to seek planning obligations by way of Section 106 Agreements alongside the CIL charge. The PPG provides further guidance on the use of planning obligations alongside any contributions being sought through the CIL. Whilst it confirms an in-principle acceptance for the continued use of planning obligations to achieve site specific mitigation; importantly, the sub-section “<i>Other Developer Contributions</i>” under the main heading “<i>Community Infrastructure Levy</i>”, reiterates the prerogative of Framework at paragraph 173, stating that local authorities should ensure that the combined total impact of developer contributions does not threaten the viability of the sites and the scale of development identified in the Development Plan. In this regard, the following key conclusions can be drawn from the PPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_ There should be not actual or perceived ‘double dipping’ with developers paying twice for the same item of infrastructure. This is particularly pertinent to New Bolton Woods where a Joint Venture partnership has been set up to control the distribution of funds generated beyond planning obligations;</li> <li>_ The use of planning obligations is limited by Regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) which ensure that any contributions are CIL compliant, do not overlap with those being funded through the levy, and are not pooled in excess of 5 contributions for any individual infrastructure project that may be funded by the levy;</li> <li>_ Where the Regulation 123 list includes a generic type of infrastructure (such as ‘education’ or ‘transport’), Section 106 contributions should not be sought on any specific projects in that category;</li> <li>_ Where a Regulation 123 list includes project-specific infrastructure, the charging authority should not seek any planning obligations in relation to that infrastructure; and</li> <li>_ Contributions may be pooled from up to five separate planning obligations for a specific item of infrastructure (e.g. a local school) that is not included on the charging authority’s infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>Site-specific contributions like this should only be sought through planning obligations where this can be justified with reference to the underpinning evidence on infrastructure planning that was presented at the charging schedule examination.</p>	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The LIP will be updated on a regular basis in consultation with key partners, local communities and infrastructure providers.</p> <p>S106 will not be sought for items on the R123 List in accordance with CIL Regulations. The relationship between S106 and CIL will be set out in the Draft Charging Schedule</p>
------	-------------	--	--	--

0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>1. Planning Obligations- it is not clear where CIL ONLY WILL BE APPLIED, S106, S238 all these contributions are key to the development of Silsden namely Highways - Relief Road, Education – New Schools, Bridges, Drainage, Power supply upgrades etc. A pooled levy could possibly provide greater flexibility to provide the relief road</p> <p>Where is the detailed list and detailed costings of the infrastructure it intends to fund by CIL?</p>	<p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL</p> <p>S106 will not be sought for items on the R1223 List in accordance with CIL Regulations. The relationship between S106 and CIL will be set out in the Draft Charging Schedule</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>The draft reg; 123 list shown does not give any detail regarding “<i>Sustainable transport improvement schemes</i>”, given that considerable investment is needed to support projects such as the Silsden Relief Road, the heading needs further clarification the road is a significant portion of the investment required or will the whole investment required be totally funded by the developers of the 1000 dwellings proposed.</p>	<p>The regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL. Major road schemes are not currently identified on the Regulation 123 list as it is considered that these will be delivered primarily though</p>

				<p>alternative funding mechanisms including Section 278 and S106 agreements and Government/Regional transport funding. However the council will continue to review the Regulation 123 list once CIL is adopted.</p> <p>The council agree sustainable transport schemes should be further defined and will consider these comments when producing the Draft Regulation 123 List</p>
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	Appendix C: Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 list lacks detail and does not clearly and succinctly describe the infrastructure improvements proposed or differentiate between local infrastructure and strategic infrastructure needs.	<p>The Regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL.</p> <p>The Council's Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) sets out the strategic infrastructure requirements in relation to delivering growth in the District. This has helped identify an infrastructure funding gap and inform the Preliminary Draft Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>The Draft 123 has been</p>



				prepared in line with the regulations and it is not considered appropriate at this time for the Council to be any more specific, for instance, it is not the role of the 123 list to identify spending priorities or detail local infrastructure improvements.
0044	Mr Smith	Historic England	Welcome the identification of green infrastructure and public realm improvements as one of the potential projects within the indicative Regulation 123 List. A high-quality public realm is an essential component in helping to encouraging people to live in and visit the Borough and attract continued investment into the District	Comment noted
<b>CIL implementation</b>				
0001	Mr McGibbon	Local Resident	Encourage the Council to ensure developers cannot get out of paying CIL by claiming their project will be unviable if they pay or if they have to build affordable houses.	CIL rates have been set in relation to viability evidence which factors in affordable housing policy requirements. Payment of CIL will be mandatory on chargeable development (subject to the exceptions policy outlined in the CIL regulations). The process for the implementation and collection of CIL will be set out by the Council alongside any adopted charging schedule.
0009	Ms Carroll	Local Resident	Silsden town council is not a representative body capable of using the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in the interests of Silsden residents. The comment sets out reasons for this, including a lack of accountability mechanisms.  Very surprised that the council is considering passing CIL monies to Town and Parish	Comment noted. The CIL Regulations require the Council pass a proportion of CIL recipes directly to those Parish and Town Councils

			Councils under these circumstances and in the case of Silsden Town Council in particular, this would be not only misguided but irresponsible based on the reasons given.	<p>where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) (see Regulation 59A for details).</p> <p>To ensure that the levy is open and transparent, the CIL Regulations detail the reporting requirements so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent. This information will be publically available.</p>
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	The proposed method of costing does not state whether the charge per m <sup>2</sup> relates to total site area or the footprint of a building.	The CIL charge per square metre relates to the gross internal area of the chargeable development; The CIL charge formula is set out within the Appendix A to the PDCS document
0014	Ms Monaghan	Local resident	In Menston residents have suffered from developers reneging on agreements to improve green spaces, provide allotments and improve public transport. What measures will be put in place to ensure any community infrastructure levy will be used as agreed?	The CIL charge would be mandatory once introduced. To ensure that the levy is open and transparent, the CIL Regulations detail the reporting requirements so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent. This information will be publically available.

0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p>The comment asks a series of questions regarding implementation of CIL including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the mechanism for ensuring the Town Council receive their relevant entitlements to CIL and within what timescale?</li> <li>• Does the pooling of a maximum of 5 planning obligations towards a particular piece of type of infrastructure, also apply to town council wishes to pursue a project?</li> <li>• Appendix B what is the mechanism by which the share of CIL to town council is paid and are the trigger points the same payment dates for both BMDC and Silsden Town Council.</li> <li>• How does this mechanism work in terms of cross ward or multiple ward issues?</li> </ul>	<p>The CIL Regulations (as amended) set out the legal framework for the duty to pass CIL to local councils and calculating, collecting and spending the levy and planning obligations.</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time.</p> <p>Further detailed guidance will produced in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	<p>Appendix A where development is done in phases will the trigger points used in the calculation agreed at the point of granting planning permission or will they be subject to change by the developer. How will the council ensure certainty regarding the payment of the CIL to the Town Council?</p>	<p>Planning applications can be subdivided into 'phases' for the purposes of the levy. CIL Regulations provide for payment by instalment. The council may decide to introduce a policy setting out approach to instalments and phasing. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations (as amended) set out the legal</p>

				framework for the duty to pass CIL to local councils and calculating, collecting and spending the levy and planning obligations.
0025	Cllr Smith	Conservative Party	This proposal seems based on the Bedford proposal where that the better areas which have a larger CIL, due to the increase in value of projects will subsidise the less desirable areas. Bradford's proposal is very similar hence the outer areas of Bradford will subsidise through political interference support the inner city leaving the outer areas with little more than the 25% of the CIL.	<p>The CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL recipes to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15% of the neighbourhood portion of CIL recipes (or 25%, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made). The monies raised other than the neighbourhood portion will go into a central pot to contribute to infrastructure across the District.</p> <p>The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed. The Regulation 123 list sets out what CIL monies may fund.</p>
0033	Ms Bagley	Vernon & Co	Regular monitoring should be undertaken to ensure any detrimental effect of the CIL	Agree. The council will keep the charging schedule under

			upon the delivery of new development is recognised and rectified.	review to ensure that levy charges remain appropriate. The Council will monitor CIL through the Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule lacks definition in terms of <b>how CIL monies will be pooled and how pooled money will be prioritised across a time-based schedule of infrastructure provision</b>. The lack of time profiles of expenditure in the Local Infrastructure Plan Update (October 2013) does not help this matter. But the proposed CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule also needs to explain how monies raised will be allocated on a time-based priority list of infrastructure provision.</p> <p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule also lacks <b>clarity</b> as to how CIL monies will be <b>pooled</b>, if at all, <b>across Local Planning Authority boundaries</b>.</p> <p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule needs to specify what happens to CIL monies collected which are allocated to infrastructure which is not subsequently delivered. <b>A time limit on identified expenditure needs to be specified</b>. Your attention is drawn to the issues that have arisen in Leeds concerning the S106 payments made by developers towards tram proposals that have not for many subsequent years seen fruition.</p>	<p>The relationship between S106 and CIL will be set out in the Draft Charging Schedule</p> <p>The council must spend the levy on infrastructure needed to support the development of their area, and decide what infrastructure is needed.</p> <p>The regulation 123 list sets out a list of those projects or types of infrastructure that it intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded through the CIL.</p> <p>The Draft 123 list has been prepared in line with the regulations and it is not considered appropriate at this time for the Council to be any more specific, for instance, it is not the role of the 123 list to identify spending priorities within it.</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and</p>

				<p>policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be produced in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>Taking into account Appendix C reg 123 list the last paragraph “<i>the council will work with local communities and parish/town councils to agree local priorities for spend. The meaningful proportion held by local communities can be spent on the regulation 123 list, but it does not have to be</i>”. Surely pro-active engagement should be sought with those community representatives in the interest of not only efficiency but also to demonstrate commitment to the identified immediate local infrastructure needs. This would also sit comfortably with the requirements of the Localism Act.</p> <p>Will 25% of these monies raised by the CIL be directly attributed to the local Parish Council and/or neighbourhood plan teams?</p>	<p>CIL Regulations require a proportion of CIL receipts to be passed to local communities where development has taken place. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations. Local communities will receive 15% of the neighbourhood portion of CIL receipts (or 25%, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made).</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations (as amended) set out the legal framework for the duty to pass</p>

				CIL to local councils and calculating, collecting and spending the levy and planning obligations.
0045	Ms Neville	Local Resident	<p>Assume the thinking behind this scheme is to use local knowledge in the decision making process regarding the needs of a community. However seriously question whether Town/Parish Councils are the best vehicle for providing this information.</p> <p>My experience of Town Councils is that they are open to operating outside the main community networks and being accountable only to themselves. Councillors are often co-opted, rather than elected, thus bringing into question how much they actually represent the community and whether in deed they can speak on its behalf.</p> <p>In terms of the councils' financial management, whilst the Local Government Act 1972 and the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011 are in place, it appears there are no external checking systems or safeguards which can be called upon to ensure proper use of income received. End of year accounts have to be produced, and checked by an auditor, but it can be very difficult to identify from these exactly how the money is spent. Attempts to clarify can be discouraged.</p> <p>My experience has been that local people are not consulted on priorities for spending and decisions can be made in a completely ad hoc and random basis. From the information I received it does seem that local Town Councils have to be in discussions with their local authorities and neighbouring councils with regard to the use of money from the levy, but I did not see any conditions with regard to consultation with the people living in their communities.</p> <p>It seems that town/parish councils can avoid cooperate with District Councils, who seem powerless to enforce resolutions to any problems. It appears there is no national system for ensuring that Town/Parish Councils act in the best interests of their communities; this is essential if communities are to have confidence that any money given to a council would be used in the best interests of its community.</p>	<p>CIL Regulations require the Council pass a proportion of CIL recipes directly to those Parish and Town Councils where development has taken place to be spent on local priorities. The neighbourhood portion is set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) (see Regulation 59A for details).</p> <p>A local council must use CIL receipts passed to it in accordance with regulation 59A or 59B to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area, by funding—  (a)the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure;  or  (b)anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area</p> <p>To ensure that the levy is open and transparent, the CIL</p>

				Regulations detail the reporting requirements so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent. This information will be publically available.
--	--	--	--	---



0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	<p>What is the mechanism that Bradford are proposing which ensures the Parish Council receive their relevant entitlements to CIL and within what timescale?</p> <p>Appendix B what is the mechanism by which the share of CIL to the parish council is paid and are the trigger points the same payment dates for both BMDC and Addingham Parish Council.</p> <p>How does this mechanism work in terms of cross ward or multiple ward issues?</p> <p>Now that the council can only pool a max of 5 planning obligations towards a particular piece of type of infrastructure, does this also apply to a parish council who wishes to pursue a project?</p>	<p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is primarily concerned with the rates the CIL is to be set at.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations (as amended) set out the legal framework for the duty to pass CIL to local councils and calculating, collecting and spending the levy and planning obligations.</p> <p>Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be produced in the run up to CIL implementation.</p> <p>From April 2015 S106 contributions can only be pooled for up to five separate planning obligations dated back to 6 April 2010 for an infrastructure project or type of infrastructure. Any planning obligation must also meet the tests in Regulation 122.</p>
------	-------------	--------------------------	--	--

Payment in Kind				
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	CIL payments being “delivered in kind”. There is no detail on what this means, how it would be delivered and who would decide on how the relevant values of such benefits could be calculated.	CIL Regulations allow for land and/or infrastructure to be provided ‘in kind’, instead of money for part or all of a levy liability. The Council does not have to adopt a payment in-kind policy, but should it choose to do so, it must publish a policy document which sets out conditions in detail. This is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	If a payment in kind is allowed how does the Town Council acquire 25% of the value if it is not in monetary form?	The Council may decide to introduce a policy for payments in kind under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule.  Any land payment must satisfy the criteria in the CIL Regulations.
0031	Ms Robson	Turley	Support the introduction of Payment in Kind mechanism (i.e. payment of CIL liability via provision of land or infrastructure).	Support noted. The Council may choose to adopt a payment in-kind policy, but should it choose to do so, it must publish a policy document which sets out conditions in detail. This is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a

				different time.
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	Fully supportive of the proposed payments in kind approach. Consider this to be a logical and reasonable approach which can both aid in the viability of development schemes and the delivery of required infrastructure. Should the Council seek to adopt this approach they will need to consult on the proposed conditions? Our client would therefore like to offer their input into this process in order to work alongside the Council to prepare a sound and robust strategy in this respect.	Support noted. The council will consider these comments in relation to any payments in kind policy which may be produced separately to CIL.
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	Whilst it is possible an offer of land might be an option using areas unsuitable for development due to topography issues etc. To enable an accurate estimate to set the CIL ANY IDEAS FOR SUCH OFFERS should be considered at this stage and not retrospectively at a later time. Obviously this would have a significant effect on funding, developers, local council provision, communities etc throughout the area.	The Council may decide to introduce a policy for payments in kind under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule. The council will consider these comments in relation to any payments in kind policy which may be produced separately to CIL.  Any land payment must satisfy the criteria in the CIL Regulations.
0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	If a payment in kind is allowed how does the Parish Council acquire 25% of the value if it is not in monetary form?	The Council may decide to introduce a policy for payments in kind under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule.  Any land payment must satisfy the criteria in the CIL Regulations.

Exceptions Policy				
0040	Mr Robinson	How Planning on behalf of Canal Road Urban Village Limited	<p>The effect of CIL on marginal sites may also produce contradictory or perverse outcomes for BDC's own Local Plan policy objectives. CRUVL is of the opinion that a sensible and appropriate way to address these issues would be to ensure that exemption relief can be permitted on a project-by-project basis where it can be demonstrated that there are specific reasons preventing schemes from becoming viable. There must be an innate level of flexibility within the council's CIL Charging Schedule to ensure that the viability of schemes is maintained as per the NPPF and PPG. It is noted that at this time that the Council has not yet decided whether to offer Exceptional Circumstances Relief but that it may choose to do so by adopting a separate discretionary relief policy. As detailed above, this is essential if the Council is to ensure that important regeneration schemes with marginal viability (such as that at New Bolton Woods) are to be deliverable and provide necessary strategic housing and other needs.</p> <p>Specifically, it is essential that relief for exceptional circumstances be available from the day the CIL Charging Schedule comes into effect in accordance with Regulations 55, 56 and 57 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). Specifically, this should relate to and ensure that key strategic sites with marginal viability (such as New Bolton Woods) are applicable. This approach would be consistent with the Framework, PPG and a number of other authorities with approved CIL Charging Schedules – such as Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council and Sheffield City Council.</p> <p>It is essential that the Council includes Exceptional Circumstances Relief for key strategic sites that have marginal viability - such as New Bolton Woods. Such sites will provide a vital strategic source of housing and other development to meet objectively assessed needs over the coming years. This imperative cannot be jeopardised by the imposition of CIL without the ability for inherent flexibility. National policy and guidance is very clear that <i>“development ... should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened”</i>. A policy for this should be included to provide developers with the certainty that the viability of development will be maintained.</p>	<p>The council recognise the use of an exceptional circumstances policy enables charging authorities to avoid rendering sites with specific and exceptional cost burdens unviable. The Council may decide to introduce an exceptional circumstances relief policy, under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately to the CIL. The council will set out any exceptions policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>Claims for relief on chargeable developments may then be considered on a case by case basis, in accordance with the CIL Regulations and must be based on an objective assessment of economic viability.</p>

0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	Will the discretionary relief policy be published for public consultation, before the CIL charging schedule is put forward for approval	<p>The Council may decide to introduce an exceptional circumstances relief policy, under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately to the CIL. The council will set out any exceptions policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>The Council may decide to introduce a policy for giving discretionary charitable investment relief, under CIL Regulation 44. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be published separately.</p>
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	No discretionary relief policy is provided for comment; to do this retrospectively runs the risk of undermining the costing and estimates used to set the CIL. For example a mixed use development linked to jobs encouraging minimal commuting should attract some relief.	<p>The Council may decide to introduce an exceptional circumstances relief policy, under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately to the CIL. The council will set out any exceptions policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p>

				The Council may decide to introduce a policy for giving discretionary charitable investment relief, under CIL Regulation 44. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be published separately.
0044	Mr Smith	Historic England	Under the CIL regulations, Local Authorities have the right to offer discretionary relief from CIL in exceptional circumstances in order to ensure that the levy does not prevent otherwise desirable development. Although it is accepted that the decision to offer exceptional relief is not part of the Charging Schedule, nonetheless, we would welcome the acknowledgement within the document that such relief may be offered in exceptional circumstances. In terms of our area of interest, we consider that CIL relief should be offered where the requirement to pay CIL would have a harmful impact upon the economic viability of developments which involve heritage assets particularly those which are at risk.	The council recognise the use of an exceptions policy enables charging authorities to avoid rendering sites with specific and exceptional cost burdens unviable. The Council may decide to introduce an exceptional circumstances relief policy, under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately to the CIL. The council will set out any exceptions policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.
<b>Instalments Policy</b>				
0015	L Corcoran	Silsden Town Council	What is the trigger point in payment by instalment?	Payment days (the day on which an instalment payment will be due) will be calculated from the commencement of development on site. The council will set out any

				instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.
0029	Ms Holland	Wakefield Council	The draft instalment policy is presented in the appendix material of the PDCS document; this should be presented in a separate document in its own right.	Noted. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.
0031	Ms Robson	Turley	<p>Turley supports the introduction of a proposed Instalments Policy. However, we recommend refining the schedule for payments as follows for liability exceeding £100k in order to support cash flow and reduce additional finance costs associated with early CIL payments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instalment 1: 10% @ 6 months</li> <li>• Instalment 2: 15% @ 12 months</li> <li>• Instalment 3: 25% @ 18 months</li> <li>• Instalment 4: 25% @ 24 months</li> <li>• Instalment 5: 25% @ 30 months</li> </ul>	<p>The council will consider these comments and set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage. However it is considered that extending the timescales too far may not provide sufficient up front funding to allow infrastructure delivery. In addition the 2014 Amendment CIL Regulations also allow full planning permissions to be phased for the purposes of the CIL.</p> <p>The rates are based on viability evidence which assumes payment of CIL at the outset of the development programme and therefore any instalment provision is supported by the viability evidence.</p>

0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	Welcome the CIL instalments policy; however question the due date relating to time from the commencement of development. Instead of a 6 monthly time gap for instalments it would be welcome if a due date could relate to percentage of development complete. I.e. 25% of the CIL payment due when 25% of the development is complete.	The council will consider these comments and set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage. The 2014 Amendment CIL Regulations also allow full planning permissions to be phased for the purposes of the CIL
0034	Mr Butler	PB Planning on behalf of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes	<p>Fully supports the identified approach in respect of Phasing CIL payments. They believe that such an approach will aid in the ongoing viability of development proposals as it will account for cash flow matters and also any changes in market conditions.</p> <p>Along with the proposed phasing of payments, fully support the identified approach in respect of payment instalments for the same reasons as identified above. Through the amalgamated use of both policies this will help to ensure that development scheme are viable on commencement and remain viable throughout their delivery.</p>	Support noted
0040	Mr Robinson	How Planning on behalf of Canal Road Urban Village Limited	CRUVL supports the inclusion of phased payments of CIL and the potential for an Instalments Policy. This will increase the flexibility of payments for developers, it must still be flexible enough to consider the specific circumstances of individual sites	Support for phasing noted. The Council may decide to introduce an instalments policy, under CIL Regulations. This is not part of the CIL charging schedule and may be considered separately to the CIL.



0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	Page 13 Para 8.4 and <b>appendix B not C</b> – Instalment provision table <i>*Payable on the anniversary of the commencement of development</i> surely * should not be used on line 1- due date 6 months, are these just typographical errors?	Payment days (the day on which an instalment payment will be due) will be calculated from the commencement of development on site. The council will consider these comments and set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	<p>1. Appendix B; instalment Policy seems to indicate instalments are only due on the anniversary of the commencement of development and appears to favour the large scale developments.</p> <p>2. On page 8 more clarity and guidance should be provided regarding the phasing and link into the infrastructure improvements which should be commenced in advance or in parallel with residential development.</p> <p>Pooling a maximum of 5 planning obligations restricts flexibility, particularly concerning large projects such as a school or road; key features are ease of access and egress, traffic segregation and safety of people.</p> <p>Phasing should take this into account namely the whole site allocated as one planning application.</p>	<p>1. Payment days (the day on which an instalment payment will be due) will be calculated from the commencement of development on site. The council will consider these comments and set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>2. Planning application can be subdivided into 'phases' for the purposes of the levy. CIL Regulations provide for payment by instalment. The council may decide to introduce a policy setting out approach to instalments and phasing. The council will set out any instalments policy in a</p>

				<p>separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>CIL will contribute to strategic infrastructure. Other mechanisms such as S106/S288 will still be used to deliver site specific improvements required to make a development acceptable in planning terms</p>
0046	Cllr Naylor	Addingham Parish Council	<p>1.What is the trigger point in payment by instalment</p> <p>2.Appendix A where development is done in phases will the trigger points used in the calculation agreed at the point of granting planning permission or will they be subject to change by the developer. How will the council ensure certainty regarding the payment of the CIL to the Parish Council?</p>	<p>1. Payment days (the day on which an instalment payment will be due) will be calculated from the commencement of development on site. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the charging schedule at the DCS stage.</p> <p>2. Planning applications can be subdivided into 'phases' for the purposes of the levy. CIL Regulations provide for payment by instalment. The council may decide to introduce a policy setting out approach to instalments and phasing. The council will set out any instalments policy in a separate document to the</p>

				charging schedule at the DCS stage.
<b>CIL process</b>				
006	Ms Cadamarteri	Local Resident	The consultation process has been extremely difficult to decipher the amount of information presented within the website. To find, extract and discover specific details has been extremely challenging. The email correspondence inviting representation was extremely vague and provided a lack of detail that would discourage full community involvement and responses from the general public.	<p>1. Noted. Consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule has been undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>It is recognised that the CIL is a complicated and technical process and the council will seek to ensure further clarity and detail is provided during the subsequent consultation on the CIL Draft Charging Schedule.</p>
0013	Cllr Hill	Parish Councillor	<p>1. CIL must be based on a relevant plan, currently the only plan in place is the 2005 RUDP. It would appear financially prudent to wait until the new area development plan is in place before the CIL is activated. Therefore, this consultation would appear to be over hasty.</p> <p>2. Consider the consultation should be put on hold until the new district development plan is in place and that areas of concern where there is little or no information are better addressed. As it stands, this Council feels it is being asked to sign a blank cheque in responding to this consultation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The relevant plan is the Local Plan. The Local Plan Core Strategy is currently being considered through an Examination in Public. The CIL PDCS has been worked up alongside the production of the Bradford District Local Plan Core Strategy in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and</p>

				<p>Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council therefore considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>2. It is considered that the CIL is based on relevant evidence, which has been worked up alongside the Local Plan Core Strategy.</p> <p>The CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is primarily concerned with the rates the CIL is to be set at. Detailed information on CIL implementation, spending, collecting, reporting and policies on payment in kind is not part of the charging schedule and may be published at a different time. Further detailed guidance will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

0025	Cllr Smith	Conservative Party	<p>The Document is based on the Core strategy document proposals but these are not agreed, so the assessment of the amount CIL will contribute to the future council budgets on this basis is wrong and will be lower than expected. The areas contributing most will be the outer areas of Bradford mainly the significant areas of Silsden Addingham and Ilkley would achieve huge CIL if approved in Core strategy. It will be unlikely CIL will be spent in those areas.</p>	<p>CIL must be based on a relevant plan. The relevant plan is the Local Plan. The Local Plan Core Strategy is currently being considered through an Examination in Public. The CIL PDCS has been worked up alongside the production of the Bradford District Local Plan Core Strategy in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The Council have used the evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council therefore considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p>
0027	Councillor Sykes	Bradford Councillor	<p>This consultation process is seriously flawed in its timing being across the main Bradford holiday period of August and is reliant on the use of a web based comment form. By definition the response rate will be low and perhaps this was the intention.</p>	<p>Consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule has been undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p>

				<p>The council disagree the consultation process was flawed. The CIL consultation period lasted for 6 weeks and finished on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The Council used a number of methods to invite people to make representations including letters/emails to relevant bodies and persons, and information included in news articles. Consultation information at was made available deposit locations and Consultation information on the Council's website</p> <p>This will be set out through a Statement of consultation alongside the CIL DCS.</p>
0042	Mr Pickles	Local Resident	<p>1 concerned regarding both the methodology and limited consultation that appears to have taken place. Although consultation has taken place with developers and agents, there appears to be little or no consultation recorded with local parish councils, neighbourhood planning etc</p> <p>Suggest further consultation is made with local communities, clarification is sought on the points made</p> <p>2. The full statement of Statutory Compliance allows scope for further detail to be included, but I question why it is not included now.</p>	<p>Consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule has been undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>The CIL consultation period lasted for 6 weeks and finished on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The Council used a number of methods to invite people to make</p>

				<p>representations including letters/emails to relevant bodies and persons, information included in news articles. Consultation information was made available at deposit locations and Consultation information on the Council's website</p> <p>This will be set out through a Statement of consultation alongside the CIL DCS.</p> <p>Further consultation will be undertaken on the Draft Charging Schedule and further detail on CIL implementation will be given in the run up to CIL implementation.</p> <p>2. There is no requirement to publish a Statement of Statutory compliance alongside the PDCS. The council will publish a statement of Statutory Compliance as part of the Draft Charging Schedule.</p>
0043	Ms Shuttleworth	Local Resident	It is disappointing that this has only been recently put out for consultation and at a time when most interested persons in the Community including Councillors are on annual leave. Hope that before setting the CIL further consultation is made with local	Consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule has been undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as

			<p>communities.</p>	<p>amended). This will be set out through a Statement of consultation publication alongside the CIL DCS.</p> <p>The CIL consultation period lasted for 6 weeks and finished on Friday 11<sup>th</sup> September 2015. The Council used a number of methods to invite people to make representations including letters/emails to relevant bodies and persons, information included in news articles, Consultation information was made available at deposit locations and Consultation information on the Council's website</p> <p>Furth consultation will be undertaken on the Draft Charging Schedule and further detail on CIL implementation will be given in the run up to CIL implementation</p>
--	--	--	---------------------	---



Other comments				
0004	Mr Dugdale		<p>1. Against future building in Cullingworth.</p> <p>2. Strongly object if any excess charges are levied against me.</p>	<p>1. Noted. This comment refers to the location of development. The CIL is not a plan providing policies for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocation of land for different uses. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>2. CIL is payable on new development in the District. Existing homeowners will not pay CIL unless undertaking new development, which is liable for CIL.</p>
006	Ms Cadamarteri	Local Resident	<p>Object to the release greenbelt land to encourage development of residential dwellings and industrial units. The comment lists several brownfield sites in Thornton that would benefit from regeneration and supports the redevelopment of these sites and states that consultation documents provide little detail regarding the regeneration of brownfield sites and prioritises the removal of green belt.</p> <p>The Comment refers to specific infrastructure issues in Thornton including water drains being blocked in specific locations and states the proposal to release greenbelt land to help build 700 houses does not adequately discuss or describe the investment needed in drainage and road infrastructure. The comment refers to no traffic surveys being completed to assess traffic levels at proposed greenbelt sites at Thornton Heights and that the council has therefore not provided evidence that adequately justifies destroying greenbelt areas.</p>	<p>The CIL is not a plan providing policies or proposals for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocations of land for different uses, including the release of greenbelt land. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>CIL rates have been set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p>

				Comments relating to land allocations, site specific issues and greenbelt will be provided to the Local Plans Team
007	Mr O'Donnell	Local Resident	Strongly oppose development on any of the surrounding green belt land around Thornton. The comment lists the reasons for this including that that infrastructure in the area (transport, education and health care) requires large scale improvements and cannot sustain further developments, brownfield sites should be redeveloped first, water drainage and narrow road issues and the adverse affect on tourism.	<p>Comment noted. The CIL is not a plan providing policies or proposals for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocations of land for different uses, including the release of greenbelt land. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>CIL rates have been set in relation to viability evidence and not policy objectives.</p> <p>Comments relating to land allocations, site specific issues and greenbelt will be provided to the Local Plans Team.</p>
008	Mr Emmott	Local Resident	Comment relating to site at Coutances Way, Ben Rhydding. Site specific issues raised relating to adverse affect on infrastructure and development in greenbelt. If approved any scheme should include a new enlarged Ilkley Grammar School. This is essential to provide additional school places needed for the catchment area	The CIL is not a plan providing policies or proposals for the scale and location development in the District or allocations of land for different uses. including the release of greenbelt land. This will be considered through the Local

				<p>Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Comments relating to land allocations, site specific issues and greenbelt will be provided to the Local Plans Team.</p>
0025	Cllr Smith	Conservative Party	Comment relating to the Core Strategy including using and brownfield land grants, reusing homes above shops for affordable homes to offset/reduce number of homes proposed in greenbelt/Greenfield locations.	<p>Noted. The CIL is not a plan providing policies or proposals for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocations of land for different uses, including the release of greenbelt land. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Comments relating to land allocations, site specific issues and greenbelt will be provided to the Local Plans Team.</p>
0032	Ms Lomas	Taylor Wimpey	Question the overall requirement for CIL in the District and would like to understand the detailed justification for pursuing CIL instead of continuing the current mechanism for securing infrastructure funding via S106 and S278 agreements.	<p>Noted. The benefits and justification for CIL are set out in the CIL Background Report</p>

0035	Ms Odwyer	Local Resident	<p>The proposed CIL will raise far less than the current S106 and S323 arrangements. Whilst only 5 106 can be pooled towards a specific item; the current arrangement has advantages over applying CIL of a fixed amount. Namely apportionment is to a particular item of infrastructure. Clear allocation would need to be set out in the CIL to be fair to both local residents and developers.</p>	<p>Noted. The benefits of CIL are set out in the CIL Background Paper. S106 will remain for site specific issues.</p> <p>To ensure that the levy is open and transparent, the CIL Regulations detail the reporting requirements so it is clear what funds have been received and how CIL has been spent. This information will be publically available.</p>
0036	Ms Thompson	Local resident	<p>Comments relating to the Local Plan being undeliverable. The comment provide detailed reason for this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bradford's housing market has been misinterpreted.</li> <li>- house building proposed would exceed the number of customers able to raise a mortgage even in most optimistic job growth scenario-</li> </ul> <p>These factors render it impossible to deliver commercial development (market housing) or affordable (intermediate housing) at the levels proposed in the Local Plan. They also render it impossible to deliver the CIL at the values set out in the proposals produced by DTZ in June 2015 and as a consequence the Infrastructure Plan is undeliverable.</p> <p>Reducing housing requirements to a more realistic figure based on evidence is the only way to deliver an achievable plan it would also reduce the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The Council are advised to withdraw the Local Plan, to withdraw the proposals regarding CIL and to withdraw the infrastructure plan.</p> <p>The representation makes recommendations regarding how genuine housing needs might be met.</p>	<p>The CIL is not a plan providing policies for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocation of land for different uses. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document</p> <p>The CIL PDCS has been worked up alongside the production of the Bradford District Local Plan Core Strategy (which is currently being considered through examination in public) in accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>The Council have used the</p>

				<p>evidence in the LIP and Viability Assessment to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential impact on the viability of development. The council therefore considers that the CIL is based on relevant and up to date evidence, in accordance with CIL Regulations.</p> <p>The council consider the CIL is based on robust evidence, including the LIP and CIL viability Assessment and do not consider the CIL should be withdrawn.</p>
0038	Mr Plumbe	Local Resident	<p>Good aspects of the proposed CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule are that is proposing indexing over time to a construction price index (but beware of that index going negative at a future date) and that minimum thresholds of the size of developments for incurring a CIL have been not stated such that the individual house built will pay as well as the larger housing developments.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

0041	Ms Gott	Local Resident	<p>The representation refers to site specific matters including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Brownfield sites which are closer to the Hospital should be considered first</li> <li>- The sites to the South will also cause the least congestion being closer to the A629 trunk road and rail station</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. This comment refers to the location of development. The CIL is not a plan providing policies for the scale and location for growth / development in the District or allocation of land for different uses. This will be considered through the Local Plan Core Strategy and Allocations Development Plan Document</p>
------	---------	----------------	--	---