

Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule

Regulation 16 and 17 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)

Draft Charging Schedule - Representation Form

Monday 14th December 2015 to Monday 8th February 2016

This is your opportunity to comment on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule. You can access the CIL Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents online from our website: www.bradford.gov.uk/planningpolicy. The documents and can also be viewed at the Council Planning Offices and main libraries.

For further information you can contact the Development Plans team by:

- Emailing us at: planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk
- Phoning us on: (01274) 433679

Please make your representation on this form

This form has two parts:

- Part A – Personal Details
- Part B – Your Representation.

Please return this completed representation form to the Development Plans Team by either:

- E-mail to: 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 8 week consultation period which will run from Monday 14th December 2015 until **1.00 pm on Monday 8th February 2016**

Copies of the comments will be made available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential.

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998

Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) requires all representations received to be submitted to the CIL Examiner. By completing this form you are giving your consent to the processing of personal data by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and that any information received by the Council, including personal data may be put into the public domain, including on the Council's website. The information you supply will only be used and retained for the purpose of preparing the Local Plan. Please note that the Council cannot accept any anonymous comments.

The Draft Charging Schedule consultation includes the Proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Rates, a Charging Zone Map, a Draft Regulation 123 List, a Draft Installments Policy, and a Draft Exceptional Circumstances Policy which you are invited to comment on via the questions set out below:-

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

	1. YOUR DETAILS
Title	MR
First Name	██████████
Last Name	PICKLES
Organisation (where relevant)	RESIDENT
Address	██
Post Code	BD20 ██████████
Email Address	Click here to enter text.

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION -

Q1 Do you consider that the proposed levy rates in the Draft Charging Schedule have been informed by appropriate available evidence?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: No:

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s), below.

The evidence provided is limited and does not take into account critical infrastructure requirements and the particular demographics of a particular area. Previous comments and concerns put forward have not been satisfactorily addressed. The statement that CIL will not be the only funding to provide infrastructure improvements is rather evasive, a sound business plan should identify how the full estimated financial commitment will be met. The base line information is dated and needs further review. (For example the recent floods indicate a number of the sites will require additional investment on top of that proposed and identified in the LIP. This applies to all sites not just those close to the flood plains. Note this was an actual not hypothetical event, after the information previously presented, which warrants a main modification to address this serious issue. The lesson learned is to provide pro-active relief measures rather than less economical re-active measures.) Additional investment is needed to protect existing residents, from worsening situations possible from inadequate prevention measures being provided on new sites.

The levy proposed of £20 sq metre is inadequate in Silsden to provide a meaningful contribution towards the £25 million plus infrastructure investment needed in the area, to support any sustainable developments and in particular it is noted in the revised SHLAA that all sites are ready now for development in Silsden, despite the previous SHLAA indicating a phased pattern of development.

Noted an addendum has been provided in Dec 2015 from CW prev; DTZ, which indicates (although the addendum is limited to a small site) that considerable headroom is available, to absorb a higher CIL rate and the S106 for education (previously applied) is expected in future to be included in the CIL 123 list.

Q2 Do you consider that the proposed rates are informed by, and consistent with, the evidence on economic viability across the District?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: No:

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s), below.

The CIL Levy set needs to truly reflect the infrastructure needs in that community to offset the burden the provision of additional housing will impose. The figures indicated in the LIP are out of date and although acknowledged we are working with a moving target, these need to be reviewed to provide accurate CIL pricing. Dramatic differences between neighbouring areas, using house price data and post code allocation is too restrictive without fullness or scope. Using only a small number of developments as a reference data set, which do not fully take into account the local features of each particular area is unsound and increases the possibility of data errors.

Q3 Do you consider that the proposed levy rates would strike an appropriate balance between securing additional investment to support the development identified in the local plan, and the potential effects on the viability of developments in the Bradford district?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: No:

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your answer, or any suggested change(s), below.

The CIL levy rates proposed will not deliver the requisite proportion of funding towards infrastructure improvements required to accommodate the new development sites. Where is the short fall in funding to come from if not the CIL. Nationally available evidence and comparable areas in the UK, (not only Yorkshire region) indicate a higher level of CIL is viable whilst still maintaining a reasonable profit margin. Indeed this additional headroom possible is identified in both the DTZ documents and those provided in the neighbouring area of Leeds. Capability of growth in the region is seriously undermined by the lack of infrastructure investment, to minimise this identified shortfall, growth should be initially directed to be in the less demanding areas first where a lower CIL has been allocated and existing utilities, services are adequate, the

higher demand for high infrastructure investment areas should be only considered when the aforementioned areas have been fully developed.

The CIL is a mechanism to allow for pooling making a significant difference rather than, small contributions through S106 to specific areas of need, it is therefore critical it is set at a level which will make a meaningful contribution to support the proposed LOCAL development to be fair to both the developer and existing local residents in the spirit of the Localism Act. The proposal does not achieve an appropriate balance. Suggest further work is needed to ensure any proposed level for the neighbouring Craven/North Yorkshire are compatibility with the rates set for Silsden/Steeton/Eastburn and Addingham. Further work is required with utilities, drainage providers to take into account the work that has taken place and identified to be needed since the LIP was produced.

Q4 Do you have any comments to make on whether the council has complied with the legislative requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended)?

Yes: **No:**

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s) below.

The Consultation has not made use of the full scope of resources available, all possible avenues for public engagement should be used. There is a high reliance on the internet, and documents could have been made available at each local community outlet, to engage non internet users in outlying districts. The Plan-it Bradford publication is a good communication tool however, more guidance could be provided to generate response to key documents such as this.

Q5 Do you have any comments to make on the Draft Regulation 123 list, and the approach to the continued use of section 106 obligations?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: **No:**

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s), below.

The draft Reg., 123 list is lacking in detail, and whilst realise it could be modified at a later stage, comments as follows;

Cycle routes are included in both CIL and s106/s278?

Not clear how special highway works/(relief road)improvement will be delivered?

Education has moved to CIL (issue with pooling of 5 obligations?)

Document presented does not take into account proposed local Parish

Council/Neighbourhood Plan 123 list (namely given that CBMDC are looking to local communities to manage local resources e.g. libraries on a voluntary basis with local funding support this needs to be taken into account)

The priority for Silsden is a relief road (identified in various documents) and improved drainage, how will this be funded and by what financial delivery mechanism and within what time scale?

Agree s106 remains for affordable housing.

Q6 Do you have any comments to make on the *Draft Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy*?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: No:

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s) below.

Appreciated that sites could get into difficulties during development and fail to deliver the expected new homes bonus for CBMDC. External influences can from time to time affect viability during build, it should not be used to ease development on difficult greenfield sites where issues have been identified at design stage.

Question the use of Independent Appraiser of Viability being appointed by the claimant, how can they be classed as *independent*, when the hirer is the claimant.

Q6 Do you have any comments to make on the *Draft Instalments Policy*?

(please tick the appropriate box)

Yes: No:

Please provide any relevant evidence to support or justify your comment, or any suggested change(s) below.

The proposed Draft Instalments Policy scale of charging favours the larger sites in preference to the smaller sites (usually local builders)

Suggest change to ensure funding comes forward front loaded to help provision of infrastructure improvements before or parallel with development.

Apply 10% at 3 months and 15% at 24 months all categories.

Q8 Please provide any other comments below that you wish to make on the *Draft Charging Schedule*.

The Draft charging schedule needs additional work before consideration and any implementation.

The revised map is still not clear on which sites are at which rate –suggest sub maps of each area provided to back-up the main area map.

The viability of rates 1,2 and 3 in particular should be re-appraised, in particular in areas where large infrastructure investment is needed to underpin sustainable growth. The CIL requires further review as a result of recent flooding issues, and further information and consultation should take place with bodies such as The Canal and River Trust.

Consider the SHLAA needs re-appraisal in light of the above and priority placed on development on brownfield sites and areas which will show the least risk to local communities.

All the above I consider to be relevant to setting an accurate CIL for the area in particular the Airedale and Wharfedale corridors of the district.

Examination

In order for the Council to introduce a CIL the Charging Schedule must be approved by an independent Examiner.

Please tick the relevant boxes:-

I would like to be heard by the Examiner at the examination.

I would like to be notified that the Draft Charging Schedule has been submitted to the examiner

I would like to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and reasons for those recommendations.

I would like to be notified of approval of the charging schedule by Bradford Council.

(Please ensure you have provided your email address, if possible, as this is the Council's preferred method of contact).

3. Signature:

[Redacted Signature]

Date:

7- FEB-2016

Thank you for taking the time to complete this Representation Form.