#### Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2011 (amended) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation 3 October 2011 – 14 November 2011

### How to respond to this consultation

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a new levy that local authorities in England and Wales can charge on new developments in their area. The money will be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods want – for example, new or safer road schemes, public transport and walking and cycling schemes, park improvements or a community hall.

The system is very simple. It applies to most new buildings and charges are fixed based on the size, type and location of the new development.

The three councils of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk have chosen to work together as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) and adopt a coordinated approach to the implementation of CIL. In order to comply with the regulations, three separate Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules have been published for comment. These are almost identical and they share the same evidence base. The only difference in the schedules relates to the geographical charging zones, Norwich is entirely in Zone A and Broadland and South Norfolk include areas in both Zone A and Zone B.

This is the first stage in consultation for setting a CIL for the three districts.

The Broadland District Council Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule looks like this:

The Norwich City Council Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule looks like this: The South Norfolk Council Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule looks like this:

Broadland Broadland District Council Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule	NORWICH City Council Norwch Dity Council Community Infrastructure Levy Preimnary Draft Charging Schedule	South Norfolk Council Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
Greater Norwich Development Partnership	Greater Norwich Development Partnership	Greater Norwich Development Partnership

## Getting involved

The consultation documents are:

- Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for Broadland
- Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for Norwich
- Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for South Norfolk

As part of this consultation a number of documents providing supporting evidence have been published:

- The explanatory document 'Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context'
- Viability Advice on a CIL/ Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (GVA, December 2010)
- Charging Zones Schedule Report (GVA, July 2011)
- Topic Paper: Green Infrastructure and Recreational Open Space (GNDP, June 2011)

There is also earlier background information supporting this consultation:

- Joint Core Strategy for Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2011
- Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study (EDAW/ AECOM 2009)
- Local Investment Plan and Programme for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk v4 June 2011

All these documents are available on the GNDP website, at www.gndp.org.uk.

The consultation documents and evidence can be viewed at each of the district council offices.

The consultation documents will also be available at libraries, at the Broads Authority offices and at the Norfolk County Council offices at County Hall. Where facilities are available evidence can be accessed via the GNDP website, www.gndp.org.uk.

The Department of Communities and Local Government has produced a helpful guide to the Community Infrastructure Levy that can be found on their website:

http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/cilsummary

## You can respond to this consultation by email or by post:

The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules and the supporting evidence are open for six weeks of consultation from **3 October 2011** to **14 November 2011**. Consultation responses must be received by **5pm** on **Monday 14 November 2011** in order to be considered.

A response form is available on the GNDP website at www.gndp.org.uk. If possible, please use this form to assist us in analysing your response and in publishing them correctly.

For more information contact the GNDP:

tel: 01603 430144 email: cil@gndp.org.uk

When responding to the consultation you can comment on one, two or all three schedules. You can:

- Use one form to comment on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for one district using one response form, or to give the same comment on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules for two or all districts or,
- Use more than one form to give different comments for each district's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule that you are commenting on

Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential. All responses to this consultation will be made available as public documents. Unfortunately we are only able to acknowledge emailed responses, but all comments will be carefully considered.

### Forms and comments can be:

emailed to:	cil@gndp.org.uk
posted to:	GNDP, PO Box 3466, Norwich, NR7 7NX
hand delivered:	to your local district council office:

- Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich NR7 0DU
- Norwich City Council, City Hall, St Peter's Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH
- South Norfolk Council, South Norfolk House, Swan Lane, Long Stratton, NR15 2XE

Evidence		
Please use this	section to give us any comments you have on the evidence:	
<ul> <li>The explanatory document 'Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context'</li> </ul>		
	vice on a CIL/ Tariff for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (GVA,	
Charging Zo	ones Schedule Report (GVA, August 2011) : Green Infrastructure and Recreational Open Space (GNDP, June	
	Having considered the evidence do you agree the appropriate balance between the desirability of funding from CIL and impacts on the economic viability have been met?	
	Νο	
Please add any	comments below	
My answer app	lies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):	
L		

#### Geographical zones

Please use this section to give us any comments about the boundaries of the geographical charging zones shown in appendix 1 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

Non-residential development zone boundary		
Question 2:	It is intended that, for non-residential development, one charging area will apply to the administrative areas of Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council. Do you agree with this approach?	
	No 🔲	
Please add any comments below		
There are clear advantages for commercial operators who operate in Zone A compared with those who operate in Zone B. Zone A operators should pay considerably more than those in Zone B. Similarly Diss and Harleston should have their own Zone for non-residential development.		
My answer applies to: (please mark one or more of the boxes):		
	All 🔲	
Γ		
Residential d	evelopment zone boundaries	

**Question 3:** The viability evidence supports two charging zones for residential development, Zone A and Zone B. The Norwich City Council area falls entirely in Zone A. Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council areas are within Zone A and Zone B. Do you agree with the boundaries for the charging zones?

No	
Please add any comments below	
My answer applies to: (please mark one	e or more of the boxes):
	All

#### **Charging Schedule**

Please use this section to comment on the rates of charge as shown in the table on page 2 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

#### Residential development – Zone A

**Question 4a:** It is intended that the rate of charge for residential development in Zone A will be within a range of £135 to £160 per m2.

What do you think the rate should be?



Question 4b: What is your justification for this rate?

Any rate in excess of the sum referred to above will see a reduction in affordable housing or an un increase in house prices resulting in more people falling into the ever increasing pit of those requiring affordable houses.

Greater income can be derived by bringing further areas or more development into Zone A, therefore re zone to bring Long Stratton into Zone A and define Zone A as the the JCS defines the NPA.

My answer applies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):		
Ą	<b>A</b> II	

Residential development – Zone B:		
Question 5a: It is intended that the rate of charge for residential development in the		
Zone B will be £75 per m2. Do you agree with this approach?		
No 🗖		
Please add any comments below		
Overtige Flag If you encycled no to the choice question:		
<b>Question 5b:</b> If you answered no to the above question:		
What should the charge be? £50/m2		
What is your justification for this rate?		
The rate reflects the issues that lead to creation of the Norwich Policy Area		
Zone $A = NPA + Greater$ benefits to those who reside in Zone A compared with those		
whom reside in Zone B.		
My answer applies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):		
NOTE In accordance with CIL regulations, the charging rates proposed in the		

Broadland		South Norfolk
-----------	--	---------------

#### Residential development – zones A and B

Question 6a: It is intended that the rate of charge for domestic garages (excluding shared-user garages) in Zones A and B will be within a range of £25 to £35 per m2.

What do you think the rate should be?

£5M2

Question 6b: What is your justification for this rate?

It reflects the value that a garage adds to a property based on £75m2 CIL for the residential element of the property.

My answer applies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):

NOTE In accordance with CIL regulations, the charging rates proposed in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules aim to balance the need to fund infrastructure in Greater Norwich with the potential impact on the economic viability of development. Any comments suggesting a variation in the rate of CIL should be justified by viability evidence.

All

	ased supermarkets and supermarkets
	hat the rate of charge for large convenience goods
	arkets and superstores of 2,000m2 gross or more will
be £135 per m	<ol><li>Do you agree with this approach?</li></ol>
	_
Yes/No	
Please add any comments be	low
However a further band rate of	f £60/m2 should be introduced for developments of
500 to 1999 m2	
There is no free lunch.	
Question 7b: If you answere	d no to the above question:
Question 7b: If you answere	d no to the above question:
Question 7b: If you answere	·
Question 7b: If you answere	See comment above
<b>Question 7b:</b> If you answere What should the charge be?	See comment above
	See comment above relating to inclusion of an
	See comment above
	See comment above relating to inclusion of an
What should the charge be?	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be?	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th There is not such a thing as a	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th There is not such a thing as a	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th There is not such a thing as a NOTE In accordance with CIL	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th There is not such a thing as a NOTE In accordance with CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Sc	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate         state?         free lunch         regulations, the charging rates proposed in the
What should the charge be? What is your justification for th There is not such a thing as a NOTE In accordance with CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Sc in Greater Norwich with the po	See comment above relating to inclusion of an additional band rate

My answer applies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):	-	

Other retail and Question 8a:	d assembly and leisure developments It is intended that the rate of charge for all other retail and assembly and leisure developments will be £25 per m2 (including shared user garages). Do you agree with this approach?
Yes	
Please add any	comments below
Question 8b:	f you answered no to the above question:
What should the	e charge be?
What is your ius	stification for this rate?
,	
My answer appl Broadland	ies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):          Image: Norwich       South       All         Norwich       Norfolk       All

Community uses Question 9a: It is intended that the rate be £0 per m2. Do you ag	s of charge for all other Community Uses will ree with this approach?	
Yes Please add any comments below		
Question 9b: If you answered no to the	above question:	
What should the charge be?		
What is your justification for this rate?		
My answer applies to (please tick one or	more of the boxes):	

Other types of development
Question 10a: It is intended that the rates of charge for all other types of
development (including shared-user garages) covered by the CIL
regulations will be £5 per m2. Do you agree with this approach?
Yes
Please add any comments below
Question 10b: If you answered no to the above question:
What should the charge be?
What is your justification for this rate?
My answer applies to (please tick one or more of the boxes):
All L

There are other issues we would like your views on, though these are not part of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules.

Discretionary relief			
The approach to discretionary relief can be found on page 3 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and in section 12 of the 'Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context'.			
<b>Question 11</b> Do you agree with the approach to Discretionary	/ Relief?		
Yes			
Please add any comments below			
My answer applies to (please mark one or more of the boxes):			
	All		

# Staging of payments The approach to the staging of payments can be found in page 3 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and in section 11 and appendix 4 of the document 'Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context'. **Question 12:** Do you have any comments about the draft policy Yes Please add any comments below To simplistic. There is a differing funding arrangement for commercial delopment compatred with residential development therefore the proposal fundamentally flawed Large scheme proposal demands payment far too early in the development cycle and process affecting ability to finance a scheme. Closer discussion needs take place with those who will be paying to determine a realistic approach. NOTE In accordance with CIL regulations, the charging rates proposed in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules aim to balance the need to fund infrastructure in Greater Norwich with the potential impact on the economic viability of development. Any comments suggesting a variation in the rate of CIL should be justified by viability evidence.

This applies to any development no matter how large or sma	all.	
Realism need to prevail.		
My answer applies to: (please mark one or more of the boxe	es):	
	All	

#### Payment in kind

Within the GNDP area, where land is required within a development to provide built infrastructure to support that development (such as a school) it will be expected that land transfer will be at no cost to the local authorities and will not be accepted as a CIL payment in kind. Where the facility is needed to serve more than one development, any land transfer over and above that needed for the specific development would be regarded as payment in kind of CIL. The approach to payment in kind can be found on page 3 of the Preliminary draft charging schedule and in section 12 of the document 'Community Infrastructure Levy: Background and Context'.

Question 13:	Do you agree with the approach to payment in kind?
--------------	--

v	DC	
ι.	63	

Please add any comments below

My answer applies to: (please mark one or more of the boxes):

All

Neighbourhoo	ds and CIL	
receive a 'mean locally. The loca	nt proposes that neighbourhoods where development takes place will ningful proportion' of CIL revenue to spend on infrastructure projects al community will be able to decide how this money should be spent used for infrastructure.	
The governmen website at www	it is currently consulting on this proposal which can be found its	
The consultation suggests that in Broadland and South Norfolk districts the Parish and Town Councils will take on this responsibility. In Norwich, where there are no Parish or Town councils, an approach appropriate to the area will need to be developed.		
Question 14a:	Subject to any updated Regulations it is proposed that 5% of the net CIL receipts be passed to local communities (e.g. the Parish Council or Town Council in the two rural districts) who express an interest in receiving it. Do you agree with this approach?	
Yes		
Please add any	comments below	
My answer applies to: (please mark one or more of the boxes):		
	All	
ä	Do you have any views about how the CIL which will be made available for the local community in Norwich, where there are no Parish or Town Councils, should be administered? <b>NO</b>	
Please add any	comments below.	
The matter has issue	to be resolved by Norwich City and its residents as it is a real local	

Other comments		
Question 15: Do you have any other comments on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule(s) or the Community Infrastructure Levy?		
Yes		
Please add any comments below		
Compared with other Charging Schedules emerging there is disparity possibly through differing expectations of different charging authorities. There is clear evidence of uncertainty in the methodology used in arriving at the rates proposed. There is clear evidence that the charging rate proposed will not necessarily deliver the infrastructure provisions set out in the LIPP.		
The provision facilities and infrastructure being provided cannot be limited to occupiers of the new residential dwellings who are in effect being directly charged therefore the need exists to discount the charges to reflect usage by those who are not contributing.		
My answer applies to: (please mark one or more of the boxes):		
	All	
For paper copies of this form please email <b>cil@gndp.org.uk</b> or telephone 01603		
430144		
Please return the form to:	OFFICE USE ONLY:	
Email: cil@gndp.org.uk	Date received:	

Post: Greater Norwich Development Partnership PO Box 3466 Norwich NR7 0NX Representation no:

Forms can also be delivered by hand to:

to your local district council office or to the County Council:

- Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich NR7 0DU
- Norwich City Council, City Hall, St Peter's Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH
- South Norfolk Council, South Norfolk House, Swan Lane, Long Stratton, NR15 2XE

ALL FORMS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 5PM ON MONDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2011

For more information or if you require this document in another format or language, please contact the GNDP:

**email:** cil@gndp.org.uk **tel:** 01603 430144

