

Annexe 1 to CIL Report - Key Issues arising from Consultation

Issues	Council Response
<p>The proposed CIL rates are significantly higher than for other nearby authorities and this will affect deliverability and maintaining a five year land supply. It will also affect affordable housing delivery.</p>	<p>The rates proposed are higher relative to neighbouring authorities base rates, but this is without reference to any indexation or other policy requirements. Whilst the technical viability exercise suggests they are viable, the council is aware their introduction will have to be carefully managed and monitored. to avoid a shock to the market and impact on delivery.</p>
<p>General support from older persons' housing providers, but concern over some aspects of the viability testing where clarification is required.</p>	<p>The council will need to provide further clarity with the evidence as to how older person housing has been tested.</p>
<p>Many of the assumptions used in the viability testing have been questioned, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of a buffer against the average CIL rate rather than the lowest rate. • How the buffer of 50% has been used to inform the rates. • The split of large and small sites. • Site typologies, including insufficient large sites. • Market values, both for market and affordable housing. • Mix and density • Benchmark land values. • Build costs • Opening up costs • S.106 allowance assumed for sites. 	<p>There is no formal way of setting the CIL rate – the Council has been informed by the evidence and set the rates accordingly.. 10 dwellings is used as the split point as this is the affordable housing threshold, where viability changes.</p> <p>Due to the number of comments on values, costs and typologies, further explanations will be set out to inform the examination.</p>
<p>Some respondents consider that Dunsfold Aerodrome has been wrongly excluded from CIL charges, especially phase 2 (800 dwellings), on the basis that the S.106 for this phase will not be as significant as for phase 1 for 1800 dwellings.</p>	<p>CIL guidance suggests that sites that are crucial to the delivery of the plan should be considered separately. The whole of the Dunsfold Aerodrome strategic site needs to be considered as one as the application of different charging regimes where there is interlinked infrastructure needs would not in this circumstance be a robust approach. Notwithstanding that most of the site could have planning permission prior to CIL being charged, the application of CIL on very large sites can cause issues in respect of delivery.</p>

	In this case it is suggested that the S106 regime is a better mechanism for ensuring the delivery of the development and its supporting infrastructure.
Several respondents suggest that developers should fund SANG in addition to CIL, rather than CIL money being used to fund SANG. The approach to CIL in different habitat areas has been questioned – e.g. consistency between approaches for Thames Basin Heaths and Wealden Heaths SPAs.	The provision of SANG as part of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA avoidance and mitigation measures falls within the definition of infrastructure and therefore cannot be excluded from CIL, although contributions towards the management and maintenance of existing SANG can be secured through Section 106 agreements. Natural England submitted a ‘no comment’ response to the recent consultation.
Lack of supporting policies – concern over lack of policies on instalments, payment in kind, relief etc. Also concern that appraisals were not published along with the evidence base.	The Council should consider coming to a position on these prior to Examination. The inputs and outputs are set out in the report. The testing has been undertaken using a toolkit and is not easily published. However, to assist the Examiner a summary appraisal for each of the sites will be supplied.
There is support in principle for CIL from town and parish councils and residents groups. There is support from the Education skills & Funding agency on the approach to funding schools through CIL.	Support welcomed.
There is general concern, especially from individuals, over traffic congestion and poor public transport.	Concern is noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan seeks to identify the transport improvements required and how these would be delivered.
There is also concern that CIL has come too late for Cranleigh, where many large permissions have been granted.	This is noted, although the Council has sought to secure the infrastructure required for these permissions through S.106 agreements.
Several respondents request that there is a clear and open process of allocating funds, including role of parish councils and state that. CIL revenues should be spent where the development takes place.	This is noted. However, the Council is progressing governance arrangements, including how to prioritise schemes to be delivered using CIL funds, and the involvement of town and parish councils, separately.
Surrey CC suggests a wording amendment to the 123 list under transport exclusions. Another	This is noted. The Council will consider whether a minor modification should be made to the 123 list to address these

<p>respondent suggests that the wording generally of the infrastructure excluded from CIL should be tighter to comply with the CIL Regulations.</p>	<p>points.</p>
<p>One parish Council is concerned that small shops are attracting a higher rate of CIL than supermarkets.</p>	<p>Noted. However the viability evidence suggests that small convenience shops are able to support a higher CIL than supermarkets. It is not proposed to levy a charge on non convenience shops in town centres.</p>
<p>Some comments on the details of the administrative arrangements and the need for clarity in the final documentation setting out the charges, exclusions etc. Includes a specific comment on the status of ancillary accommodation at retirement villages.</p>	<p>Noted. The importance of clear documentation when CIL is implemented is acknowledged.</p>
<p>Some comments on the information contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the need for it to be kept up to date.</p>	<p>Noted. The IDP is a living document and will be updated when necessary.</p>
<p>Some comments on detailed matters such as the approach to CIL in kind.</p>	<p>This will be addressed in supporting documents alongside the Charging Schedule.</p>
<p>Comment from Town Council that there should be a CIL rate for student housing.</p>	<p>This has not previously been identified for modelling as substantial new accommodation is not identified in the Local Plan. Given the limited amount of such accommodation in Waverley it may be difficult to meaningfully assess the viability of such developments. In addition whether such a development would be liable for CIL would depend on the landowner/developer.</p>