

CIL Draft Charging Schedule (DCS)

Summary of Consultation Responses Received

No.	Organisation	Summary of representation received	Council response	Action
1	Gareth Kitchen	<p>The proposed non-negotiable flat rate system seems like a good idea. To me the existing S108 system has always seemed opaque and ripe for abuse.</p> <p>Directing a quarter of the levy to parishes with Neighbourhood-Parish Plans in place is welcomed as this will ensure local involvement and democratic accountability.</p>	Welcome support.	No change.
2.	Wendy Fey	This is a very sensible proposal, so much simpler than the old complex system. I am very much in favour.	Welcome support.	No change.
3.	Colin Vickery	I do not agree with the proposal to raise money for whatever purpose through a tax on development if the use of this money is not required as a consequence of the development. In my opinion it would be unfair and inappropriate.	The money is required to fund infrastructure necessary to deliver the growth strategy set out in the Local Plan.	No change.
4.	Eastington Parish Council	Eastington Parish Council note that there is no mention of the 15% / 25% of CIL to be given directly to parish councils in the Consultation documents, nor how the payments will be made when an instalment plan is adopted.	The Council has no discretion whether to give 15% / 25% to parish councils, this is set out in law. The details of how the payments will be collected and distributed will be agreed in consultation with parish councils.	No change.
5.	National Farmers' Union in the South West	<p>For agriculture to become sustainable in the future it will be essential that developments including all agriculture buildings and structure's, agriculturally tied buildings and any barn conversions are able to gain planning permission easily and without any additional costs.</p> <p>Therefore suggest the following amendment: <i>3.21 CIL is to be charged against all net gain in</i></p>	Agricultural related development is not one of the uses for which CIL will be charged and does not need to be specifically referred to. Agricultural tied properties are likely to be either self build (and therefore exempt from CIL) or are likely to have no land costs and therefore will be viable with CIL. Barn conversions are likely to be self build and/or below the affordable housing threshold and therefore viable with CIL. The	No change.

		<p><i>floorspace, and thus the liability to pay CIL can fall on development that benefits from permitted development rights, and thus in its own right does not require planning permissionIn the circumstances of Agricultural development this has the potential to capture buildings such as Hay Barns, Livestock sheds, Agriculture Tied Houses and Barn Conversions the development of which has no viability. For this reason it is proposed to set agricultural at £0.”</i></p> <p>Currently in the Community Infrastructure Levy for dwelling houses will incur a charge of between £0 and £80 per square metre; given the importance of agriculture within this rural area there should be an exemption (zero rating) for all agriculture, agriculturally tied buildings and any barn conversions.</p>	<p>NFU has provided no viability evidence to demonstrate that qualifying types of development would be unviable with CIL.</p>	
6.	Woodland Trust	<p>Whilst green infrastructure and natural greenspace is being acknowledged with your draft Regulation 123 lists for Stroud District, trees and woodland specifically should also be acknowledged. Stroud District has an above average proportion of ancient woodland at 4.62% compared to a Great Britain average of 2.40%, therefore, it is vital that this natural resource is absolutely protected.</p> <p>Also, although strategic flood risk measures and sustainable drainage systems are being taken into account, the role which trees and woods, planted in appropriate locations, can play in alleviating certain types of flooding and improving water quality should also be acknowledged with your Regulation 123 List.</p> <p>Therefore, the CIL Reg. 123 list should be amended to read:</p> <p><i>‘ Provision of open space, green space, new</i></p>	<p>The definition of green infrastructure set out in the Local Plan includes “parks, open spaces, playing fields, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, river and canal corridors, allotments and private gardens.”</p> <p>It is agreed that the Green Infrastructure section could refer to woodlands, in addition to greenspace and river corridors. The role of trees and woodlands in alleviating flood risk is recognised and reference is made to the RSuDS scheme which involves managing trees and woodland to reduce flood risk downstream.</p>	<p>Amend Annex 2 to read:</p> <p>Green infrastructure The creation, improvement and maintenance of accessible natural greenspace, <u>woodland</u> and river corridors, for biodiversity and flood risk enhancements (excluding on site provision)</p>

		<i>woodland creation, leisure and recreation.'</i>		
7.	Mrs. T. Organ	<p>The CIL exemption for Self Builders must be upheld as specified in the government's Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>(Having said this, there might be a case for requiring larger self-build homes e.g. over 250sqm (which are less likely to be sustainable) to make a contribution.)</p> <p>Self Builders should be supported and encouraged to create high-quality, sustainable homes; not deterred or penalised by yet another tax. Significant tax revenues are already generated directly and indirectly by land transactions and are also generated by the employment of construction contractors and purchases from local suppliers.</p>	<p>Welcome support. This is a national exemption and there is no scope for the Council to introduce CIL for larger self-build homes.</p> <p>The Council is supporting self-builders through the new online register (see http://www.stroud.gov.uk/housing/self-build-housing) and through the Local Plan policy that requires 2% of houses on strategic sites to be made available for self and custom builders.</p>	No change.
8.	Wotton-under-Edge Town Council	We suggest that for Strategic Sites identified in the Local Plan, the CIL rate should not be £0/m2 but an agreed amount to allow Parish and Town Councils to use their part of the CIL to increase facility within their parishes affected by the said developments.	The CIL rate is set with reference to viability matters and the evidence demonstrates that the strategic sites cannot afford to pay CIL and deliver the necessary infrastructure required on-site. Parish and town councils have a role to play in discussing the delivery of the required infrastructure.	No change.
9.	Stroud Town Council	<p>Stroud Town Council has the following views on the draft documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We recommend Annex 2 – Social infrastructure, should include facilities for burial grounds and related infrastructure. The infrastructure requirements identified in the Neighbourhood Development Plan should be mentioned The reference to older peoples housing in Table 1 on page 5 was not clear. Could this be explained and defined 	<p>The Council confirms that burial grounds constitute community facilities and agrees to amend Annex 2.</p> <p>The R.123 list sets out infrastructure requirements for the Local Plan. The 25% contribution to parishes with a NDP will help meet infrastructure set out in the NDP.</p> <p>Table 1 excludes older peoples housing from paying CIL due to viability considerations (this is explained in the CIL Viability Update report, page 58).</p>	<p>Amend Annex 2 to read:</p> <p>Social infrastructure Social infrastructure, including community facilities, <u>burial grounds</u>, sports, recreational, play infrastructure, youth provision, public realm, art and cultural facilities (excluding on site provision)</p>

10.	Severn Trent	We have no specific comments in relation to this consultation at this time, with regards to the implications of calculating the CIL, the cost for providing water and waste water infrastructure is by a combination of developer and Severn Trent contributions via customer charges as established by legislation and agreed by Ofwat. Costs for water and waste water therefore need not be included in the CIL.	Welcome comments.	No change.
11.	Sport England	<p>It is understood sports infrastructure will be funded or part funded through CIL. Whilst it is good that the Council are seeking CIL to fund sports provision, Sport England would recommend that the CIL Regulation 123 list should state specifically what is needed and this should be underpinned by a robust need and evidence base. It is noted that the Stroud District Local Plan is not underpinned by a robust and up-to-date assessment of need for sport. The Council need to remedy this to ensure a sound local plan.</p> <p>Sport England therefore recommends that the CIL Draft Charging Schedule clarifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation that S106 agreements will be used to secure new sports facilities needed to meet new demand arising from development for sports facilities (indoor and outdoor) where not already sought through the CIL (e.g. CIL may be used to fund a new leisure centre to meet growth in demand for swimming pools BUT S106's would be used to fund all outdoor sport). 	<p>Welcome support for references to sports facilities under social infrastructure to be funded by CIL. The Council's indicative R.123 list is a list of types of infrastructure to be funded through CIL not a detailed schedule of schemes. A detailed schedule will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p> <p>Annex 2 clarifies that S.106 obligations will continue to be used to deliver play and sports facilities where on-site provision continues to be required. The Council is producing a Planning Obligations SPD to provide further clarification on how S.106 obligations will be used in the future.</p>	No change.
12.	Environment Agency	We note Annex 2 (Indicative Draft Regulation 123 List) of the draft Schedule, clearly defines what CIL and Planning Obligation (Section 2016 (s106) payments are used for. We welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure and Strategic Flood Risk Measures in respect of both.	Welcome support.	<p>Amend Annex 2 to read:</p> <p>Strategic flood risk measures management infrastructure Improvements to Severn</p>

		<p>We note reference is made to ‘improvements to Severn Estuary flood defences’. We recommend this is re-worded to ensure it is applicable to all strategic flood defences / mitigation, not just flood defences along the Severn Estuary.</p> <p>We are keen to ensure that the term ‘flood risk measures’ are taken to have a wider meaning of ‘flood risk management infrastructure’ so as to include not just ‘hard’ defences, but also things like maintenance, forecasting, warning and modelling etc. – i.e. all those things that are required to make the hard defences and general management of flood risk happen. We feel the wording in the Annex 2 may need some alteration to reflect this.</p> <p>We consider the inclusion of Water Framework Directive (WFD) waterbody improvements would be appropriate here. Under the WFD there are requirements to enhance waterbodies through development, and ensure that development does not lead to deterioration in waterbodies. Many waterbodies in Stroud District are currently below Good Ecological Status and therefore failing their WFD targets to achieve Good Status by 2027. Enhancements can take the form of water quality improvements by installing Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), fisheries improvements by removing redundant structures from watercourses and improving the general habitat of watercourse and their bank-sides. As such we consider it is appropriate to ensure these WFD elements of GI are included within the CIL 123 List.</p>	<p>The Council agrees to amend Annex 2 to refer to all strategic flood defences.</p> <p>The Council agrees to amend Annex 2 to refer to flood risk management infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council agrees to amend Annex 2 to Refer to Water Framework Directive (WFD) waterbody improvements.</p>	<p><u>Estuary and other flood defences</u>, river corridors and restoration of canal network for flood risk enhancements including the RSuDS scheme and as set out in the Stroud Valleys Initiative (excluding on site provision)</p> <p>Green infrastructure The creation, improvement and maintenance of accessible natural greenspace, <u>woodland</u> and river corridors, for biodiversity, <u>Water Framework Directive waterbody improvements</u> and flood risk enhancements (excluding on site provision)</p>
13.	Bathurst Ltd.	Bathurst Ltd supports the approach of setting CIL at £0 on strategic sites. These sites are heavily burdened with enabling and infrastructure costs. They are critical to new	Welcome support.	No change.

		<p>housing and employment delivery in the district.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Position Statement for the North East Cam allocation, has not been previously seen by Bathurst Ltd. It is not an agreed document. It is out of date and contains many inaccuracies, including matters not previously discussed with Bathurst Ltd.</p> <p>Compared with the viability evidence for the Preliminary DCS, the Council's evidence now indicates that all strategic sites can achieve viability with full 30% affordable housing. It is difficult to understand this dramatic turnaround in modelled viability in such a short space of time. This is particularly so on SA 3, where known infrastructure costs have increased.</p> <p>As the Millfields site is subject to a proposed £0 CIL, we have not undertaken a forensic analysis of the Council's viability modelling. However, we are unclear whether the heavy (and additional) enabling costs associated with large strategic sites have been factored in to the appraisals. Often termed the 'Harman' costs, these are estimated (in the Harman Report) to be in the order of £17k – £23k per plot.</p> <p>Bathurst Ltd's experience is that substantial new S.106 requests and demands are now being made, none of these infrastructure demands were set out in Policy SA3, nor are they fully reflected in the Council's CIL viability modelling.</p>	<p>Bathurst Ltd was involved in discussions which are reflected in the Position Statement. There are a number of elements where service providers and developers disagreed over exactly requirements and this is reflected in the statement. As there is a current planning application for North East Cam it is entirely understandable that discussions in certain areas have progressed since the Position Statement was produced.</p> <p>House prices have risen since the PDCS stage, making sites viable with the full 30% affordable housing.</p> <p>It is necessary to reflect the site costs in the appraisals as these are not included in the BCIS costs. The appraisals include an allowance for site costs of between 10% and 20% of the BCIS costs and for the sake of clarity exclude the s106 infrastructure and mitigation costs which are added in addition. This was tested at the consultation. At 20% the allowance equates to £18,000 per market unit and £13,560 per affordable unit.</p> <p>The latest estimated infrastructure costs set out in Position Statements, taking account of the views of service providers and developers have fed into the latest CIL modelling.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Bathurst considers that the R.123 list is vague and generalised and does not give the precision and transparency required. For strategic sites, the S.106 infrastructure requirements should be limited to those clearly set out in the site-specific Local Plan policy (SA 3 for Millfields).</p> <p>The Regulation 123 list should pick up, with clarity and precision, other projects, rather than adding them to already heavily burdened strategic schemes, which are critical to the delivery of the Local Plan. Bathurst Ltd consider that the list should certainly include projects like any M5 / J.14 upgrade, which has never previously been identified as a requirement linked to the Millfields development (Millfields has a negligible impact on the junction).</p>	<p>The R.123 list clearly identifies the types of infrastructure required. The Local Plan sets out the requirements for the allocated sites together with the supporting IDP.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for the M5 J.14 were clearly identified in the Council's transport evidence as required to deliver the strategic site allocations. See for example, the Stroud Local Plan Capacity Assessment (December 2014) Page 65 – "Junction M: M5 Junction 14 / B4509. Junction M is currently operating over capacity in the AM peak and near capacity in the PM peak and is forecast to be operating over capacity in 2031 with development traffic. Therefore mitigation is required."</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
14.	Natural England	No comments.	Noted.	No change.
15.	Blue Cedar Homes	<p>The proposed CIL rate for older persons housing is excluded. As a retirement house builder, this rate is very much supported by Blue Cedar Homes.</p> <p>In addition, the recent Court of Appeal decision giving legal effect to the policy regarding affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations set out in the Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 should be taken into account in the Council's CIL Charging Schedule.</p>	<p>Welcome support.</p> <p>The recent decision will reduce the S.106 requirements for smaller sites and will therefore have a positive effect upon site viability, ensuring that CIL at the current rates will be achievable.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
16.	Minchinhampton Parish Council	<p>The Council has serious concerns about this process. Firstly allowing only a six week window has enabled this council only one opportunity for discussion. Please also note that not all parish councils enjoy the regular attendance of their district councillors.</p> <p>Councillors are worried CIL will raise the cost of new housing, and that in a broader context it</p>	<p>The statutory period for the CIL Draft Schedule is 4 weeks. The Council has extended this to reflect Local Plan consultation periods which are six weeks in length.</p> <p>The latest CIL viability update demonstrates that CIL rates set out in Table 1 will be less</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>would be a tax on construction since the contributions proposed by yourselves appeared in general to be higher than the current – and continuing – Section 106 contributions.</p> <p>Requesting an opinion on the basis of a detailed 24-odd page document, without adequate signposts to key issues, can only add to confusion for councils composed of lay people. A seminar should have been arranged in order that the changes and their implications could be more fully explained.</p>	<p>than 3% of Gross Development Value and less than 25% of the Residual Value. Both these tests demonstrate that the CIL rates set are reasonable and would not threaten the growth set out in the Local Plan. CIL is not expected to impact on house prices.</p> <p>The Draft Schedule has been simplified and is clearly explained on the Council’s website and correspondence has encouraged consultees to contact the Planning Strategy Team for further enquiries. Minchinhampton Parish Council did not contact the Council for assistance during the consultation period. CIL has been discussed at recent Parish Forum meetings and will continue as the details of how CIL will operate are developed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
17.	<p>Tetlow King representing South West HARP Planning Consortium</p>	<p>It will be important for the Council to consider the impact of the reinstatement of the PPG guidance relating to thresholds for affordable housing and tariff-style contributions on its policy, including the CIL Charging Schedule. In particular, the proposed CIL rates should be reviewed.</p> <p>The exclusion of older people’s housing from the levy is fully evidenced and therefore supported. It would however be helpful for the Charging Schedule to clarify that this covers age-restricted housing of both C2 and C3 Use Classes, as care can be provided in both.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of an Instalments Policy in the DCS.</p> <p>The introduction of discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances remains important. This does not strictly necessitate the entire CIL charge being afforded relief, but rather that the amount necessary to make development viable</p>	<p>The recent decision will reduce the S.106 requirements for smaller sites and will therefore have a positive effect upon site viability, ensuring that CIL at the current rates will be achievable.</p> <p>Welcome support. The Council is no longer applying CIL rates to uses other than housing and retail so there is no need for this clarification.</p> <p>Welcome support.</p> <p>Welcome support.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>is discounted.</p> <p>We support the review mechanism in the DCS which will be implemented every three years or if local house prices fluctuate by more than 10%.</p>	Welcome support.	No change.
18.	Rodborough Parish Council	Rodborough Parish Council is in agreement with this proposal.	Welcome support.	No change.
19.	Woodchester Parish Council	There was no mention in the document of the 15%/25% contribution which will be made to Parish Councils and how that process will operate. More guidance on this would be appreciated.	The Council has no discretion whether to give 15% / 25% to parish councils, this is set out in law. The details of how the payments will be collected and distributed will be agreed in consultation with parish councils.	No change.
20.	Gloucestershire County Council	<p>There is currently no assurance that County Council infrastructure will be funded through CIL. As with other emerging CIL charging schedules, there needs to be a mechanism in place to ensure sufficient monies are passed to GCC in a timely fashion to ensure county infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>The approach to Strategic Sites – securing infrastructure through s106 agreements - is welcomed. It has been shown elsewhere that delivery in-kind (e.g. the provision of a primary school) secured through a s106 agreement is a more efficient way of dealing with large scale developments.</p> <p>Whilst it provides the broad overview sufficient for CIL preparation purposes, infrastructure costs are likely to be higher than those in the IDP which can only be a snapshot in time. The latest version relates to 2014. The proportion of the total infrastructure costs which is county infrastructure is 70% to 80%. The recent updating of infrastructure requirements for the strategic sites is welcomed.</p>	<p>It is agreed that governance arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that education, transport and other infrastructure delivered through the County Council are planned for.</p> <p>Welcome support.</p> <p>It is agreed that infrastructure costs may increase over time. The CIL Draft Schedule makes it clear that CIL rates will be reviewed every three years or if there is evidence to suggest that local house prices have changed by more than 10% from the date of implementation of CIL.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>GCC has been involved in the development of the draft Reg 123 List, and welcomes ongoing dialogue regarding future CIL expenditure. The suggested approach in the Reg 123 List is supported by GCC because it provides a balance between securing contributions from a wider range of small sites, whilst enabling strategic sites to provide infrastructure through s106.</p> <p>The Reg 123 could reference specific schemes of strategic transport infrastructure which can be funded through CIL. References to education, waste, archaeology and ecology, libraries and public health in the Reg. 123 list are welcomed.</p>	<p>Welcome support.</p> <p>The Council's indicative R.123 list is a list of types of infrastructure to be funded through CIL not a detailed schedule of schemes. A more detailed schedule will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
21.	Pioneer Property Services Ltd on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<p>Disputes that the Council's viability evidence base demonstrates that 30% affordable housing, CIL and other S106 contributions will be deliverable. Comments are made particularly about the open market value uplifts used in the viability study being in excess of those suggested by Land Registry data for the same period. Furthermore, the reliance on artificially high values and artificially low costs (and lack of sensitivity testing) renders the 2016 viability study just as unreliable as its predecessors.</p> <p>Further concerns are raised about the viability and Infrastructure Development Plan evidence base, particularly the fact that not all s.106 costs have yet been determined and cannot therefore be accurately reflected within the viability evidence base.</p> <p>The draft Planning Obligations SPD confirms that an array of s106 obligations will still be sought from sites post CIL. Post CIL s106 costs are likely to be at least £10k per dwelling, particularly on large Greenfield sites.</p>	<p>The latest CIL Viability update has sought to address in detail concerns relating to values and costs raised at the earlier Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule stage. Further work has been undertaken particularly regarding sales prices from the Land Registry and more up-to-date development costs. The District Council is confident that the CIL rates set are reasonable and would not threaten the growth set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations (and Guidance within the PPG) require the use of existing available evidence. The viability assessment update has drawn on the most up to date available information in the IDP.</p> <p>The CIL viability update has drawn on the most up to date available information in the IDP and has used modelled typologies that reflect the type of development that is expected to come forward.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		It is argued, that it is not robustly demonstrated that the CIL charge of £80/m2 is viable, particularly on large Greenfield sites. The Council is being warned that this may impact on the overall level of housing delivery and on the ability for applicants to provide the level of affordable housing and infrastructure where S106 contributions are sought.	The District Council is confident that the CIL rates set are reasonable and would not threaten the growth set out in the Local Plan.	No change.
22.	Dursley Town Council	What is not included is a schedule of when parish/town councils will be paid their share of the levy collected by SDC. The Town Council request to be consulted on this and for it to be an annexe to this document, or the subject of an additional document. With a payment instalment system, parish/town councils may wait a long time to receive their share of the levy.	The details of how the payments will be collected and distributed to parish councils will be agreed in consultation with parish councils. There is an opportunity to agree a local timetable for payments to be made. If not, statutory periods are set out in the CIL regulations which require the Council to pass on payments received within six months of receipt.	No change.
23.	Persimmon Homes Severn Valley	Expresses concerns that the Council's land supply is made up almost entirely of sites which attract nil rate of CIL. It is therefore unclear how CIL will assist in meeting the anticipated worst case funding gap. Charging authorities should not use rates for different geographical areas to deliver policy objectives. We consider the choice of the Stroud Valley as the only specific geographical charging area in the district is designed specifically to meet a policy aspiration to regenerate the Stroud Valleys. The development strategy equally supports the growth and regeneration of other key areas including Dursley, Stonehouse, the Cotswold canal corridor and Sharpness, which are not similarly identified. The indicative Draft Regulation 123 List includes a number of infrastructure and service	CIL will be payable by windfall developments not allocated in the Local Plan. Whilst a small sites allowance was identified in the housing supply, larger windfall sites will continue to come forward, as evidenced by historic rates. The Stroud Valleys charging zone reflects the results of viability testing. Site typologies for other areas, including Dursley and Stonehouse, demonstrate that sites in these areas are viable at £80 m2. Whilst some infrastructure types appear in both CIL and S.106 columns, it is made very	No change. No change. No change.

		<p>categories that appear in both the CIL and S106 columns. This raises a question of perceived 'double dipping'. There is also the danger that a number of items secured in the S106 column on strategic sites (strategic flood risk and transport measures linked to strategic development sites) will provide strategic infrastructure. The schedule needs to make it clear that S106 contributions will be strictly related to site specific matters only.</p> <p>Supports the proposed introduction of an instalment policy. However it is not clear what size of application site this will refer to. We suggest it should apply to the standard national definition of major development (10 or more dwellings) defined in article 2(1) of the Development Management Procedure Order.</p>	<p>clear that S.106 obligations will be sought for on-site infrastructure required by the development and CIL will be collected for off-site infrastructure provision. The draft Planning Obligations SPD provides more details.</p> <p>The instalment policy is linked to the amount of the payment rather than the size of the development.</p>	No change.
24.	Savills on behalf of Crest Nicholson, Redrow and Taylor Wimpey	<p>Supports the Council's instalment policy</p> <p>Concerns are expressed in relation to the lack of clarity in respect to the draft Regulation 123 list and asks the Council to reconsider the project list in more detail; alongside providing clarification in respect to how the In-Kind mechanism will work in Stroud.</p> <p>Has a number of concerns regarding the robustness and credibility of the viability evidence underpinning the residential CIL rates within the DCS.</p>	<p>Welcome support.</p> <p>The Council believes that the indicative R.123 list is very clear about the types of infrastructure to be funded through CIL and where S.106 obligations will continue to fund infrastructure. A detailed programme will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p> <p>The latest CIL Viability update has sought to address in detail concerns relating to values and costs raised at the earlier Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule stage. Further work has been undertaken particularly regarding sales prices from the Land Registry and more up-to-date development costs. The District Council is confident that the CIL rates set are reasonable and would not threaten the growth set out in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>There are specific concerns with the allowances for abnormal costs and site opening works. This raises particular concerns in relation to ability of the Council to deliver the development strategy set out in the adopted Local Plan which seeks to deliver the remainder of development through infill and windfall sites.</p> <p>Recommends changing the approach to charging on larger / strategic sites to enable these sites to be dealt with flexibly through bespoke s106 agreements; to ensure that a fixed CIL rate does not fundamentally alter their viable delivery. Suggests that the nil CIL rate applied to the identified strategic sites is extended to all sites above 150 dwellings.</p> <p>In addition to addressing the proposed residential CIL rates it is essential that the Council ensure that there is a consistent and transparent relationship between CIL and Section 106 agreements once CIL is in place in Stroud. At present there is a great deal of uncertainty, which undermines the value of adopting a CIL Charging Schedule.</p>	<p>Abnormal costs are addressed in the study. There is an argument (as set out in Gedling) that it may not be appropriate for abnormal to be built into appraisals in a CIL viability study. A council should not plan for the worst case scenario – rather for the norm. Having said this, an additional allowance of 10% of the BCIS costs on residential sites has been made for abnormal costs associated with brownfield sites.</p> <p>Differential CIL rates can only be set for sites when infrastructure arising from these sites is known and viability work has been carried out. The latest work assesses types of sites likely to come forward within the current Local Plan. CIL can be reviewed when the Local Plan Review considers new strategic sites for allocation.</p> <p>The Council disagrees that there is uncertainty. Highway access arrangements and on-site infrastructure will be paid for via S.106 obligations and off-site infrastructure will be paid for via CIL.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
25.	Canal and River Trust	<p>The Trust supports the proposed Draft CIL Charging schedule and welcomes the inclusion of canal and towpath improvements relating to all canals within the district on a simplified Regulation 123 list. However it is not clear if this relates only to physical infrastructure (locks and sluices and the creation of new towpaths) or will also encompass improvements to the existing canal towpath (resurfacing and widening to improve its use as a Green infrastructure asset). This type of improvement, where the towpath is</p>	<p>Welcome support. The Council's indicative R.123 list is a list of types of infrastructure to be funded through CIL. The list identifies canal re-opening which could include new locks but also improvements to existing canals which could include towpath improvements. A more detailed programme will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>part of a sustainable transport route for a proposed development adjacent or in close proximity to the canal may be better provided via S106.</p> <p>Due to the multi-functional nature of canals and towpaths more clarity may be required for situations where an improvement could fall within several categories. We suggest that where an improvement is required to make the development acceptable, it should be secured by s106 in order to provide more certainty that it will be delivered.</p> <p>The Canal & River Trust requests a meeting to discuss these detailed issues as soon as possible. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss how the Council will prioritise the different types of infrastructure on its Reg. 123 list once funding has been secured.</p>	<p>It is agreed that on-site infrastructure required to make a development acceptable can be secured via S.106 obligations. However, due to the linear and strategic nature of the canal network, CIL provides the best approach to funding future canal infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council welcomes a meeting to discuss prioritisation and detailed implementation matters once the principle of CIL and CIL rates have been agreed.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
26.	Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd	<p>Given that Strategic Sites are zero rated for CIL due to the fact that they will require substantial infrastructure requirements in their own right, could this also be the argument for brownfield windfall sites located within the settlement boundary?</p> <p>There is no clear distinction in the draft s.123 list between those contributions sought under CIL and those to be sought by s.106 agreement. For instance, the subjects of Transport, Social Infrastructure, Green Infrastructure and Strategic Flood Risk Measure are identified as being funded/part funded by CIL, however they are possibly instead to be funded by s.106 agreements for Strategic Sites “and other development sites”. It is not clear what “the</p>	<p>The strategic sites are zero rated due to the costs of on-site infrastructure required to deliver these sites. This does not apply to brownfield windfall sites which tend to be smaller and required to contribute to off-site infrastructure via CIL. However, certain brownfield sites located within the Stroud Valleys are not viable with CIL in place and therefore have been given a zero rate.</p> <p>Annex 2 is very clear that if infrastructure is required on-site then arrangements will be agreed through S.106 obligations. Where infrastructure is delivered off-site then CIL will fund it. There will always be other development sites where facilities can be delivered on site e.g. a large windfall site could deliver play facilities on-site and S.106 obligations will be used in this circumstance to set out ongoing</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		other developments' are and how/when this distinction applies so that a development will not be 'double charged' for such infrastructure.	maintenance arrangements.	
27.	Nailsworth Town Council	<p>Clarification is required on the definition of 'on site provision' of cultural facilities</p> <p>In the Draft Charging Schedule, 2. Background says that 'Money raised from development will help the Council pay toward district wide infrastructure priorities'. This implies the CIL allocation may be out of town/parish council hands. How are district wide priorities decided?</p> <p>Canal infrastructure (123 List): will this be a district wide contribution from every parish?</p> <p>Green Infrastructure (123 List): please define 'natural' greenspace and how this differs from recreational and play infrastructure. Suggest to omit the word 'natural' as this is open to interpretation and may prevent investment in important public open spaces that aren't traditional equipped play areas or areas with local habitat significance</p> <p>Strategic flood risk measures: please rephrase to include other flood risk measures such as off site attenuation ponds, wetlands and smaller areas reflecting local needs for flood alleviation</p>	<p>The Council's draft Planning Obligations SPD encourages applicants to engage with the Council at an early stage to determine if specific proposals will result in S.106 obligations for public realm/public art provision.</p> <p>CIL is to pay for infrastructure set out in the Local Plan. Priorities and mechanisms for delivery are the responsibility of the District Council. 15/25% of CIL is paid directly to parish councils where development occurs and they have the responsibility for spending this money.</p> <p>Money raised from development wherever it occurs may be used to fund canal infrastructure, subject to spending priorities.</p> <p>Natural greenspace includes woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, river and canal corridors where multiple functions relate to biodiversity, mitigating flood risk and adapting to climate change. The Local Plan includes policies relating to natural green spaces and it is appropriate to refer to this in the indicative Reg. 123 list.</p> <p>CIL is to pay for infrastructure set out in the Local Plan and therefore needs to focus on strategic measures. These can include the creation of attenuation ponds and wetlands. However, individual projects including small scale flood risk enhancements can help to support strategic requirements. Parish councils are encouraged to look to their 15/25% CIL payments to support local</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>Health and wellbeing infrastructure: this needs a definition. Can this include hard and soft infrastructure such as neighbourhood and community initiatives e.g. soundproof 'privacy' treatment room for podiatry services</p> <p>Renewable energy infrastructure: this needs a definition. This needs to extend to zero carbon initiatives e.g. charging points for electric vehicles (cars and bikes)</p>	<p>improvements.</p> <p>The Reg. 123 list needs to concentrate on strategic measures to deliver infrastructure required by growth set out in the Local Plan. Neighbourhood and community initiatives could be funded through parish councils' 15/25% CIL payments. A more detailed programme will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p> <p>The Council agrees to amend Annex 2 to refer to low carbon energy generation, reflecting the Local Plan policy ES2. This could include charging points for electric vehicles. A more detailed programme will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Amend Annex 2 to read:</p> <p>Renewable <u>or low carbon</u> energy infrastructure</p>
28.	Stonehouse Town Council	<p>All the exemptions will leave very little development that is subject to CIL. In particular: The exemption of buildings into which people do not normally go does not appear to be justified. The exemption of all sites within the local plan will exempt most of the major development in the plan period. A lower rate for sites within the Local Plan would be more appropriate. The exemption of land in the Stroud Valleys seems unnecessary. It would seem more appropriate to set a lower rate for brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is not clear why supermarkets and retail warehouses should pay a lower rate than other development.</p> <p>Appendix 2: Indicative draft Regulation 123 list is very broad and less specific than the previous version of Feb 2014. The list of transport</p>	<p>The exemption of buildings into which people do not normally go is a national exemption. The strategic sites are zero rated due to the costs of on-site infrastructure required to deliver these sites. Brownfield sites located within the Stroud Valleys are not viable with CIL in place and therefore have been given a zero rate. There will still be a sizeable amount of windfall development which will pay CIL.</p> <p>The lower rate has been set with regard to what retail developments can afford to pay. The justification for the revised rate is set out in the Viability Update, in particular sections 8 and 9.</p> <p>The Council's indicative R.123 list is a list of types of infrastructure to be funded through CIL not a detailed schedule of schemes. A</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		infrastructure projects should include railway stations and improvements to railway stations as per the preliminary draft charging schedule..	more detailed schedule will be developed and reviewed on a regular basis once CIL is in place. The A419 major scheme referred to has now secured funding.	
29.	Police and Crime Commissioner for Gloucestershire	Welcomes the inclusion of Emergency Services(Police Fire and Ambulance) on the indicative draft regulation 123 list under infrastructure to be funded, or part funded , through CIL. However it is recommended that the following explanatory text is inserted, relating to Police only: "Developer contributions towards additional police infrastructure to meet the needs of strategic site allocations and other development sites"	Welcome support. There is no explanatory text as there is no intention to split contributions towards this type of infrastructure between CIL and S.106 obligations. Any contributions towards Emergency Services will come from CIL alone. The suggested text refers to strategic site allocations which are CIL zero rated.	No change.
30.	Stroud Valleys Project	Stroud Valleys Project would be interested to work more with district, parish and town councils to improve outdoor spaces (from verges to parks and greenspaces) with volunteers from local communities so that greenspaces are in a good condition for people and wildlife. We are already working with several local councils doing this type of work.	The District Council welcomes opportunities to work further with the Stroud Valleys Project in the future. CIL will help to fund green infrastructure and social infrastructure projects which are likely to involve partnership working with local organisations including the Stroud Valleys Project.	No change.