

CIL / Local Tariff Stakeholder Consultation Workshop – Outcomes

10am – 1pm, 3rd August 2010, Conference Room 1, Kings Centre, King St, Norwich

Overview

- 1.1 On 3rd August 2010, GNDP and GVA Grimley hosted an informal public consultation workshop. The purpose of this consultation workshop was to understand stakeholder's thoughts and views on the potential introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy / Local Tariff across the area covered by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council. GVA Grimley explained the work and answered questions arising from stakeholders.
- 1.2 Identified stakeholders and partners including local landowners, developers and agents active in the area were invited to the consultation event. A total of 23 stakeholders attended.
- 1.3 GVA Grimley welcomed the Stakeholders to the session, and, following a presentation of the Study Brief and proposed work, divided those present into two groups for a 90 minute discussion question and answer session. The groups then reformed to discuss the main issues arising as a whole.
- 1.4 Below is a summary of the main issues / responses received from stakeholder feedback, divided into key project themes:

1) Geography

- When asked to consider how the geography of the study area should be dealt with, the stakeholder response was that any CIL should be looked at by 'growth area', rather than on a district by district basis. Stakeholders also considered that there should not be a single tariff, but a number of tariffs reflective of development growth proposals, local markets and geography.

2) Principles

- Regarding the principles of a CIL, Stakeholders thought that it should be considered in the final GVA Report whether CIL is made applicable to community uses as well as uses such as residential and commercial. GVA is to set out exactly which uses CIL would be applicable to in accordance with the CIL Regulations.
- Stakeholders commented that the GVA Report should make reference to the purpose of CIL, and particularly include narrative on the 'distance effect' – i.e. that CIL is spent in a different area from where it is generated.

3) Viability

There were concerns from stakeholders that the Drivers Jonas Delloitte (DJD) Affordable Housing Viability Study used inaccurate assumptions, for example:

- The DJD assumptions on residential re-sale values were too high;
- The base values, or Existing Use Values used were too low.

In addition the following points were raised:

- The debate of CIL v S106 in terms of viability needs to be set out within the GVA Report;
- Stakeholders wished it noted that S106 agreements are currently working well for smaller site development;
- It was said that GVA's work needs to set out proposals or conclusions for when any CIL payment might be required to be made, as there was concern from Stakeholders over any initial CIL payments impact on early phase cash flows;
- The GVA report should consider the cumulative effect of CIL and policy implementation (for example, different levels of affordable housing provision should be tested, not just the 40% set out in the DJD Affordable Housing Viability Study);
- Stakeholders and GVA concurred on the view that the GVA Report will set out what CIL viability is based on what development can afford, rather than the infrastructure funding requirement;

Sustainability / Design Codes:

- It was noted by Stakeholders that there are few examples to date of BREEAM above 'Very Good' for commercial developments in the area.
- Similarly, Stakeholders confirmed that there are few examples of residential developments to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5 or 6.

4) Impacts

- GVA confirmed with the Stakeholder group that the impact of a 'no NAHP grant world', as well as a 'with NAHP grant world' would be appraised.
 - Stakeholders wished it noted that currently for commercial developments, green travel plans & highway works are the only contributions developers expect to pay, or make allowances for. The impact of a CIL could therefore be significant;
 - It should be set out in the GVA Report whether CIL is for the betterment of existing facilities, new facilities or both;
 - As a point of note (although not a part of this study) it was considered that a policy requirement of 40% affordable housing is unreasonable. Stakeholders were also of the view that the provision of affordable housing needs to be addressed in terms of policy flexibility and in light of CIL.
- 1.5 The meeting concluded with a confirmation of next steps and how GVA Grimley would be working with GNDP and Stakeholders over the study