

The preparation of the Community Infrastructure Levy is a public process and your full representation will be made public for this purpose.	<i>For office use only:</i>
	<i>Date received:</i>
	<i>Rep no:</i>

**Greater Norwich
Development
Partnership**

**Community Infrastructure Levy
Draft Charging Schedules for Broadland, Norwich
and South Norfolk**

Representations Form

Please return to:

By email: cil@gndp.org.uk
By post: Greater Norwich Development Partnership
PO Box 3466
Norwich
NR7 0DU

All comments must be received by 5pm on Monday 5 March 2012

Please read the Statement of Representations Procedure and Guidance Notes before you complete this form.

1. Personal details:	2. Agents details (if applicable)
<i>*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title and Name boxes in column 1 below, but complete the full contact details of the agent in column 2.</i>	
Title	Miss
First name	Lisa
Last name	Matthewson
Job title	Senior Planning Associates
Organisation	The Planning Bureau Ltd.
Address	Hartington House, Hartington Road, Altrincham
Postcode	WA14 5LX

Telephone no. 0161 926 3344

Email address lisa.matthewson@theplanningbureau.ltd.uk

Q1. Do you consider the Council(s) has followed a correct approach in developing the Draft Charging Schedule as required by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended)?

No

I would like my representation to be considered for (please tick all that apply):

Broadland District Council's Draft Charging Schedule..... **X**

Norwich City Council's Draft Charging Schedule..... **X**

South Norfolk Council's Draft Charging Schedule..... **X**

If no:

a. Did you raise this issue at the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Stage?

Yes

b. Please give details of what change(s) you consider are necessary, having regard to the legal requirements for a charging schedule and, if not raised previously, why not. You will need to say why you think this change will make the Draft Charging Schedule legally compliant. It will be very helpful if you could also put forward your suggested revised wording of any text. Please note your comment should briefly cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify the representation and the suggested change as, after this stage, further submissions will only be possible at the request of the examiner, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination. Please be as precise as possible. Only information that relates to the representation will be accepted.

Please add your comments here

As the market leader in the provision of sheltered housing for sale to the elderly, McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd considers that with its extensive experience in providing development of this nature, it is well placed to provide informed comments on the Greater Norwich Draft CIL Charging Schedule insofar as it affects or relates to housing for the elderly.

In our previous representation (Representation CIL072) we stated that the proposed Charging Schedule would effectively prejudice the development of specialist accommodation for the elderly in Greater Norwich. Given that the need for this type of housing is acknowledged in the LDF's evidence base, we find the Council's limited response to our representation to be extremely disappointing.

As such, we would like to reiterate the concerns cited in our previous representation in light of the Council's response and the revised Draft Charging Schedule.

CIL Charging Zones

We reiterate our concern that the CIL Residential Charging Zones as proposed by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership remains unsuitable and prejudices the redevelopment of previously developed land in the area.

By charging a higher CIL levy rate for urban areas, including most of Norwich City and its surrounding hinterland, the Council is in effect subsidising the development of greenfield rural land over previously developed urban areas. This approach is based solely on a viability

report by GVA Grimley, which makes assumptions on viability based on land values across Greater Norwich.

We would assert however that land values alone are not by themselves the sole means for determining CIL levy rates. Issues such as the sustainability of a site should be considered by the Council. At present the proposed CIL regime contradicts National Planning Policy Guidance within PPS3: Housing which prioritises the re-use of previously developed land over green field land with Paragraph 40 stating *"a key objective is that Local Planning Authorities should continue to make effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously development"*. It would therefore not be unreasonable for Council's to set lower CIL rates in areas in which they wish to encourage development, for example more sustainable urban locations.

A precedent for this has been set in the adopted Shropshire CIL Charging schedule which, sensibly, sets a lower rate for the principle urban area of Shrewsbury and the other key market towns. The rationale being, not only to focus development in these areas, but also because urban areas have more established infrastructure which is easier and less costly to supplement than the provision of entirely new facilities in greenfield locations.

We would argue that just because the Council has evidence that supports the provision of higher CIL rates in urban area, that this is the most important course of action. The purpose of CIL should not be solely to extract the highest rate of monies from developers, particularly at a time when economic growth is stagnant, and should work in conjunction with wider national and local planning objectives.

Communal Areas

In our previous representation we proposed a CIL rate limited to the net saleable area for specialist accommodation for the elderly.

Many forms of specialist housing accommodation, such as retirement housing and extra care accommodation for the elderly provide communal areas for residents at an additional cost to developers. Specialist housing providers also have additional financial requirements as opposed to other forms of development that will only pay on 100% saleable floor space. This does not provide a level playing field for these types of specialist accommodation and means that a disproportionate charge in relation to saleable area and infrastructure need is levied.

The Council's response was *"that the issue of communal areas is no different in specialist housing accommodation, such as retirement living from other flatted developments. The management and upkeep of communal areas should be reflected in management charges and sales prices"*.

This response shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the role of communal areas in specialist accommodation for the elderly on the part of the Council.

Firstly, in comparison to open market flats the communal areas in specialist accommodation for the elderly are considerably larger in size, fulfil a more important function and are accordingly built to a higher specification than those provided by open market flatted developments. Typically, the average McCarthy and Stone scheme provides communal areas that account for an average of 30% of a development's total. In open market flatted apartments the level of communal space would be significantly less than this.

Secondly, not only do these communal areas cost additional monies to construct, they also are also effectively subsidised by the developer until a development has been completely sold out.

For example in a McCarthy and Stone development the staff costs and extensive communal facilities are paid for by residents via a monthly management / service charge. However, due to the nature of these developments the communal facilities are fully built and operational from the arrival of the first occupant. Therefore to keep the service charge at an affordable level for residents, service charge monies that would be provided from empty properties are subsidised by the Company. This is a considerable financial responsibility as it usually takes a number of years to fully sell a development.

It is therefore clearly evident that the communal facilities provided by specialist accommodation for the elderly and the associated empty property costs differ considerably

Notification requests

In line with the Statement of Representations procedure, please indicate if you wish to be:

- notified that the Draft Charging Schedule has been submitted to the Examiner in accordance with Section 212 of the Planning Act 2008
- notified of the publication of the recommendations of the Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations
- notified of the approval of the Charging Schedule by the Charging Authority(s)

Signature:

Signature: Lisa Matthewson	Date: 05/03/2012
-------------------------------	---------------------

NB: A signature is not required on forms returned electronically

Please email to cil@gndp.org.uk or post to Greater Norwich Development Partnership, PO Box 3466, Norwich, NR7 0DU