

**Charles, Ruth**

---

**From:** Charles, Ruth  
**Sent:** 25 October 2012 16:41  
**To:** 'Annette Feeney'  
**Cc:** Baxter, Amy; Eastaugh, Sandra  
**Subject:** RE: CIL

Dear Annette,

Please see below response on behalf of the GNDP

1) The S106 costs that we have used from the statement of common ground do not include affordable housing. They are costs of infrastructure and principally education, transport and open space. It is possible that some of the examples include a small element of non-infrastructure travel planning costs.

2) The residual S106 of £750 per market dwelling is intended to cover non-infrastructure needs (such as those relating to travel planning). The figure was arrived at following discussions with Norfolk Homes and Savills. It is included in the calculations in the response to the Examiner's question (EX2). It is a relatively nominal figure and smaller development would have no S106 costs (other than affordable housing)

3) The calculation of previous S106 has been converted to the amount per market dwelling to make it comparable with CIL rates.

kind regards,

Ruth Charles  
Greater Norwich Development Partnership Project Manager

---

[www.gndp.org.uk](http://www.gndp.org.uk)

Greater Norwich Development Partnership  
PO Box 3466  
Norwich, NR7 7NX

---

**From:** Annette Feeney [mailto:annette.feeney@broadland.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 24 October 2012 15:26  
**To:** Charles, Ruth  
**Cc:** Baxter, Amy; Eastaugh, Sandra  
**Subject:** CIL

**FURTHER MATERIAL FROM THE GNDP**

Further to the note relating to the discussion on day 1 please provide clarity in relation to 2 points

1) The argument outlined in paragraph 5 that the S106 monies can be added to the CIL "pot" depends on whether the S106s have been specifically based on providing infrastructure of the sort that CIL is intended to fund. Can you please confirm whether this is the case and that the S106 arrangements do not relate to the provision of other non-infrastructure matters such as affordable housing.

2) Noting the reference to a "residual S106" for free market dwellings please clarify 2 matters. First, given the intention to retain some S106 requirements what proportion of the S106 monies raised previously should be excluded from the CIL pot and what is this based on. Second when considering the quantum of the extra money in the CIL "pot" arising from previous S106 monies should the calculation be based on an amount per dwelling or an amount per free-market dwelling.

Can you please ensure this email is placed on the web site and I will circulate to participants accordingly.

Annette Feeney