

SHROPSHIRE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY EXAMINATION  
HEARINGS PROGRAMME

Note: As the CIL examination is a new procedure it is unrealistic to predict accurately the amount of time that will be required to discuss each topic in full. Therefore to ensure that the hearings are conducted efficiently, whilst also allowing all those participating sufficient time to set out the points they wish make, it is proposed to operate a “rolling programme”. Each topic will be discussed in full in the order set out. Breaks will be taken at suitable and agreed times mid morning, lunch time and mid afternoon. The proceedings will adjourn at approximately 1700 on the first day and will resume at 1000 on Day 2.

DAY 1		WEDNESDAY 27 JULY 2011
1000	Examiner - welcome and introductions Examiner - opening statement Council - confirmation that the legal and procedural requirements have been met Council – opening statement All participants - any questions about the procedure	
DAY 1 1000 – 1700		
DAY 2 1000 - Close of hearings		
TOPIC 1	<u>Viability:</u> Is the schedule supported by appropriate available evidence having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs? Broad areas for discussion are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is the evidence on viability based on robust assumptions with regard to cost and availability of land, developer’s profit, construction costs, grant funding.</li> <li>• has the economics of developing small sites, particularly in the rural area, been considered in sufficient detail?</li> <li>• have house price differentials been considered in sufficient detail?</li> <li>• has the impact of section 106 contributions and affordable housing contributions been taken into account?</li> <li>• general concerns including: viability in current market conditions/ risk of levy being added to house prices rather than coming of the land value</li> </ul>	
TOPIC 2	<u>The infrastructure funding gap</u> is the funding gap derived from a detailed and up to date evidence base of infrastructure requirements (including consideration of draft developer contributions SPD and CIL list)? has account been taken of all other sources of funding?	

TOPIC 3	<p><u>Residential Levy Rates</u>  are the urban/ rural differential rates supported by viability evidence?  is the rural levy rate sufficiently sensitive to varying markets across the area?  do the residential rates strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effect on the economic viability of development across the area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• will the higher rural rate deter rural development?</li> <li>• will it increase the cost of rural housing?</li> <li>• will it be detrimental to low and mid market developments?</li> <li>• how will the levy affect cross subsidised housing?</li> </ul> <p>are the charging zone boundaries between urban and rural areas clearly defined and supported by the viability evidence?</p>
TOPIC 4	<p><u>The nil levy rate for non residential development</u>  does the evidence demonstrate that the majority of non residential development would not be viable if a levy was charged?  consideration of development types and geographical areas where charging a levy would be viable  does the complexity of operating a differential rate for non residential development outweigh the benefits of the potential contributions from the levy?  does the nil rate comply with State Aid rules?</p>
CLOSE OF HEARINGS	