

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

**Respondents**

Ref	Name	Organisation / (paper only response)	1 Residential Levy Rate	2. Evidence (residential)	3 Levy Rate for Other Uses	5. Levy beneficiaries (Annex C)	6. Other comments
1	Mr Kerswell	Local farmer (p)	<i>Object</i> – in general <i>Support</i> – levy for for holiday lets and incomers Does not factor in rising costs re. zero carbon / Code Level 6?	Will stifle devt as SSDC did with ah contributions. Failure of Devt Land tax in the 1970s.	<i>Support</i> – Nil rate essential for farming business and self build homes for local low earning families.		
2	Mr M Wilde	Les Stephan					CIL will clearly make development more expensive which, in the current economic climate is hardly likely to encourage development. Planning Departments do not have a very good record in dealing with Section 106 agreements, some taking many months to complete. If long negotiations become necessary we foresee a slowing down of development
3	Cllr T Woodward	Shropshire Councillor	<i>Object</i> – The levy has the potential to massively increase the cost of properties making them even less affordable to buyers. It may not be possible to reduce land values where land was bought at previous values, or where land prices remain high. The levy must take account of other costs, namely the increase in material costs, the costs of improving eco and sustainable build standards and providing affordable housing. A higher levy rate in the rural areas is not the best mechanism for delivering housing in rural Shropshire: conversely a lower rate in the market towns will target housing in these locations at the expense of rural areas. Authorities who set lower levy rates will attract more development.				Less public funding places more of the burden on developers. Would prefer contributions for infrastructure improvements to be applied to other significant parties including utility companies, local authorities, etc.  The Levy has the potential to disadvantage small and medium-scale housing development, particularly in rural areas. It overlooks the benefits that housing contributes to sustainability by the very fact of introducing new families to Shropshire (helping retain services by providing customers for shops, schools, etc.) and improving the quality of life for the residents who wish to move to larger or smaller properties within Shropshire.  For every home built, the local authority will get six years of matched council tax funding, through the new homes bonus. This is an opportunity to adjust the Levy in the rural areas by way of the match funding from Government being spent locally in the community where a smaller Levy could be topped up by Shropshire Council, in the true spirit of Localism by all parties.
4	Mr N Porter, Head of Premises and Planning	LA Children & Young People's Services	<i>Support</i> - 120/m2 in the rural area & urban extensions  <i>Object</i> - to 40/m2 in Shrewsbury and the market towns because it is insufficient to cover the costs of schools related to development in Shrewsbury and the market towns.  A housing development with no access to available school places is unacceptable.	1 form entry primary school = £3m (incl. site). 1 form entry extension to a secondary school = £3m. Total = £6m for school education.  The DfE has indicated that the provision of school places to meet increased birth rates in existing stock will be a priority, but that there is no additional funding to LAs to provide school places in all-new	<i>Support</i> - S106 contributions should deal with any issues caused to schools and the provision of childcare facilities.  Some sites and types of	Schools are a separate category, and a higher priority than other facilities, as provision of school places is a statutory and mandatory function of the Council.  In addition, childcare/early years should be listed explicitly.	

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

			The Council will have to take into account that social housing requires access to school places, also, and has perhaps a higher than average need for childcare/early years provision.	development. The assumption remains that this should be funded by developers.	development will cause particular problems for schools, e.g. noise, traffic, congestion. This will vary from site to site and is best dealt with through site-specific S106 agreements rather than a levy.	Finally, the ordering of the list should reflect the Council priorities for service development.	
5	Mr S Jones	Halls Holdings Ltd	<p><i>Object</i> – Totally oppose the levy on any buildings. As it is detrimental to first time buyers, the levy should not apply to small properties under 140m2 in size. Payment of the levy should be after completion or occupation of the dwellings, not 60 days after commencement. The inflation measure index is likely to see higher increases than general inflation and is unjustified.</p> <p>Affordable housing contributions should be reduced when the levy is introduced, otherwise developers are paying twice.</p> <p>The Levy must be consistent between towns and the rural area. It is discriminatory to have a higher level in the rural area, and will stifle development further. Rural areas already suffer from high house prices, higher travelling costs, fewer job opportunities and higher heating costs.</p> <p>Disagree that the balance between the desirability of funding for infrastructure and its impact on development is different in the rural area.</p>	Whilst some of the infrastructure elements are more expensive in rural areas, general expectations of rural dwellers are less.	There should be a nil rate for holiday lets and for dwellings that have a planning condition tying them to commercial uses.		
6	Mr H Horsley, Hon. Secretary	Much Wenlock Civic Society			<i>Support</i> - exemption of affordable housing.		<p>In the past legal constraints limited the use of funds from Section 106 agreements to the Parish and surrounding parishes, and restricted them to capital rather than recurrent costs. It is not yet sufficiently clear what limits will be put on the use of the community levy. Clarification is essential to ensure a transparent equitable system in which the public can have faith.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the dubious transparency of "Open Book Accounting" and the complex negotiations which can derive from this system. It seems potentially to put enormous powers in the hands of individuals and the outcomes for the public are thus reliant on the negotiating skills, acumen and the unshakeable integrity of those individuals. This may turn out to be the very antithesis of transparent local democratic accountability. We feel that the draft needs to be very specific</p>

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

							about what democratic checks and balances are to be built into the system of negotiation and agreement to protect individual officers from undue pressure and to protect the public interest.
7	Ms S Clayton, Town Clerk	Much Wenlock Town Council	<i>Object</i> – The Town Council also believes that the need for infrastructure development is not so different in scale as the difference in CIL rates between the market towns and rural areas would suggest. For example, the costs of provision of school places will be similar and, in Much Wenlock’s case, there are proven, quite costly requirements for infrastructure to enable sustainable growth.	It would be perverse to suggest a low rate when the evidence shows that a higher rate is clearly justifiable and feasible. Shropshire should not sell itself short by requiring lower contributions than what is being achieved by other local authorities. The Town Council also believes that the need for infrastructure development is not so different in scale as the difference in CIL rates between the market towns and rural areas would suggest. For example, the costs of provision of school places will be similar and, in Much Wenlock’s case, there are proven, quite costly requirements for infrastructure to enable sustainable growth. There is justification for some kind of geographic variation in how the rate is applied to the market towns, to achieve ‘revitalisation’ in some places and in others ensuring a fairer contribution from development to local needs. The towns in the north of Shropshire clearly have a different set of circumstances to Much Wenlock and other towns in the south and east; the latter ones are exposed to higher development pressures due to their proximity to Telford and the West Midlands and being of smaller scale have fewer (and so more valuable) development opportunities. A variable rate would allow higher rates in appropriate locations whilst not deterring necessary development in more marginal locations.	<i>Support</i> – the nil rate for other uses. <i>Object</i> – to the omission of reference to agricultural and forestry workers dwellings, which should be at nil rate. Similarly the nil rate should apply to affordable housing needed for travellers and gypsies. If a designated dwelling should come out of these restricted uses, the owner/developer should then be required to pay the full CIL rate for rural housing.	The Town Council has provided Shropshire Council with an analysis of the weaknesses and infrastructure needs for the community to ensure sustainable community development (see Place Plans).	
8	Ms C Warner, Clerk	Welshampton and Lyneal Parish Council	<i>Object</i> – 120/m2 in the rural areas is too high. There is a likelihood that rural areas will see an increase in affordable housing and a decrease in market housing. Housing associations should also contribute the levy, although not at the same level.				All outputs from the collection of the Levy should be delivered in the area where the development takes place.
9	Mrs J Nicholls, Clerk	Astley Parish Council (p)	<i>Object</i> – the differential between towns and the rural area is unrealistic, totally unfair, and unacceptable. Once again the rural areas would appear to bear the brunt of any such levy.				
10	Mr K Bailey,	K M Bailey Ltd	<i>Object</i> – All areas should be treated the same and pay the same rate. As this government tells us “we are all in it together”.				The levy should be imposed on all new development, including extensions to existing properties, to spread the burden more fairly.

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

11	Mrs C Morgan, Clerk	Church Pulverbatch Parish Council	<i>Object</i> – The councillors feel that the Levy is very unfair as it is 3 times higher in rural areas than urban. Not all rural areas have street lighting, do not have easy access to libraries etc.				
12	Mr C Jones		<p><i>Object</i> – will ultimately lead to less small scale development especially in Rural areas with a knock on effect of fewer jobs created by very small builders and developers.</p> <p>Whilst supporting the levy on larger sites, object to it applying to less than 2 dwellings as the land purchase value and build cost is ultimately higher on small sites.</p> <p>The combined impact of the levy and the affordable housing contribution puts an unacceptable burden on small developers.</p> <p>The nil rate that applies to self build housing should be extended to self build market housing.</p>	The studies by Fordham Research are fundamentally flawed as they only include one example of a single dwelling development in their sample (that of Bank Farm, Tibberton). The studies don't account for the higher cost of land values which always accompany single/ double plot developments. There is no economy of scale on these sites, and likewise all the costs have to be recouped from the sale price of the property leading to even higher property prices. Basing evidence on a single example is not reasonable or in any way accurate.	<i>Support</i> –Positive move to encourage small scale industry and jobs as businesses contribute through higher business rates. Would support a nil rate being extended to apply to all self build housing.	I am in broad agreement with the types of infrastructure proposed so long as it is related for the immediate communities benefit and not pooled for use elsewhere.	Living in a rural area is much more expensive than living in an urban area, the policy which is currently been explored will do little to encourage affordable living, job creation, and affordable market housing.
13	Mr R Plowden, Chair	Lydbury North Parish Council	<p><i>Object</i> – 1.Discriminates against rural villages and local communities - will strongly discourage (along with all the other costs been heaped on 'rural' development) any form of residential development, which will lead to continued stagnation in these areas.</p> <p>2. will discourage 'rebalancing' of rural communities (per the Core Strategy) in particular where need some limited new development to make existing facilities (school, shop/PO, Pub, Church, Village Hall ) sustainable.</p> <p>3. contrary to Government's Localism agenda which aims to help and empower local communities (and not to discriminate against them).</p>		<i>Support</i> – Because unless you encourage employment and growth you will stifle any hope of economic recovery/growth. Also supports a nil rate for affordable housing.		For the moment why not limit developer contributions to Affordable Housing because there is a strong possibility that what is currently being proposed (the levy), particularly in the rural areas, will stifle virtually all residential development, and hence contribute to the unstainability of our existing village facilities.
14	Mr T Evans		<p><i>Support</i> – The £40/m2 rate in the towns.</p> <p><i>Object</i> – The £120/m2 rate as this level of contribution is not justified from the evidence provided.</p>	The argument for making rural developments pay three times that of other developments is unsustainable when measured against the access to the infrastructure benefits afforded to rural dwellers. I would suggest that rural developments should make the same contributions as all the rest of the developments.	<i>Support</i>		
15	Mr G Cattle	Hope Conservation Trust	<i>Object to town rate / strongly object to the rural rate</i> – the levy rates are all too high and do not recognise the fragile state of the construction industry and in particular the house building sector.	When South Shropshire introduced a high affordable housing contribution rate it became known as a "development blackspot". A levy that is too high will result in house-builders going elsewhere.	<i>Support</i> - a nil rate for affordable housing. <i>Object</i> – There are signs that other types of development are recovering and	Residential care in particular seems to be doing very well at the moment due to the aging population and number of expansion plans in progress.	The transport infrastructure funding gap is very high and the wish list of transport projects is very ambitious given the financial climate. The Shrewsbury North West Relief Road should be excluded. We are opposed to the Parkway Station project: it should not be included.

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

					doing rather better than the housing sector at the moment.		
16	Mr J Quallington		<i>Support</i> – The need for a differential levy is accepted, after all to build in the country is a bonus.				
17	Mr J Berry	Sport England				Welcome the inclusion of sports provision within the list of the types of infrastructure proposed as beneficiaries of the Levy. However, the calculation of the required sporting provision has been based solely on the standards set out in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation IPG, which only considers pitches, courts and greens. Other sporting infrastructure, including built facilities such as swimming pools and sports halls, may also be required within Shropshire to support new development and are considered to be potential beneficiaries of the levy.	The Council's Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy is considered to be one of the tools for identifying the infrastructure required to support new development in the County and associated costs.  Further and wider consideration of the likely sporting infrastructure required in Shropshire may have an impact on the calculation of the infrastructure costs per square metre of new development. This may then have implications for the process of weighing this against the economic viability evidence and policy considerations to reach an appropriate Levy for Shropshire and the type of development covered by the levy.
18	Mr J Tait	Taylor Wimpey (Planning Prospects Ltd)	<i>Object</i> – the level of growth and the infrastructure requirements to support it have yet to be set in an adopted Core Strategy. The Preliminary Charging Schedule pre-empt the Core Strategy and should be revisited when the Core Strategy is adopted.  Supports a Levy rate that is not too high above the existing rate of developer contributions, as a more transparent and certain method of delivering infrastructure, providing that additional developer contributions are not also sought over and above the CIL. The levy rate could however be considerably lower if a broader range of development was required to contribute to it.  We are concerned that other planning obligations over and above CIL will further threaten residential development viability.	The infrastructure gap is an important factor in setting the levy. The costs set out inevitably will be the subject of review and variance over time however appear so broad and vague at this stage as to be meaningless in informing the levy. When considered alongside the proposed levy charge, it suggests that it will be impossible for development within Shropshire to in anyway fund this gap. It fails to recognise that a significant proportion of the housing development set out within the Core Strategy has either been completed to date or is already committed with planning permission and which would not be subject to CIL. All of these calculations mislead the infrastructure costs context.  We are concerned that the calculation of “additional profit” over simplifies the viability of residential development, with fundamentally	<i>Object</i> – places the burden of funding infrastructure entirely on residential development. The proposals create an undue and unfair burden upon the residential development sector. A nil rate is justified by the Council on economic development grounds because the commercial property market remains highly volatile and uncertain, but it fails to recognise the significantly	The North West Relief Road should not be included.  Infrastructure requirements that are related to individual developments, such as the sustainable urban extensions, should be excluded from the CIL list and directly addressed as part of site-specific planning obligations. The infrastructure list should be refined to better identify and separate out those infrastructure requirements that are directly attributable to larger scale greenfield sites. Future pooling of planning obligations towards infrastructure will not be possible	It will not be possible for non-residential development to contribute to defined infrastructure as S106 planning obligations cannot subsequently secure contributions to those infrastructure items within the CIL list.  It is unclear as to whether specific and focused viability has been undertaken in respect of the SUE sites to inform a differential levy for those sites or why such a differential has been identified in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

				unrealistic assumptions on land costs and land owner profits as well as reasonable developer profits which vary considerably from site to site. We have considerable concerns about the robustness of this assessment and its ability to inform the appropriate level of the levy.	volatile and uncertain housing market conditions and the challenges to viability which the residential sector also faces in the current economic climate.	alongside CIL so it is essential that "excluded improvements" are linked to certain specified development proposals.	
19	G. Powell (GDP Planning)	Norton in Hales Parish Council				It is implied that the levy is to be secured for local infrastructure provision. No reference is made however to how this revenue is to be secured for local use on a parish by parish basis nor is there any indication as to who will administer the local fund (Parish Council or Shropshire Council?)	In the past 'infrastructure contributions' have been secured through a Section 106 Agreement. It is assumed that this practice will now cease. What is the legal standing of a 'liability notice' and are there legal costs attached to their issue which will be deducted from the levy rate income? If this is the case there will be less benefit derived by the community from the infrastructure levy.
20	P. Richards	Peter Richards & Co.	<i>Object</i> – Will stifle new development. Would prefer to continue to use section 106 planning obligations. <i>Object</i> – The rural rate will render hundreds of rural development opportunities unviable.	Example provided of 3 new dwellings in North Shropshire, at market value of £165,000 each, where CIL at £120/m2 plus an affordable housing contribution as per the Type and Affordability of Housing SPD, would reduce the residual land value from £126,000 to £45,810. In this example the land value would not be sufficient for the land owner to allow the parcel to be developed.	<i>Support</i> – as tax on employment development would endanger job creation. <i>Support</i> - a nil rate for affordable housing.		CIL is another financial hurdle preventing market development across the county – in particular in the rural areas. Feel the introduction of CIL should be delayed until the economy and in particular the residential market has recovered.
21	S Miller	Persimmon Homes North West	Generally support the introduction of CIL and its intentions to create a simpler, fairer, more transparent and predictable system of standard charges, capable of unlocking additional funding for infrastructure. It will be essential for the Council to apply the Levy and s106 contributions in a fair and transparent way which avoids duplication. However CIL will only achieve this if Councils take a pragmatic stance on its application and factor in viability on a site by site basis. Support the flexibility to reduce the levy where an affordable housing s106 agreement is also in place and the developer can demonstrate the scheme is not viable. It will be crucial that the Council is prepared to assess the submitted viability within a reasonable two week period in order to avoid unnecessary and costly delays.	Greater clarity is needed over the infrastructure funding gap to assess whether it target is justifiable and appropriate. Despite positive margins going forward on newly acquired sites, operating margin on sites bought pre credit crunch still (and will continue to over the medium term) to run at a negative margin. Recent results from the large PLCs show margins of between 3 and 6%. It is important for the UK housebuilding industry to recover margins on sites going forward to assist with the recovery of the housing market and the economy as a whole.			There is also no mechanism mentioned in any of the documents that enable CIL contributions to be paid back to the developer if not spent within 3 years. Could you please clarify the Council's position on this matter?
22	P. Cahill	Highways Agency			Notes that the nil rate for employment is surprising given Core Strategy Policy CS9 and	Concerns that the highways improvements to the A5 that are excluded from the levy list may not be deliverable if they are	The HA is also concerned about the limit of no more than 4 planning obligations for specified infrastructure, noting that more than 4 obligations may be required for some junction improvements at Shrewsbury and Oswestry.

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

					that offices and retail can generate the greatest impact on the strategic road network.	challenged by developers. In particular, in light of the statutory tests for planning obligations, the HA cannot be certain that all the improvements needed can be directly related to the relevant developments, fairly and reasonably in scale and kind to the developments.  The HA recognises that developers cannot be expected to bear the full cost of delivering growth.	Improvements to the strategic road network should be classified as "critical". The HA cannot comment on the costs given for the junctions as it has not seen how these were arrived at, and therefore cannot confirm that the costs have been captured appropriately. In calculating the proposed levy rate, has the Council taken into consideration that applicants may have other obligations to satisfy, thus exerting additional pressure on developers?  The HA is pleased to note that sustainable transport and urban traffic management (items k and m) are on the CIL list (Annex C).  The HA notes that "a minority proportion" of CIL receipts will be spent on strategic infrastructure but that this is in line with the Localism Bill. As and when the Bill's provisions become clearer, the HA will work with Shropshire Council to put these new mechanics into place.
23	N. Blackie	FBC Manby Bowdler	<p><i>Object</i> – whilst the CS may well be adopted in a form close to that of the final draft, no real work has been done on the other DPDs to complete the LDF suite. Until that work is done, the nature of the infrastructure necessary cannot be considered with sufficient depth to enable a charging schedule to be prepared. The CIL will necessarily be inadequate. If that inadequacy is that an assumption has been made that more infrastructure is to be planned for than is necessary, the result is that too much money will be demanded of developers, with the effect that the market will be depressed, so that development takes place at too slow a rate.</p> <p>The divisions between rural and urban developments is apparently arbitrary, and is so radically different as to lead to the suspicion that it is simply a tax to discourage development in the rural areas. The CIL should not be used in that way. The levy should fairly reflect the relative infrastructure costs.</p>	<p>The schedule envisages that <i>new</i> development should pay for the cost of providing infrastructure to benefit <i>old</i>. For example, flood defences. On the assumption that new development is not put into areas where flood is a real risk, why should it pay for those that are? That cost should be borne by the county as a whole through taxes.</p> <p>The meaning of the concept of viability is entirely unclear in the context of discretionary relief. The factors should be explicit, so as to avoid argument as to the proper starting point - what level of profit is in fact regarded as appropriate for a developer. Similarly, in relation to regulation 55, the cost of complying with planning obligations needs to be explained.</p>		<p>The objectives within the charging schedule are unrealistically high, and are inappropriately prioritised having regard to the current and anticipated market place in Shropshire. Some of the items in the schedule should be regarded as "nice to have" rather than absolutely essential. For example, Community Arts provision and Medical facilities are obviously at different parts of the continuum. T</p> <p>The schedule lists items that are in some instances only relevant to certain parts of the county: some developments will not benefit to any appreciable degree from infrastructure in Whitchurch, and should not have to pay for it.</p>	<p>8. The whole basis of the CIL is wrong, given that the government has indicated its intention to legislate so as to change the statutory provisions as part of the Localism Bill. The CIL has not taken into account the changes being proposed to the factors to be considered. The CIL should not be progressed until the effect of those changes has been considered. The Cala decision (January 2011) has confirmed that the intention to legislate is a material consideration for a decision maker to take into account.</p>
24	A. Ross	Commercial Estates Group, c/o Broadway Malvan				<p>We do not object generally to the broad types of infrastructure identified in Annex C of the Preliminary Charging Schedule, which would be the beneficiaries of the Levy. However it is</p>	<p>The highway infrastructure works proposed as part of the Council's proposed Sustainable Urban Extension at Shrewsbury West, which include works at Churncote Island and the delivery of what is now referred to as the Oxon Link Road, are acknowledged by the Council (and the site promoters) to be a specific and inherent part of those proposals. Accordingly it appears from Annex C of the</p>

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

						essential that the exclusions identified in criteria k) and l) are retained both now and in any amended future lists, for reasons clarified below.	Preliminary Charging Schedule that the Council is, rightly, proposing to exclude such works from the types of transport infrastructure that can benefit from the Levy. However this clear and correct position is confused by Appendix A of the 'Levy Rationale Background Paper' which identifies the Oxon Link Road as an eligible transport project which contributes to the infrastructure funding gap, which CIL payments will look to eliminate or reduce. For clarity and to ensure consistency with Annex C, reference to the Oxon Link Road project should be deleted from Appendix A of the 'Levy Rationale Background Paper'.
25	T. Barrett	Broseley Town Council					The Town Council request an assurance that 75% of the sum levied would be returned to the community it had come from.
26	B. Ellison		<p><i>Object</i> - These rates are totally unjust and imbalanced. Why should the levy in Rural Areas be three times the amount of that in Shrewsbury? Why are you making it more expensive for residential development, and for people, especially younger people, to be able to stay and or move to live in a Village or Rural Area?</p> <p>The proposed rural levy charges are going to discourage or setback development instead of promoting housing development to maintain a sustainable and confident Village Community. We need development to keep our Villages vibrant, to keep our Schools, small Shops/Post Offices, and to retain and strengthen transport facilities.</p> <p>Living in the Rural Areas and Villages is not a privilege as you may think. In fact Villages are being neglected and totally ignored at times, and unfair levy charges like the ones proposed will do nothing to enhance the rural areas.</p>	<p>I object to the levy charge being paid when the development first commences. When a property has been sold, or a certain stated number of dwellings have been built or sold, fair enough, then pay a levy charge if needed.</p> <p>I think your proposal, on the other hand, would catch the Big Developers who try to avoid the S106 like the plague and who delay payments/promises for years, and break/tweak every condition in the planning permission agreement!</p> <p>In one of your many Planning Documents you stated that your vision is for a 'Flourishing Shropshire' and that should include our beloved Rural Areas. This outrageous initial levy charge of £120/sq. m will not help the situation of essential affordable housing for both rent and sale. You are simply closing the door on any rural aspiration, particularly in the present economic climate that we are all experiencing.</p>			
27	Mr A Fox	Fox Associates	<p><i>Object</i> - The £40/m2 proposed charge would amount to an unreasonable burden. This would – for instance - be better spent on sustainable building technology. This would be a choice of the developer or purchaser (to present as environmental benefits) rather than a burden imposed by the CIL.</p> <p>The proposed £120/m2 charge on rural areas would be extremely prohibitive representing an additional 10% of build costs, and again would be better spent on sustainable building technology at the preference of developer or purchaser.</p> <p>No particular regard seems to have been given to rural circumstances and the</p>	<p>The Council produces no evidence to suggest development can carry the burden of the CIL.</p> <p>The Council produces no evidence to show how the proposed levy rate has been calculated.</p> <p>There is surely evidence - particularly in the current market - that the imposition of the CIL will compromise the intentions of the Core Strategy; and planning policy.</p> <p>There is a raft of legislation, guidance and policy that could be put forward as evidence to show the financial burden already imposed on</p>	Support- a nil rate	These are all types of infrastructure that should be financed out of general taxation; or as necessarily specific to and a requirement for the development itself. Development already carries the burden of infrastructure charges for enhancements; improvements; repairs; or additions to infrastructure such as roads, services and	<p>If required to pay a levy there is a risk that there will be a reduction in the quality of the built environment and a reduction in the delivery of development that the council's core strategy and planning policy seeks to promote.</p> <p>Developers face a vast range of regulations; policies; standards; and criteria to comply with. Almost all, without exception, add cost to development. The Council's emerging Sustainable Design SPD will also impose additional costs to development. Any further burden will seriously compromise the delivery of development.</p> <p>It is submitted therefore that – on balance - there should be no infrastructure levy imposed</p>



Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

			<p>government's intention to rural proof domestic policies. The government also seeks to encourage sustainable economic growth in rural areas. These proposals fly in the face of that intention. They discourage rather than encourage; they do not present as sustainable economic growth; and they impose a burden on rural development.</p>	<p>development. The rates suggested are prohibitive and will lead to a reduction in housing development rather than an increase - which is currently required to meet demand and policy.</p>		<p>drainage facilities. All of which benefit the community as a whole. Infrastructure for other community facilities should not be a burden on development projects. It should be shared by the community as a whole.</p>	<p>in this present climate and that the charging authority should defer any initial charges by setting a nil rate leaving an option open for future further consideration when the economy improves.</p>
28	L Goff	Balfours	<p><i>Object</i> - The £40/m2 rate is unlikely to meet the full cost of the strategic infrastructure required and in addition still be able to contribute towards the unknown proportion that will have to be spent in the immediate area. Despite the need to support investment and growth in the economy, significant infrastructure implications are associated with any form of development. The proposed differential between urban and rural areas is far too great. It is not clear what proportion of this payment is to be pooled into the strategic infrastructure pot and what proportion is to be dedicated to the local area. A CIL levy at £120/m2, on top of the proposed affordable housing contribution, will undermine sustainable growth in the rural areas and divert footloose investment to adjacent rural areas outside of Shropshire where payments are less. We object to the rural areas potentially subsidising the urban areas. We object to the potential blight that the differential will create between urban and rural areas as investment will be artificially redirected to the significantly cheaper development areas. The economy of the rural areas will inevitably suffer. We consider in the interests of fairness and transparency all development should pay a fixed minimal level payment towards the funding of the costed strategic infrastructure identified by Shropshire Council, with a top-up element reflecting the local infrastructure aspirations identified by the local community in the different areas. We consider it unreasonable to comment on a provisional charging schedule which does not incorporate the full detail of the infrastructure that is to be funded, particularly in the rural area.</p>	<p>Central London CIL rates proposed are only £50/m2 and £40/m2 in the suburbs, given the land values and potential profits associated with development in the City it is hard to comprehend how rural Shropshire merits charges at the suggested £120/m2 level. There is no evidence within the supporting document of the rates likely to be charged by adjoining authorities, this information is crucial to judging whether Shropshire will remain competitive for house building and investment.</p>	<p><i>Support</i> – a nil rate for affordable housing and community uses <i>Object</i> – to a nil rate for employment and commercial. In cases where such payments make development unviable, or on small projects under a defined threshold, exemptions could apply. Hotels, institutions and leisure should make minimal contributions towards the strategic infrastructure requirements from which the business will directly benefit, e.g. local travel options.</p>	<p>A minimal levy rate should be set for all development. These payments could be limited to the strategic projects such as highways and flood defences.  The rationale behind the proposed open space rates is not clear. It seems to suggest that rural residents need more informal open space than people living in market towns.  Also, rural residents are to be asked to pay a further £273.59 per dwelling towards natural open space. We consider rural residents should pay a reduced contribution towards natural and semi natural open space as it is not clear what this financial contribution is actually funding.</p>	<p>A proportion of CIL contributions is to be returned to the community for local infrastructure projects. If such monies were used to fund new community facilities or acquire community assets it would seem counter-productive to claw back this money.</p>
29	D Leiper		<p>The higher rural rate could be interpreted as a method of restricting rural development, although the report shows that Infrastructure costs between urban and rural are virtually the same. This is contrary to the public's wish to encourage development in villages, a desire that has been incorporated into the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Payment of the levy at the commencement of development puts the developer at financial risk. If a developer has to fund the levy through borrowing this will not be repaid until the residential units are sold. In the current market this could be months or years (for</p>		<p>Will the levy income be ring-fenced for the infrastructure identified in the Levy Rationale report?</p>	<p>What allowances will SC make for developers who have paid a high market rate for land they own but have yet to develop?</p>

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

			If the cost of the levy is not to be added to the house price it must come off the amount paid for the land. The Levy Rationale report notes "It is recognised that in reality 'landowner profit' and therefore land cost depends on willingness to sell / expectations". A willingness to sell depends on the price it can be sold at, so any reduction in price will act as a disincentive. How does Shropshire Council propose to encourage landowners to make building land available?	evidence look at any large housing development in Shropshire where houses remain incomplete or unsold). Such a burden and uncertainty will discourage house building.			
30	J McCabe	Ministry of Defence					<p>The 'Quartermen Charges' (i.e. rents) paid by service personnel for Service Family Accommodation (SFA) are significantly below private market rents and, more importantly, also below the rents associated with social rented properties.</p> <p>The Council's SPD on Type and Affordability of Housing acknowledges the special case of SFA development and excludes such proposals from the requirement to provide affordable housing. It is considered that in the context of CIL, SFA developments should also be treated as affordable housing developments and therefore should be given the 100% relief that the consultation document affords to other social housing developments.</p>
31	A Seabury	Cardington Parish Council	<i>Object</i> – Many rural developments are redundant agricultural buildings, often listed and already subject to many extra restrictions and costs. To impose such a high Levy on them would risk making them uneconomic, putting vulnerable buildings at risk. It would impact on the conversion of redundant buildings into holiday lets, which form valuable diversification and employment in areas where options are quite limited. These businesses support the local pubs, shops and restaurants making the area more sustainable. It seems unfair that rural holiday accommodation should be subject to three times the Levy of a residential development in a town. Holiday cottages do not require the same level of infrastructure.	The rural Levy should be the same as the urban one, as the level of services are not comparable.	<i>Support</i> – any levy would hinder the local economy and go against the principle of affordable housing.		In the Draft Developer Contributions SPD it states, "The higher levy rate in rural areas will be guaranteed to be for local benefit". What is the definition of 'local' as in the past money has not always been spent in the area it was raised!
32	A Morgan	West Mercia Police	WMP commends the Council for aiming to implement the CIL in Shropshire by October 2011. If the Council amends its Charging Schedule to allow for CIL funding of the ongoing costs of operating infrastructure (as indicated by Government), WMP advises that safeguards are inserted in parallel with such amendments to prevent (a) An ever increasing chunk of the CIL being used for continuing service provision rather than new infrastructure, and (b) Individual types of			WMP is deeply concerned that the list of types of infrastructure specified as beneficiaries of the Levy does not appear to include the police. Annex C should contain an explicit reference to the police and emergency services, as infrastructure providers	The Charging Schedule should give explicit recognition to the potential provision of strategic infrastructure with a county wide significance and make provision accordingly. To reflect the Localism Bill, the Charging Schedule should explain how CIL revenues might be allocated to local communities or infrastructure providers as legitimate recipients and indicate at what scale and proportion allocations might be made. WMP also respectfully recommends that Shropshire Council require recipient

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

			infrastructure benefiting disproportionately at the expense of others.			who will receive funding from the Community Infrastructure Levy, not least to be consistent with the Council's Core Strategy and Place Plans.	neighbourhoods to show that any expenditure conforms with the wider plans of service providers like WMP, education and health for example. This will in turn help to ensure that infrastructure is delivered across the County in a fair and consistent way.
33	Mr & Mrs Whittingham		<i>Object</i>	The sample of development sites from which the above figures are derived is not wide enough to be truly representative and appear unduly high.	<i>Support</i> -Land values are much lower than residential and the developed use does not impact as much on infrastructure.		
34	Mr A Smith	English Heritage		We have a query regarding the calculation of the chargeable amount. This relates to the chargeable development and the internal floorspace where it refers to 'existing buildings that are going to be demolished'. We suggest that it would of help to further clarify and explain the situations where demolition might be appropriate and conversely where it would not be appropriate.			We strongly recommend that the scope of the list is expanded to include heritage considerations where they can support the development of the area. A possible approach to amending the list might be as follows:  c) Enhancement of publicly accessible open spaces <i>and heritage assets</i> d) leisure, <i>cultural and</i> community facilities and services f) <i>Public realm improvements and</i> community arts provision
35	J Good		<i>Object</i> - Do we really want to encourage people out of the countryside and into the towns? I think that this levy will stifle many new developments further reducing growth of housing stock and driving up prices. Additionally it will lead to developers looking for cost savings elsewhere leading to even smaller rooms and poorer quality houses. In my opinion developers should only pay where there is a requirement for new infrastructure. It is worth noting that the impact of the recent recession on the construction industry has cost many thousands of jobs and severely reduced the number of new home being built, badly affecting national housing targets.		<i>Object</i> - Businesses have enough to cope with at present.		Most single dwellings require no additional infrastructure and where they do this should be paid for directly by the developer.  I believe that when you compare the income from council tax to the actual cost of running the authority, most houses benefit the county.
36	S Hackett	Leebotwood & Longnor Parish Council	What was Shropshire Council's justification for the huge disparity between the proposed levy of £40 per sq m in urban areas and £120 per sq m in rural areas? How does the disparity and proposed levy compare with "like" authorities?			b. What guarantee was there that income derived from this levy from rural development will be allocated to the infrastructure needs of that specific parish? To ensure this transparency exists within SC it is recommended that such income is transferred to the specific parish council's accounts and treated as a restricted fund as it arises.	

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

37	S Locke	Berrys	<p><i>Object</i> - The figure is higher than we would have expected. The guidance suggests that there were a "limited number of cases" which averaged £40 per square metre. We feel that £4000 per dwelling given the current market is high and would suggest a slightly lower figure of £30 per sq metre.</p> <p>The figure in rural areas is very high. There are many settlements that would benefit from some investment in new housing but a figure of £120 / m2 will deter development. A figure of £80 / m2 would be more reasonable and would still generate funds to provide local facilities and services.</p>		<p><i>Support</i> - We would also like to flag up the issue of essential farm workers dwellings which should not be subject to the £120/m2 rate as they provide essential needs accommodation for rural businesses.</p>		
38	C Lambert	The National Trust	<p><i>Charitable Relief</i> - We suggest that most charitable developments of the type described in the first sentence would either be nil rated or subject to mandatory relief under regulation 43 and so not subject to the discretionary process outlined in the second sentence. In addition we suggest that the proper test in regard to the type of investment development that is covered by regulation 44 should be to consider the contribution to the community of the <i>charitable purpose funded by the development</i>, rather than simply the contribution of the development itself.</p>	<p>Farming and forestry are an important component of the rural economy of Shropshire. A nil rate for such development is consistent with the proposed nil rate for other employment uses. Even if a rate were being charged for other employment uses we would argue that the new farm and forestry buildings rarely if ever give rise to a need for improvements to community infrastructure. Furthermore, although the Council's viability modelling has not addressed these sectors we would anticipate that any such modelling would show viable CIL levels to be very low.</p>	<p><i>Support</i> - The present CIL regulations contain no automatic exemption for farm or forestry buildings and we assume that they would be covered by this category.</p>	<p>Although we welcome inclusion of the enhancement of publicly accessible open space (category c), we would suggest that this could be extended to include to "provision or enhancement..."</p> <p>In category (i) flood risk management, we would welcome clarification that this includes upstream land management to reduce flood risk as well as harder engineering solutions.</p>	
39	S Faulkner	NFU	<p><i>Object</i> - We are extremely concerned about the high level set for residential development in the rural areas of Shropshire. This could act as a break upon economic development in rural areas. We have read the justification, but in our view this fails to justify a levy that is three times as high as residential development in towns.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.36 of the Viability Study confirms that a large number of sites will not be viable. The suggestion is that these will have to be treated as 'exceptional'. Quite clearly where it is known that a large number of sites won't be viable they cannot be exceptional. It means that the rate has been set to high.</p>	<p>Whilst it is appreciated that the point at which a landowner may sell is difficult to assess it is vital that this is factored into the assessment of CIL. The simple point being if the landowner is unwilling to sell it means the project is not viable. If the possibility of 'additional' profits is reduced because of CIL, developers will not look at the more difficult sites and this may undermine the strategy of the Plan.</p>	<p>Agriculture must be specifically listed in the nil rate list. We do welcome the fact that single plot exception sites will not be subject to a levy as this will enable some people in rural areas to build their own homes. There is however still a need for market housing in rural areas to ensure that small communities stay sustainable and vibrant.</p>	<p>It is not clear from the documents on the Council's web site whether an assessment of the infrastructure needed to underpin the Core Strategy has been carried out. This is particularly true of the rural areas.</p>	
40	V Smout	Oswestry Rural Parish Council	<p><i>Support</i> - developers need to provide resources for the infrastructure that is needed</p>		<p><i>Support</i> - jobs are needed and any</p>	<p>In agreement with all the types of</p>	

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

			when a development is built. If an estate is built with the infrastructure not in place problems arise. Schools, drainage, adequate green areas, utilities are all needed to cover the extra residents.		help given for businesses to start up is a bonus. Leisure is important especially for young people, and affordable housing is to be encouraged to keep young people.	infrastructure proposed in Annex C.	
41	R Mager	Shropshire Wildlife Trust	<p><i>Support</i> - Residential development clearly places a burden on existing infrastructure. Existing infrastructure will need enhancing and new infrastructure created. If the rate is the same is it necessary to have additional definitions of geographical areas? While there may be justifications for a higher rate in rural areas the difference between the two rates is significant and might warrant further investigation.</p>	<p>A reduced rate would be appropriate for developments that were environmentally sustainable. These might include developments where energy and water use produces minimal demands, where alternative transport facilities are integrated, where SUDS, ecologically functioning green space is included.</p> <p>The rationale for the levy rate indicates that many commercial developments could contribute to a levy. The fact that the varying financial constraints make this complicated is not sufficient reason to abandon a contribution from commercial developments.</p>	<p><i>Object</i> - There are still infrastructure implications, a reduced/nominal rate would perhaps be more appropriate than a nil rate. Employment related development should be included as it does have an impact on the green infrastructure, water supply and drainage, energy network, traffic, etc.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure should be given greater recognition with the CIL documentation and Natural &amp; Semi-natural Open Space should be added to Annex C, which should however be <i>in addition to</i> on site provision of green space.</p>	<p>Understandably the onus is very much on the traditional infrastructure, however there is a range of social and environmental infrastructure that would benefit from greater recognition and support.</p> <p>As the Levy funding is not designed for maintenance payments what policy provision is there for future maintenance of the new infrastructure? Maintenance requirements for natural open space are often underestimated and without sufficient funding to support on-going management sites can quickly lose their ecological value. Cost can be highly variable depending upon the site type, community engagement, etc. Shropshire Wildlife Trust figures range between £100 – 1000/ha/year.</p>
42	R Tweedale		<p><i>Object</i> - I believe the charging rates being let to the Rural Areas of the County will inhibit the carrying out of the necessary appropriate and essential development in Rural Areas and small settlements. The Economy is already under great pressure in the key and Market Towns in the County as well as the Rural Areas. Young couples and the elderly down sizing will in my opinion undoubtedly further damage the financial viability of such schemes which are already extremely difficult to fund and develop. Registered Social Landlords have seen cuts in their funding by some 50 to 70% and these cuts are likely to be long term. Consequently, this type of housing will for several years be more reliant on the active involvement of the private sector. The placing of further financial burdens on this sector of the market will in due course, increase further pressure on the already fragile state of the Rural Economy in Shropshire.</p>	<p>The introduction of Flat Rate Levy charges across all Urban and Rural Area does not allow sufficient flexibility as not all as developments are standard and each one relies to different circumstances which impact on their viability.</p> <p>The proposals are therefore too simplistic and will inhibit development In the current economic climate full payments up front will inhibit the financial viability of Development. Can the Levy be phased throughout the development so as to ease the financial burden?</p>			
43	D Wall		<p><i>Object</i> – the rates are high and will discourage growth.</p>	<p>Comparison with adjoining counties in Wales.</p>	<p><i>Object</i> –all development should contribute, not just housing.</p>		

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

44	K Jones	Donington with Boscobel Parish Council; Albrighton Parish Council	While it is accepted that the provision of infrastructure support is greater in rural areas, the burden should be more fairly spread across the county with a differential of no more than twice. Reasonable figures might be £50/m2 and £100/m2, to provide a more equitable solution, which the report says is the aim of the Levy, in which smaller sites also contribute proportionally to infrastructure costs. A large differential will discourage any development in rural areas, and some might suggest there should be no differential, so that decisions can be based on need rather than financial issues of viability.	At the proposed rates the evidence would become all too apparent, with the rural villages becoming even less sustainable than at present, with all the investment going into the county town and other key centres.	Support Incentives will be needed to encourage inward investment.	Annex C seems comprehensive: maybe craft workshops or similar, within community facilities, could be provided as well.	
45	S Blackburn	Hope Bowdler and Eaton Parish Council	<i>Support – £40/m2:</i> The bulk of development will occur in Shrewsbury and the market towns. The Levy needs to be affordable while the bulk of development will generate greater income. <i>Support – £120/m2:</i> Unavoidable greater infrastructure needs and costs.	We have seen great difficulty in extending services from the community hubs and the decline of transport opportunities.			
46	A McCann	Bromford Housing Group	What is the justification of the Levy being apportioned to residential work and not other types of development and usage?  Acknowledging the reasons described, the rural rate being 3 times the other categories seems excessive and may be restrictive in terms of development opportunities.  Concerned whether rural schemes could afford the higher rate per sqm quoted.				Where there are additional benefits to off - site environments from the works constructed, can there be a reduced scale to reflect these provisions?
47 48 49	M Sackett	RPS on behalf of Persimmon Homes, Mosaic Estates and J Ross Developments	<i>Support</i> - broadly supports the overall approach to setting a realistic CIL level in Shropshire with a significant differential between urban and rural areas;  The level of £4,000 per 100m2 dwelling, or £40/m2 is considered generally reasonable and realistic for urban sites. The principle of a higher rate in rural areas is also considered to be reasonable.  The principle should be established whereby developments, which fully fund or which disproportionately contribute directly towards CIL qualifying infrastructure on site, for example through road construction or securing an education facility serving a wider population than the development itself, are able to receive CIL credits from other developments. This should be addressed through the S106 Planning Obligation process.		The application of a 100% discount for all affordable dwellings is supported.  The exclusion of non-residential development is understood. However, policies must be in place in the Site Allocations and Management of Development DPD and the Planning Obligations SPD to ensure appropriate contributions are sought and secured from non-residential development.		1. The CIL PDCS is a very significant emerging policy document and we have concerns that only a very short period has been given for preparing representations;  2. require confirmation that allocated sites at Shrewsbury and the market towns and other key centres will be regarded as part of the urban areas in application of the charging schedule and not as lying within rural areas outside an outdated urban boundary from an historic Local Plan; and  3. seek a mechanism for securing credits from delivery on site of CIL qualifying infrastructure which is provided at a disproportionately high level of contribution through development.  The principle of phasing payments by phase under outline permissions on larger sites is supported. It will be important to secure such phasing arrangements through planning permissions issued on larger site allocations such as will be needed at Shrewsbury and the larger market towns. It is agreed that the Liability Notice should be issued following the approval of reserved matters in the cases of

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

							outline planning permissions as suggested.  The principle of discretionary relief where a planning obligation has been entered into for a sum greater than the chargeable CIL amount is supported. It is recognised that a viability assessment would be needed in such cases.
48	M Sackett	Mosaic Estates	<p>The development costs associated with Shrewsbury West will be very significant in terms of high costs of highway improvements and construction. It is noted that the Churncote Island improvements and relocation of the Oxon Park &amp; Ride are expressly excluded from schemes for which the CIL may be used in CIL PDCS Annex C. It is considered that the high abnormal development costs associated with Shrewsbury West justify a lower CIL charge per square metre than the wider Shrewsbury urban area. A reduced rate of <b>£15/m<sup>2</sup></b> is suggested for Shrewsbury West given its understood requirement to fund the improvement to Churncote Island, the relocation of the Oxon Park &amp; Ride facility and the construction of the Oxon Link Road between Churncote Island and Holyhead Road.</p> <p>There is a prospect that the Shrewsbury West developers will fund and deliver the Oxon Link Road at no cost to the public which is a scheme that is fully eligible for CIL contributions. Accordingly, the CIL structure as proposed in the Core Strategy and CIL PDCS should not preclude arrangements whereby the developers/landowners of the Shrewsbury West SUE should receive a CIL credit through the Planning Obligation process reflecting the disproportionate contribution made towards this 'common infrastructure requirement' by this development.</p>	<p>The case for a reduction can be demonstrated by the scale of CIL that would be achieved from a development at Shrewsbury West development. Assuming 600 market dwellings, and an average CIL of £4,800 (based on 120m<sup>2</sup> average), the proposed CIL at £40/m<sup>2</sup> overall would be about £2.9m (600 x £4,800). As RPS understands the evidence from Shropshire Council to the Core Strategy Examination, the Churncote Island improvement works alone are likely to be about £2.5m, before any consideration is given to construction of the Oxon Link Road (estimated at some £6.5m) and laying out of the relocated park &amp; ride facility.</p> <p>Given the known position in terms of the high costs at Shrewsbury West, it is contended there is a compelling case for a lower CIL rate at this SUE. This will be a more transparent approach than the alternative of the Shrewsbury West development and land interests having to seek discretionary relief.</p>			<p>(a) seek a significant reduction of the Shrewsbury West SUE Charging Rate or a mechanism for securing credits from delivery of the Oxon Link Road which is identified in the <i>Rationale</i> document as a CIL eligible scheme;</p> <p>(b) seek consideration of a reduction of the Oswestry SUE Charging Rate or a mechanism for securing S106 Planning Obligation contributions from all residential and some commercial developments at Oswestry towards A5 and A483 Trunk Road junction improvements.</p>
48 49	M Sackett	J Ross Developments & Mosaic Estates	<p>The Oswestry SUE has infrastructure burdens that are largely on site and a CIL of £4,000 to £5,000 per market dwelling may not be unreasonable, subject to the extent of potential off-site contribution towards trunk road junction improvements. A reduced CIL rate for the Oswestry SUE should be considered if the trunk road junction improvement works are not funded equitably.</p>	<p>At Oswestry, there is a compelling case in J Ross Developments' and Mosaic Estates' view that all residential developments and some more significant commercial developments should contribute towards these junction improvements through the Planning Obligation process. An example is the 'approved' new foodstore at the Cattle Market site (S106 pending) which has been assessed as having an impact on the Mile End A5 junction. This requirement should be identified in the SAMDev DPD and the Developer Contributions SPD,</p>			

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

				whereby S106 Planning Obligations would secure appropriate proportionate contributions from qualifying developments at Oswestry.			
49	M Sackett	J Ross Developments	<p>Although, there may be a case for a modest differential between the Urban/SUE and Rural Area CIL Charging Rates to secure greater contributions towards social infrastructure in the latter as part of the 'rural rebalance' strategy, J Ross Developments strongly objects to the threefold increase.</p> <p>J Ross Developments is active in Shropshire and can provide evidence on development viability in the rural north and north-west of the county which demonstrates that a CIL rate of £120/m<sup>2</sup> is highly likely to undermine development viability and to deter investment and the provision of new homes in these areas.</p> <p>J Ross Developments does not accept that a blanket Rural Area CIL charging rate of £120/m<sup>2</sup> can be justified on viability evidence grounds. Rather than assisting 'rural rebalance' it will be likely to deter investment and housing building activity with the result that infrastructure benefits will not accrue at all. The infrastructure costs differential in rural areas and urban areas is considered broadly marginal (£125 v £128/m<sup>2</sup>) and this cannot justify a threefold increase.</p> <p>Further, residential land values in the north and north-west of Shropshire are demonstrably lower than at the main urban areas of the county. The land values will not be able in many cases to withstand the level of CIL costs and the development will not remain viable. Landowners will be unwilling to release land to the market and consequently the sought rural re-balance will not arise.</p> <p>It is accepted that different considerations may apply in the rural east and south east in particular where there is commuter pressure and land values are significantly higher. The north and north-west areas of Shropshire have a slower market and higher development costs arise as a result with development taking longer to complete.</p> <p>Shropshire Council is requested to reconsider the rural area CIL charging rate proposal for these reasons.</p>	<p>We refer to a typical rural area housing scheme undertaken by the company at Berwyn Fields, St Martins which was granted permission in March 2009.</p> <p>That development comprised some 56 general market dwellings ranging between 2 and 5 bedrooms and between 665ft<sup>2</sup> and 2,126ft<sup>2</sup> in size (63m<sup>2</sup> and 200m<sup>2</sup> respectively). The total S106 contributions came to £355,651 excluding affordable housing costs which averaged at some £6,350 per general market dwelling and £5.94/ft<sup>2</sup> (£63/m<sup>2</sup>). This contrasts with average general market dwelling's CIL cost of £11,880 based on the proposed £120m<sup>2</sup> at the average dwelling size of 99m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Accordingly, under the proposed CIL charging rate, the St Martin's proposal would be required to pay £665,280 or some £310,000 more. This effectively would reduce the average land value of a residential plot by over £5,500.</p> <p>In parts of rural Shropshire average plot values are not able to take this level of reduction with the development remaining viable. Where there are abnormal development costs unrelated to CIL issues the viability position deteriorates further.</p>			



Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

50	P Downes	Bovale Ltd c/o Harris Lamb	<p>The wide variety of contributions now being sought by the public sector from market housing schemes is of particular concern to the house-building industry when, in many cases, these contributions actually relate to social considerations, such as the provision of affordable housing and education, where the impacts arise from the occupation of the schemes rather than their physical development. There is a practical effect in that developments can only bear so much contribution before viability is adversely affected.</p> <p>The desire to achieve the satisfactory delivery of housing for the nation, a stated objective of national government, as well as urban regeneration is being called into question. As such, the planning system does need to make judgements between the desirability of providing homes for the majority and achieving urban regeneration, with consequent economic and environmental benefits for the population and other matters relating to social policy.</p> <p>An appropriate distinction has been made in regard to individual settlements, whereby, increased contributions could be justified in higher value locations (I.e. Whitchurch, Bridgnorth, Wem, Ironbridge). As such, as currently proposed, the same levy rate applies to prime areas as well as the more run down areas of Shropshire and is not, therefore, responsive to local circumstances.</p> <p>In this regard, we also consider that it is important the SAMDev DPD should not only seek to allocate sites but incorporate a formal adjustment to the existing settlement boundaries so that identified sites in urban fringe locations could be assessed as being immune from the higher charge (£120/ m2). This point should be clarified through reference to the SAMDev in the CIL Draft Charging Schedule.</p>	<p>It is understood that a viability mechanism is being proposed (for exceptional circumstances); however, this could have the potential to be a drawn out process as any negotiation would require third party valuations. It should be clarified that the affordable housing numbers will still be negotiable on the grounds of economic viability. In this context, has the Council considered what impact this will have on the average rate?</p>	<p>Can it be clarified that affordable housing units would be exempt from the requirement to provide CIL payments?</p>	<p>There is a need for additional clarification regarding how the levy monies will be spent. Under the current system of negotiation planning obligations through legal agreements such as S.106 contributions, it is a requirement that Local Authorities are effectively able to demonstrate how the levy would relate to the development concerned and what impact this would have in terms of meeting the infrastructure needs of that development.</p> <p>However, it would appear that the proposed Levy system allows that monies acquired from planning gain can then be passed on to community groups, and so, raising questions regarding the certainty as to whether contributions would be used to enhance matters identified as having the potential to be affected by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>It is noted that Shropshire Council is currently consulting on 'Place Plans' which relate to individual communities across the Unitary Authority Area and that these plans are seeking to identify potential infrastructure requirements and shortfalls in finance available to facilitate this. We will comment further on specific 'Place Plans' in due course.</p>	<p>it is understood that the Council is in effect proposing to fix the level of contribution sought through CIL at the point of determining the planning application and that such amounts would apply throughout the duration of the planning permission and not, therefore, vary according to any proposed future changes in CIL contributions which may occur throughout the duration of that permission. This approach is to be welcomed, in that, it would provide increased certainty to the development industry regarding the extent of the liabilities which are attributable to the landowner and/or planning permission.</p> <p>Further clarification should be provided regarding what stage of the development process the Local Authority considers that a scheme has been commenced. For instance, would this be at the point of completion of the foundations which relate to the first building? Whereby, any agreed demolition, remediation and land re-profiling works have been completed in advance of this?</p> <p>We also raise our concerns regarding this proposal, in that, by setting a fixed timescale of 60 days (without incorporating a mechanism for review) the policy could be insufficiently flexible, and so, unresponsive to changing economic circumstances in particular the current constraints imposed by the banking industry which are impacting adversely on development funding.</p> <p>In particular, our concerns relate to matters regarding the phasing of development and how through the making of advanced payments for all phases, the cost of borrowing would be increased and the viability of a development further compromised. Can it be confirmed therefore that an agreed CIL levy rate can be agreed at the outline stage, albeit, payment provided to the local authority on a phased basis in accordance with the delivery of the development?</p> <p>It is important to note that developers are increasingly being required to work to the budgetary timescales and constraints of the major financial institutions and that the availability of development finance has, in recent years, slowed down progress in advancing new development projects.</p> <p>In addition, it is important to note from instances where economic viability is a realistic concern that the house building industry has sought to advance new development models in an attempt to generate finance through the</p>
----	----------	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--

Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

							<p>phased release of plots within a development, to provide a capital return from which to commence further stages of a project. The requirement to provide CIL could therefore compromise the availability of development finance, and so, further impact upon the rate at which development can be achieved. As such, we consider that the imposition of a Levy, with rigid timescales, would further exacerbate this problem and so lead to delays in the implementation and delivery of development.</p> <p>The consultation also does not set out what the consequences would be if payment is not made within the 60 day period.</p>
51	S Hackett	Condover Parish Council	<p>What was Shropshire Council's justification for the huge disparity between the proposed levy of £40 per sq m in urban areas and £120 per sq m in rural areas. How does the disparity and proposed levy compare with "like" authorities?</p>		<p>"Nil rate" other types of development: The council support that affordable housing should be nil rated to promote its development and make it affordable to build and buy. It is presumed that employment, commercial, hotels, residential institutions, assembly and leisure developments will if "nil" rated be considered separately under a individual S106 agreement.</p>	<p>What guarantee was there that income derived from this levy from rural development will be allocated to the infra structure needs of the specific parish in which development arose? There is little information provided on who would allocate the funds and on what basis. To ensure transparency exists within SC and local parish needs are met it is recommended that such income is transferred to a specific parish account and treated as a restricted fund by Shropshire Council who is required to consult with the parish on its infrastructure needs. These can often be supported by a parish plan or village design statement.</p>	
52	S Griffiths	Longden Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council consider that this will penalise development in rural areas. The Parish Council do not agree with the extremely high levy for rural areas. The Unitary Authority, when it was formed, promised a system "fair for all" the Parish Council feel that the proposed disparity in charges is a step backwards.</p>				
53	R Hewat-Jaboor		<p><i>Object</i> – the ability to deliver is dependent upon factors beyond the Council's control. The money which may dribble in from the Levy is at risk from local inconsistency. Therefore development will all but come to a halt. It will do nothing for the creation of a vibrant rural economy. It has an unfair</p>	<p>If implemented it will be the 'wealthy and retired' who are able to afford this punitive tax. Those with lesser incomes with families to bring up will take their skills and entrepreneurship elsewhere where the local economy will welcome</p>			<p>It smacks of social engineering and can only be a misreading of the facts. It follows the disastrous proposal which in effect restricts the building of Local Needs Housing to the wealthy and privileged by not recognising the huge cost of actually getting to the stage of making a start on site. This proposal gives the impression of</p>

**Summary of Responses on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

			40/120 bias against rural development.	them.			being out of touch with the rural crisis.
54	M Turner			1. On p10 of the 19th Jan background paper, you say total for Rural is £128.88 while Shrewsbury is £125.38. However on p 2 of the Charging Schedule you suggest that the Levy be £40/m2 for Shrewsbury, while the Rural levy is £120/m2. I consider this to be to high a differential when you have already shown that Shrewsbury and Rural are not that different, even taking into account improving rural sustainability.			2. I would be glad to know where the new Parkway station is to be sited. 3. Where do you get the figure of 40,300 increase in the population from?