

Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation 2023

QUESTION SUMMARIES

DATA TRENDS

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

All Pages –

Respondent #21 –

“

”

COMPLETE

Started: Thursday, February 23, 2023 3:28:54 PM

Last Modified: Thursday, February 23, 2023 3:47:35 PM

Time Spent: 00:18:40

IP Address:

[REDACTED]

Page 1: Survey Information

Q1

Do you confirm that you have read and understood the privacy notice? You must select 'Yes' in order to take the survey.

Yes

Page 2: Register for consultation

Q2

Your name:

Leigh Bell

Contact details:

Address

[REDACTED]

Post code

[REDACTED]

Email address

[REDACTED]

Q4

Do you wish to notified of future updates to CIL by the council? If yes we will use contact details provided above

Yes

Q5

Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination? If yes we will use contact details provided

above

Yes

Page 3: Your response

Q6

1a. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study informed the production of the proposed rates in the draft CIL Charging Schedule. Do you have any comments on the content of the CIL Viability Study?

Suggesting that a site doesn't have headroom or viability of a CIL is included should not be a get out of jail free card for developers if the project cannot accommodate a CIL financially it is the project that is not viable not the CIL payment

Q8

2a. Do the proposed levy rates set out in the draft CIL Charging Schedule appropriately reflect the conclusions of the CIL Viability Study?

They appear reasonable

Q10

3a. Do the proposed levy rates set out in the draft CIL Charging Schedule provide an appropriate balance between securing infrastructure investment and supporting the financial viability of new development in the area?

They appear to do this

Q12

4a. CIL rates should not be set at a level which could render new development financially unviable. To ensure the financial viability of new development in the area, and to take into account variations in land prices and development costs throughout the authority's area, the draft CIL Charging Schedule proposes variable rates for different kinds of development. Do you have any comments on the proposed CIL rates?

If the imposing of a CIL payment on a project makes it "unviable" this means that the project is not viable not that the CIL is not a viable option. Using viability as an excuse to avoid payment to mitigate projects is not acceptable position. This surely means the project needs to be re thought.

Q14

5a. Should any types of development be charged a different CIL rate, and if so, why? Where alternative rates are proposed, please provide evidence to demonstrate why a proposed rate should be changed.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Your response

Q16

6a. To support the financial viability of new development in the area, the draft CIL Charging Schedule includes an Instalments Policy which allows specified levels of levy charges to be paid in instalments over a set period of time. Do you have any comments on the draft Instalments Policy?

Seems reasonable, as parts of the development sell then finances become available

Q18

7a. Part 6 of the CIL Regulations (as amended) allows the Council to give discretionary relief for certain types of development from paying the levy. The Council has not identified any types of development which may require this beyond the compulsory relief and exemptions outlined in the

Regulations. Is there a need to provide discretionary relief from the levy to any types of development, and if so, why?

No, if the development cant accommodate levy then the build isn't viable

Q20

8a. Do you have any other comments on the draft CIL Charging Schedule?

Respondent skipped this question

Q22

9a. Do you have any other comments on the CIL evidence base?

The evidence around health infrastructure mitigation is light, there is no gap analysis, capacity understanding or impact assessment of increasing population by additional builds. Primary care needs assessment and capacity analysis, Pharmacy needs assessment and capacity analysis, dentistry capacity analysis are not mentioned. The suggested 30 million on sport and cycling compared to 5.6 million on health care infrastructure does not reflect an accurate picture this needs to be re addressed using the correct health capacity analysis

Powered by  SurveyMonkey

Check out our [sample surveys](#) and [create your own now!](#)