

South Worcestershire Councils
(Malvern Hills District, Worcester City and Wychavon District)
Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL]

Examination of Draft Charging Schedule [SWCIL01]
as amended by the Statement of Modifications [SWCIL04]

**Main issues and questions
for discussion at the hearing**

Issue 1

Does the amended Draft Charging Schedule comply with the requirements of the *Planning Act 2008* and the *CIL Regulations 2010*, as amended?

This is addressed by the Councils' Statement of Compliance [SWCIL02]. The Councils will be asked to confirm compliance with the requirements verbally at the start of the hearing.

Issue 2

Do the amended Draft Charging Schedule and the accompanying maps set out with sufficient clarity what proposed CIL rates will apply to each category of development in each defined charging zone?

Please refer to the Examiner's Further Initial Queries and Comments on the Draft Charging Schedule (CIL/EX/07), to which the Councils have been asked to respond by Tuesday 1 November 2016. Their response will be posted on the CIL examination webpage.

Issue 3

Is the amended Draft Charging Schedule supported by appropriate available evidence in respect of infrastructure planning?

- a) Has the infrastructure funding gap been appropriately assessed?
- b) Has the target amount that the Councils propose to raise through CIL been appropriately assessed?
- c) Is it sufficiently clear which projects or types of infrastructure are to be funded in whole or part by CIL and which site-specific matters will continue to be subject to s106 contributions?

Issue 4

Is the amended Draft Charging Schedule supported by appropriate available evidence in respect of economic viability?

Generic residential viability assessments

- a) In respect of setting Benchmark Land Values:
 - i. Is the overall approach appropriate?
 - ii. Should comparables evidence be taken into account?
 - iii. Should an allowance be made for land promoter risk?
- b) Are the following factors in the assessments appropriate and soundly based on evidence:
 - i. sales values for market housing;
 - ii. values for affordable housing;
 - iii. build costs;
 - iv. infrastructure costs?
- c) Should an allowance be made in the assessments for:
 - i. abnormal costs;
 - ii. external works;
 - iii. provision of garages for market housing?
- d) Has an appropriate viability buffer been applied?

Residential viability assessments for the strategic sites

- e) For the Cheltenham Road, Evesham site (SWDP 51/1):
 - i. Are the correct gross and net site areas used in the assessment?
 - ii. Is there a consistent approach to modelling BLV and RLV in relation to gross or net site area?
 - iii. Are the sales values for market housing appropriate and soundly based on evidence?
 - iv. Are the values for affordable housing appropriate and soundly based on evidence?
 - v. Are appropriate GIA figures used in the assessment?

Viability assessment for sheltered retirement housing

- f) Does the viability assessment for older people's housing support the application of a CIL rate to sheltered retirement housing within use class C3?

Viability assessment for student accommodation

- g) In the student accommodation viability assessment, are valid assumptions made in respect of:
 - i. Number of rooms;
 - ii. Room sizes, communal and circulation space;
 - iii. Build costs per room;
 - iv. Rental income?

Viability assessment for retail development

- h) Should a minimum floorspace threshold be set for retail developments subject to CIL and if so, what should it be?
- i) Does the viability evidence support the application of CIL to retail developments on brownfield sites?
- j) Is the assessment of capital values for retail developments based on an appropriate methodology and sound evidence?

Issue 5

Are the proposed charging rates in the amended Draft Charging Schedule informed by and consistent with the evidence on economic viability, and does the evidence demonstrate that the proposed charging rates would contribute towards the implementation of the Councils' relevant plans and support development across South Worcestershire?

Residential rate

- a) Are the proposed CIL rates of £40 per square metre for residential developments in Malvern Hills and Wychavon, outside the Main Urban Areas, appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?
- b) Are the proposed CIL rates of £40 per square metre for residential development on sites SWDP50/7 (Land off Abbey Road, Evesham) and SWDP51/1 (Cheltenham Road, Evesham) appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?
- c) Is a CIL rate of £40 per square metre for sheltered retirement housing appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?
- d) If the answers to (a), (b) and/or (c) are no, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate(s)?
- e) What alternative residential rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?

Student Accommodation rate

- f) Will any student accommodation provided for or on behalf of the University of Worcester be exempt from CIL because of the University's charitable status?
- g) Is the proposed CIL rate of £100 per square metre for student accommodation appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?
- h) If not, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate?

- i) What alternative student accommodation rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?

Food Retail (Supermarkets) and Retail Warehouses rate

- j) Is the proposed CIL rate of £60 per square metre for food retail (supermarkets) and retail warehouses appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?
- k) Is the rate appropriate for all types of supermarket including discount retailers?
- l) If the answers to (f) and/or (g) are no, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate?
- m) What alternative retail rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?