

SWCIL06 – JUSTIFYING THE LEVY (UPDATED) CONSULTATION DOCUMENT
(APRIL 2016)

EXAMINER'S INITIAL QUERIES

Section 2 – Infrastructure Funding Gap

1. Para 2.3, lines 7-8 refer to a "SWIDP figure (circa £275M)" for the infrastructure funding gap. From para 2.1 it appears that this refers to the October 2014 edition of the SWIDP.
 - (a) Is the £275M funding gap figure set out in the SWIDP, and if so, where?
 - (b) If the £275M funding gap figure is not set out in the SWIDP, how has it been derived?

2. Table 1 gives costs for three categories of infrastructure (Transport, Education and Sport & Recreation). Costs for the first two categories are updated to Nov 2015 and the last is taken from the Oct 2014 SWIDP.
 - (a) Would it be appropriate to use the July 2016 SWIDP as the source for the most recent figures?
 - (b) If so, the most recent cost figures would appear to be £228M for Transport (SWIDP p120), £115.6M for Education (SWIDP p127), and £76.35M for Sport & Recreation (SWIDP p 133). Is this correct? If not, what should the figures be?

3. Table 1 sets out Anticipated Delivery via S106 figures of £70M for Transport and £58.09M for Education, and an Other Anticipated Funding figure of £18.65M for Education.

What is the source for each of these figures and how have they been calculated?

4. Column 6 of the table at Appendix Y to the SWIDP lists other potential sources of funding for Transport and Sport & Recreation infrastructure. For example, Worcestershire County Council, Local Transport Body, New Homes Bonus, University of Worcestershire, Sport England, etc.

How have any potential contributions from these other funding sources been taken into account in arriving at the funding gap figure in Table 1?

Section 3 – Viability

5. The last sentence of the note beneath Table 2 says *viability evidence for older people's accommodation suggests a CIL rate of zero for all authorities*.

How has that evidence on older people's accommodation been taken into account in setting the proposed CIL rates shown in Table 8?

SWCIL01 DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULES CONSULTATION DOCUMENT –
POST CONSULTATION TRACK CHANGES VERSION (JULY 2016)

EXAMINER'S INITIAL QUERIES

Section 6 – The South Worcestershire Approach

6. Paragraph 6.2 indicates that the SWCs have decided not to set the CIL rates close to the limits of viability. It would be helpful to know what the maximum theoretical level of CIL would be, for each category of development for which a CIL rate is proposed. This would help me to understand how much of a viability “buffer” has been allowed in setting the rates.
- Could these maximum theoretical CIL rates please be provided (or a reference to where they can be found, if they are already available in a published document)?

Section 7 – CIL Implementation and Payment

7. Paragraph 7.5 says that *indexing of the charging schedule will be provided at the beginning of each financial year by SWC*.
- Is this a reference to CIL Regulation 40(6), which provides for the chargeable amount to be adjusted by an index figure to take account of annual changes in costs?

Appendix A – Proposed CIL Regulation 123 List

8. Each item of infrastructure in the table indicates that it *excludes those items of infrastructure stated as to be provided through Section 106 Obligations*.
- Does this mean that any item of infrastructure that is listed as being delivered through S106 in the Accompaniment to the Regulation 123 List, is excluded from the Regulation 123 List itself?

Appendix B – Map showing district boundaries etc

9. Could I please be provided with hard-copy extracts of this map, showing the main urban areas of Worcester City, Malvern, Droitwich, Pershore and Evesham? They will need to be at a large enough scale to easily make out the location of the boundaries of the main urban areas and the boundaries of the adjacent strategic sites.