The Brighton & Hove bike share scheme BTN BikeShare is publicly owned and operated on behalf of the city council by Hourbike. All assets (hubs & bikes) are owned by the city council. The network of hubs and scheme bikes are important elements of the city's cycling infrastructure and facilities. Bike share offers sustainable, clean and healthy transport options as an alternative to private car travel. Consequently it can help offset the negative impact of development on local transport infrastructure...
and assist in the delivery of local plan. We propose that new bike share infrastructure (hubs&bikes) is
secured through CIL contributions and is explicitly included in the Infrastructure List

Do you wish to make a further representation?

No
Dear Brighton & Hove City Council

Here is the response to the consultation from Brighton & Hove Buses.

Brighton & Hove Buses currently has a close working relationship with Brighton & Hove City Council regarding the spending of s106 contributions on sustainable transport works to benefit bus passengers in the city. Many thousands of pounds of s106 contributions have been spent in recent years on real time bus information signs, bus shelters and raised kerbs, as well as “residual” amounts being spent on things like minor bus stop works, particularly where they benefit the less able.

But s106 funding has its limitations, mainly geographic, and some areas of the city have had very little s106 money spent on them where there has been little development. Thankfully, areas like Moulsecoomb, Coldean and Bevendean have been the focus of central government bid funding in recent years with many real time signs being installed, but without that there would have been no LTP or s106 money available in these areas and future similar funding is far from certain.

Another issue is the variability in the planning agreements, sometimes giving reasonable scope to provide what’s best for passengers, but sometimes being overly prescriptive and of limited use. The CIL-DCS document sets out the criteria of how the CIL will be charged but says almost nothing about how it will be spent, other than one mention on page 9 that sustainable transport spending from s106 would be scaled back with the introduction of the CIL.

The CIL does seem to offer some benefits and Brighton & Hove Buses is broadly supportive of the proposal.

However, it is really important that the funding continues to be used for sustainable transport improvements, and our support for the proposal is conditional on that being the case. The extra flexibility that the CIL brings must not mean that the funding is diverted away from sustainable transport projects into other areas.

Kind regards

From: PlanningPolicy [mailto:PlanningPolicy@brighton-hove.gov.uk]
Sent: 02 May 2018 15:23
Subject: Extension of consultation dates and increased availability of documentation - BHCC CIL Draft Charging Schedule and relevant evidence
Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: Community Infrastructure Levy – Publication of a Draft Charging Schedule and relevant evidence 2018

We are contacting you on behalf of the Greater Brighton Metropolitan College with regards to Brighton & Hove’s (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule on Community Infrastructure Levy within the City.

Our clients would like to express their support for the CIL Draft Charging Schedule in relation to the ‘nil’ CIL charge on new education space which is classified as ‘all other development uses’ on page 8.

It is important that the CIL charge remains as ‘nil’ for education space for the foreseeable future and in any future review of CIL as it is important that educational facilities are not burdened by additional costs.

If you have any further queries or require further information please contact me on

Yours sincerely

ECE Planning

14 May 2018
Ref: RH/Let/P1347

City Development and Regeneration
Brighton & Hove City Council
Ground Floor
Hove Town Hall
Norton Road
BN3 3BQ
Policy, Projects and Heritage Team  
Brighton & Hove City Council  
Hove Town Hall  
Norton Road  
Hove  
East Sussex BN3 1QB

27 June 2018

Dear

Response to consultation: Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for Brighton & Hove City Council.

Thank you for the invitation to respond to this consultation. I refer to previous discussions with the University’s former Head of Housing Services, Dean Spears, and wish to confirm our position with regard to CIL.

We are pleased to note that you have previously confirmed that, under the prevailing Planning Policy Guidance, the University can claim relief, reflecting our educational charitable status as a local higher education provider. Our understanding is that this status applies currently and for forthcoming CIL developments. Thank you also for highlighting the range of exemptions in the proposed CIL charging schedule, including new affordable housing units, self-build housing and certain developments by charities. These exemptions are important for the University and our partners in order to accommodate more of our students in Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) and we look forward to working with the City Council to identify more sites for this purpose.

We note that you have highlighted that, following the initial representations to the draft charging schedule, the proposed rate for PBSA has fallen from £250 per square metre to £175 per square metre, which could be relevant when charitable status does not apply. Whilst the University welcomes this reduction, we would like to see either:

1. A three-phased approach to the charge, in parity with the proposed residential charging in zoned areas of the city instead of the current blanket charge across the city.
2. A further reduction in the proposed rate to £125 per square metre.
We are concerned that this blanket charge at the currently proposed rate could lead to higher rents for students or deter developers from planning new PBSA in the city. This in turn could place future pressures on the already crowded local private rented housing sector and be counterproductive to what the Council is looking to achieve.

As long-standing members of the Strategic Housing Partnership, the University remains committed to working collaboratively with our local civic partners. We look forward to continuing to work closely with the Council on matters such as the development of the city's new student housing strategy over the summer.

Yours sincerely
I am aware that the consultation period is coming to an end in respect of CILs versus S106 contributions and so I am writing to add my support to retain the S106 developer contributions to support the activities of the Local Employment Scheme and to respond to the training needs on the specific sites which contributions have been secured.

Contractors are recognising that the S106 is being used for the benefit of local people and their sites, which also benefits the industry as a whole. Contractors are encouraged at outset to identify how the contributions may be utilised for the benefit of the development and individuals accessing training, which potentially would be beyond their financial reach.

There are so many projects in progress and in the pipeline that in some instances projects are struggling to recruit people with the necessary skills. By funding specific identified training, creating a new job role, it enables an individual to increase their income and through that role progression, provide openings for other to enter the industry.

At this crucial time of high levels of construction activity and the momentum created by a process that works, it would be a backward step for all concerned if the current model of S106 developer contributions linked to developments was withdrawn.