

## **Community Infrastructure Levy - Statement of Representations made on the Draft Charging Schedule; Brighton & Hove City Council**

The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require that the charging authority (Brighton & Hove City Council) submit to the examiner a statement setting out the number of representations made to the Draft Charging Schedule in accordance with regulation 17 (as amended), and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations.

36 representations were made under Regulation 17 to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule consultation carried out between 28 March 2018 and 13 June 2018 with a further 2 comments submitted after the deadline had passed. It was considered that no disadvantage or prejudice would be afforded to the 36 representations made in accordance with CIL Regulation 17, and therefore the 2 later comments have been included within this Statement. The table below provides a summary of the main issues raised by the 38 respondents with a Response commentary by Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC) where appropriate. All representations and comments will be sent to the Examiner for consideration in full.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>General Comment Summary</b>	<b>BHCC Response</b>
<b>Residents</b>		
Resident 1	Developers should pay towards disruptions and environmental damage caused through developments and any traffic rearrangements that are made for new roads and access to the new site.	Representation noted. BHCC approach to developer contributions proposes to continue with appropriate obligations to on-site / site specific provision for development related: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• transport access, trunk roads and highways works provision under s278 and /or s38 of the Highways Act;</li> <li>• nature conservation and ecological measures</li> </ul>
Resident 2	Support for S106 charges and CIL. Important that adequate infrastructure such as roads, public transport, schools, medical facilities, parks and open spaces supports development. A substantial amount should be spent very locally to development to demonstrate benefits of developer contribution sums. It is particularly important to avoid funds being "lost" in general	Support welcomed and representation noted. The Council seeks to strike an appropriate balance between additional infrastructure investment required to support new development and the potential effect on economic viability of development across the city. Proposals include strategic infrastructure to be funded through CIL receipts;

	Council funds.	s106 obligations to deliver site based infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, and the neighbourhood portion to deliver local infrastructure priorities for new development accepted into that area. CIL monies spent to be reported as part of the Council's Authority Monitoring Report or within a potential Infrastructure Funding Statement
Resident 3	Improvements to: Green space. The Public Rights of Way Network. Public Transport. Reductions in motorised traffic pollution.	Representation noted. The draft Infrastructure /R123 list identifies CIL funding has potential to fund Greenspace, citywide walking and cycling facilities and networks, public transport facilities and services, offsite air quality mitigation and monitoring; all as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Resident 4	Anything that brings money for BHCC to assist voluntary groups such as the Brighton Unemployed Centre Families Project [BUPFC] is to be welcomed. Who will be paying the Community Infrastructure Levy?	Support welcomed and representation noted. CIL is funded through new development as identified in the Charging Schedule, currently draft. The charge is levied in the way prescribed by the CIL regulations, with rates set locally at £/Sq. m levels, striking an appropriate balance between additional infrastructure investment to support new development and the potential effect on the economic viability of development.
Resident 5	Concerned how decisions will be made to spend CIL on amenity improvement. Has not been able to find out how to apply for the 1% of ticket sales for the i360, and believes that spending should be transparent, with an open application process quarterly.	Representation noted. Currently the council is working to bring in a CIL Charging Schedule to help fund infrastructure required to support new development. BHCC will establish governance procedures and protocols to allocate CIL funds to deliver city wide infrastructure as well as infrastructure relating to the neighbourhood portion of CIL funding. In respect of the i360 annual Ticket Revenue Contributions this will be spent on environmental improvements and maintenance measures within the area as defined with the s106 Agreement in consultation with all interested parties.
Resident 6	No comment	Representation noted
<b>Statutory Authorities</b>		

Natural England	No comment - it poses no likely risk or opportunity to Natural England's statutory purpose	Representation noted
Southern Water	Confirm no comments at this stage	Representation noted
Historic England	No comment to make at this time	Representation noted
Sport England	<p>Pleased to note that S106 contributions for sport facilities can be required on site.</p> <p>Strongly encourage inclusion of off-site mitigations within draft Infrastructure /R123 list. The Playing Pitch Strategy is up to date and could be used to inform when off-site mitigation is appropriate.</p>	Support for council's approach to developer contributions is welcomed and representations are noted. The draft Infrastructure /R123 list identifies that CIL funding has the potential to fund off-site provision and improvements to publically accessible parks and other recreation/open space facilities including built provision to play space, indoor/outdoor sports, and playing fields as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP identifies the Playing Pitch Strategy as one of the Strategies and Plans which will identify priorities and inform a long term vision for provision, delivery and management of public Parks and Open Spaces Citywide.
Environment Agency	<p>Support that the following will continue to receive contributions (s106) for on-site/site-specific provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development related flood defences and coastal engineering including site-specific policy allocation mitigation;</li> <li>• Development related water supply &amp; utilities provision, &amp; wastewater drainage</li> <li>• Development related nature conservation and ecological measures.</li> </ul> <p>Support that the following are included within the Draft Regulation 123 List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Flood Risk Management</b> Strategic Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) surface water flooding - priorities where identified in Infrastructure Delivery Plan</li> <li>• <b>Provision and enhancement of Green Infrastructure network</b></li> </ul>	Support of council's approach to developer contributions is welcomed and representations are noted.

	Green infrastructure network connectivity including cross boundary infrastructure, rights of way, biodiversity measures and tree planting.	
Highways England	<p>No comment on DCS.</p> <p>Highways England have agreed potential mitigations with the council at the relevant A27 junctions impacted by the Council's City Plan. The agreed highway mitigations fall outside of CIL contributions and should be funded by development via S278 agreements with Highways England but in some instances may occur through s106 agreement.</p> <p>Highways England want to work jointly with BHCC to ensure contributions collected towards agreed highway mitigations are index linked and held for a sufficient period to enable all relevant contributions from development to be collected and the agreed works constructed. Accordingly, we are advising that payback periods for such contributions should be no shorter than the length of the plan period to ensure successful delivery of agreed mitigation works.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed.</p> <p>For pooled s106 contributions necessary for jointly securing delivering of strategic supporting infrastructure, any requirement for repayment where reasonably requested under any s106 Agreement will be considered following all sums having been received and following completed provision of that infrastructure.</p>
Sussex and Surrey Police	<p>Recognition of policing and other emergency service providers within draft Reg 123 list is welcomed, although concerns with the current generic wording for Emergency Services and double dipping. Have submitted recommended wording for citywide infrastructure to be funded via CIL such as ANPR and improvements to Brighton Police Station to increase overall capacity; and areas to be included within s106 obligation such as on-site emergency services facilities and CCTV.</p>	<p>Representations noted. The draft infrastructure /R123 list identifies that CIL funding has the potential to help fund City wide emergency services; as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Recommended wording for projects suitable for CIL funding and requirements for s106 obligations noted. Appropriate wording will also be included in the next update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposed for mid-2019.</p>
<b>Infrastructure Providers</b>		
BTN BikeShare (Brighton & Hove bike share scheme)	<p>BTN BikeShare is publicly owned. The network of hubs and bikes are important elements of the city's cycling infrastructure, and facilities offer sustainable, clean, healthy transport options as an alternative to private car travel. Helps offset the negative impact of development on local transport infrastructure and can</p>	<p>Representation noted.</p> <p>The draft Infrastructure /R123 list identifies that CIL funding has the potential to fund city wide transport improvements including cycling facilities and networks; as identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Appropriate</p>

	assist in local plan delivery. Propose that new bike share infrastructure (hubs & bikes) is secured through CIL contributions and is explicitly included in the Infrastructure List.	wording will be included in the next update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposed for mid-2019.
Brighton & Hove Buses	Broadly supportive of CIL if it continues to be used for sustainable transport improvements. Sustainable transport works have been provided through s106 provision, albeit with geographical limitations. Other areas have benefited from central government bid funding, but future is uncertain. S106 can be overly prescriptive but CIL's extra flexibility should not divert funding away from sustainable transport projects - current funding levels for projects should be retained if not improved.	Support welcomed and representations noted. BHCC will establish governance procedures and protocols to allocate CIL funds to deliver city wide infrastructure.
ECE Planning on behalf of Greater Brighton Metropolitan College	Support for nil CIL charge on new education space as 'all other development uses'. Important that this use remains as nil rate for the foreseeable future - including any future CIL view, so educational facilities are not burdened by additional costs.	Support welcomed and representation noted.
University of Sussex	Welcomes the reduction in PBSA rates when charitable status does not apply. Seek either a zoned approach to PBSA or a further reduction in proposed rate to £125sq.m due to potential to increase rents for students and deter developers from planning new PBSA in the city – placing future pressures on crowded local private rented housing sector.	Late comment included for reasons set out in introduction. Received 27 June 2018. Support for changes made to reduce PBSA rates between Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) and DCS stage is welcomed.  Additional viability appraisal work on PBSA was carried out in response to the PDCS consultation outlined in the CIL Viability Assessment Addendum (February 2018) and changes to the PBSA rate were included in the preparation of the DCS. No evidence has been submitted with this comment, however further consideration has been given to evidence submitted by other parties under the DCS consultation.  On review of all evidence submitted it is considered that

		<p>the CIL Viability Assessment and Addendums have assessed sufficient scenarios and typologies to support the DCS rates. It is not considered that the proposed CIL charge would be so significant as to prevent the student accommodation allocated in the City Plan Part 1 from coming forward, and it is not considered that sufficient evidence has been submitted to justify a further reduction in PBSA rates.</p> <p>The Council seeks to strike an appropriate balance between additional infrastructure investment to support new development and the potential effect on economic viability of development across the city.</p>
Local Employment Scheme Co-ordinator, BHCC	Support for retention of local employment scheme for specific sites under s106 obligation	Support welcomed and representation noted.
<b>Parish/ Town Councils</b>		
Telscombe Town Council	No comment	Representation noted.
Rottingdean Parish Council (Received outside DCS consultation dates)	Welcomes introduction of CIL at BHCC and is in broad agreement with proposed Charging Schedule. Queries regarding neighbourhood portion /S106 and commencement of CIL charge in relation to planning applications.	<p>Late comment included for reasons set out in introduction. Received 14 June 2018.</p> <p>Support of BHCC's approach to developer contributions and the DCS is welcome. Explanation of neighbourhood portion is set out within online PPG. S106 obligations are sought when necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and are part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Permissions granted prior to CIL commencement will not be liable to the CIL as set out in DCS.</p>
<b>Community groups/Forums</b>		
Brighton & Hove Local Access Forum	Priority to be given to improvements to access to countryside, green space and reference to be made to Brighton & Hove Rights of Way Improvement Plan	Representation noted. The draft Infrastructure /R123 list identifies that CIL funding has the potential to fund Open Space Provision, the provision and enhancement of Green Infrastructure network and Transport and Highways

		<p>improvements including rights of way where identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is live evolving document. In respect of the Rights of Way Improvement Plan appropriate wording will be included in the next update of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposed for mid-2019.</p>
Hove Civic Society	<p>Proposed charging mechanism considered to be fair, easy to understand and administer.</p> <p>However additional costs will reduce rarely achieved affordable housing targets and affect design and quality of materials, immediate public realm and other less tangible aspects. There may be an overall detrimental effect on City Plan policies relating to quality – perhaps take a realistic view on 40% affordable targets instead.</p> <p>Sceptical whether viability studies can capture quality issues – no metrics to do this convincingly, an art rather than a science.</p> <p>Consider changing provision of artistic element from s106 to CIL as sums available on individual developments are small and may not generate a city wide artistic legacy.</p>	<p>Support welcomed and representations noted. The Council's CIL Viability Assessment has used an established, well recognised approach and has considered a suitable range of development scenarios likely to come forward in the city. Viability assessment has been based upon development typologies including affordable housing provision in accordance with the Council's planning policy approach, with a contingency allowance for site specific s106 obligations and/or other site-specific matters considered alongside the usual development costs.</p> <p>The latest viability assessment work (November 2018) also provides the Council with further information which considers the influence on overall viability of varying affordable housing requirements, as it is acknowledged that recent experience indicates that this may vary in practice. Affordable housing has a significantly greater impact on viability than a CIL</p> <p>The published Draft Infrastructure/R123 list of city wide infrastructure which may be funded in whole or in part by the CIL includes 'Public realm and cultural infrastructure'. S106 obligations deliver site based infrastructure necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.</p>
Brighton Marina Neighbourhood Forum (BMNF)	<p>Supports development at the Marina. Concerns over current state of Brighton Marina's public realm. The inner and outer harbour of Brighton Marina should be considered as one unit</p>	<p>The IDP identifies that infrastructure required for site-specific delivery at Brighton Marina is consistent across the Inner and Outer Harbour, resulting in abnormal costs</p>

	<p>with the same CIL arrangements for cohesive overall development. Nil CIL can be supported despite a lack of neighbourhood portion, as there are other planning mechanisms to ensure the public realm takes account of surrounding area, producing an integrated whole for future development.</p> <p>BMNF should be a consultee for all future proposals and applications for the wider DA2 area to influence overall and cohesive public realm development. Insist on BMNF involvement with future s106 obligations and governance of CIL spending in the DA2 area - due to previous considered wasted s106 spending and also to ensure infrastructure impacts from Black Rock site are adequately met.</p>	<p>across the Brighton Marina area.</p> <p>Any new permissions to replace existing consents at the Outer Harbour would require s106 developer obligations to meet the need for site-specific infrastructure when CIL is in place.</p> <p>On further review of representations and, given the Council's knowledge of the site and wider development area, the Outer Harbour is considered strategic for Local Plan and CIL purposes due to the scale of planned housing delivery and the amount of housing to be delivered which may require further planning permission. Proposed modifications to the DSC will amend the nil-rate CIL charging zone at Brighton Marina Inner Harbour; expanding this to include the DA2 site area as a whole (boundaries as mapped in the City Plan). The published DCS and Map (Appendix 1) has been amended by the Statement of Modifications.</p> <p>S106 obligations are sought when necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and are part of the planning application process.</p>
<p>The Regency Society of Brighton &amp; Hove</p>	<p>In Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) consultation report the retail rate for city centre comparison retail is considered as a small proportion of development value for Churchill square; but retail warehousing / food stores considered as price-sensitive. Clarification sought of which it is.</p> <p>Why is retail rate lower than other comparable size cities? Does PDCS response to Churchill Square owners that conference centre is subject to nil rating mean alternative plan for Conference centre is to retain within Churchill Square development?</p> <p>Have the council proved developments other than Strategic Sites do not have abnormal costs, e.g. Gasworks site, and if</p>	<p>Quoted sections of Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) consultation report relate to different retail typologies and their separated rates within the PDCS. Different considerations are relevant to each typology, and a CIL needs to be set locally. Generally larger format retail development (retail warehousing and foodstores for example) is expected to be the most viable, with town centre and other shopping development typically less viable overall. Viability is sensitive to the development values and costs, as is the case for all development types, and this is why the proposed charging rates are not higher for any retail type.</p> <p>The Draft Charging Schedule rates proposed for all</p>

	<p>CIL is a relatively small influence for Gasworks site why not also for the two strategic sites?</p> <p>BHCC states that CIL charges cannot be personalised according to procurement, ownership etc. but contradicts pledge to review obligations if necessary. How will this be done and will it be the same as for s106 agreements?</p> <p>The Draft Infrastructure and R123 List is unclear on where CIL money is to be spent and reasons for allocation/spending CIL money, and does not justify CIL. With only £2 million p.a. expected, there is no weighting and appears to be a wish list. What are consultation dates?</p> <p>Queries regarding Reg 123 list – its status, decision making priorities and public consultation; allocation of CIL receipts.</p> <p>Clarification of costed Infrastructure Requirements – does a costed summary determine expected CIL receipts, or does the schedule relate to IDP predicted costs.</p> <p>Issues around neighbourhood portion – how does BHCC define influence of neighbourhoods, what engagement will BHCC use, how will the neighbourhoods be defined, how much is meaningful in terms of neighbourhood portion.</p> <p>Request further response to PDCS consultation report resident comment ‘Why is purpose built student space exempt and sheltered housing not exempt.’</p>	<p>development uses are informed by the evidence within and the recommendations of the CIL viability study - considered as appropriate evidence in terms of informing viable rates for development uses.</p> <p>The viability assessment is necessarily but appropriately high level and takes into account recognised CIL principles using an accepted and tested methodology. Every scheme is different and no review of this nature can reflect all the variances seen in a wide range of site specific cases. The reasons for, on balance, proposing differential CIL treatment for particular sites / zones are set out in the Nil CIL Charge Zone /Strategic Sites Informative.</p> <p>For clarity, on further review, the Gasworks site, which had not been nil-rated owing to its relatively small scale in planned development terms, is now also proposed for nil rating within the DA2 nil CIL charging zone.</p> <p>When the CIL charge has been calculated and where viability is clearly and robustly shown to be under too much pressure at the scheme delivery stage, the overall package of developer obligations including s106 agreements can be considered and reviewed if necessary.</p> <p>The Draft Infrastructure List (Draft Regulation 123 list) forms part of the relevant information provided and has been available alongside the DCS for review as part of the consultation between March – June 2018 (as set out in the amended Statement of Representations Procedure). This has been with the purpose of helping to clarify how developer contributions will work once the CIL comes in and s.106 continues to fund some development related infrastructure/development mitigation.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies known infrastructure required to support development along with costs and funding sources where known. This informs the extent of the funding gap that might be supported by CIL (bearing in mind the total infrastructure requirements are much larger) and in turn informs the R123 List. The Estimated CIL Income has been calculated based on up-to-date information held within the Brighton &amp; Hove Authority Monitoring Report of 2016/2017; and the planned amounts of development for PBSA, Retail; and Residential set out in the City Plan Part 1; using the proposed CIL charging rates set out in the DCS.</p> <p>Decisions regarding neighbourhood portion spend will need to be informed by an understanding of local priorities and will commence once the levy collection has begun so that the amount available is known then matched to local priorities for the most effective use of funds. To ensure compliance with the Equalities Impact and Outcomes Assessment (EIA), allocation of the neighbourhood portion will include consultation with the Council's Communities, Equalities and Third Sector team.</p> <p>Charitable institutions are allowed to claim certain exemptions or relief from the levy as set out in the CIL Regulations. Otherwise the CIL rates apply as set out in the Charging Schedule. Purpose Built Student Accommodation is proposed to be chargeable at a citywide CIL rate of £175 / Sq.m. Any exemption would need to be associated with charitable relief. The Statement of Modifications clarifies that the proposed CIL charge and zones for residential C3 use class schemes, has been informed by the evidence within and the recommendations of the CIL Viability Assessment, as are the rates applicable to other uses. Sheltered housing falls</p>
--	--	---

		under a C3 residential use.
<b>Agents / Developers / Landowners</b>		
Lichfields on behalf of Landsec (Brighton Marina Inner Harbour)	Strong support for the introduction of the strategic site rate. A nil CIL rate for the Brighton Marina Inner Harbour is a welcome response to previous representation and will ensure that CIL does not threaten viability and delivery of housing on this important strategic site, an approach supported by CIL Regulations, NPPF and NPPG.	Support welcomed and representation noted. On further consideration of the evidence and balance, this approach is now to be extended, as indicated in the Statement of Modifications.
GVA on behalf of ICG-Longbow (Brighton Marina Outer Harbour)	<p>The DCS does not acknowledge Brighton Marina Outer Harbour as strategic. Insufficient weight has been given to implications of CIL on Outer Harbour schemes which should be given a nil CIL charge, consistent with Brighton Marina Inner Harbour.</p> <p>Concerned that an appropriate balance has not been struck between the need to fund necessary infrastructure and the potential impacts on economic viability of the Outer Harbour. Refer to NPPF paras 173 &amp; 175 – ensuring viability and deliverability of sites; CIL should support and incentivise development. CIL has an impact upon viability and can affect site delivery and objectives of the development plan. Planning Permission granted in 2006; phase 1 complete; phase 2 commenced but with long running delays; phases 2-6 not yet developed. Proposals involve significant abnormal costs in terms of flood risk mitigation, and permission includes secured s106 financial obligations and benefits to local infrastructure, transport, open space and public realm. Currently exploring options to deliver remaining phases of the scheme. New permissions may be necessary to bring forward remaining phases, or minor material amendments required.</p> <p>Disagree with council response at PDCS stage – consider that although not identified as a strategic allocation within DA2,</p>	<p>Policy CP1 of City Plan Part 1 identifies 1940 residential units to come forward within the DA2 area. It is acknowledged that 853 units relate to an existing permission at Brighton Marina Outer Harbour, which includes a s106 agreement for developer contributions. Policy DA2 (para 3.12) sets out ‘the long term aspiration of the council is to address the deficiencies of the Marina and the wider area to facilitate the creation of a mixed use area of the city’.</p> <p>Any new permissions to replace existing consents at the Outer Harbour would also need to address abnormal site conditions and include s106 developer obligations to meet the need for site-specific infrastructure when CIL is in place. The IDP identifies that infrastructure required for site-specific delivery at Brighton Marina is consistent across the Inner and Outer Harbour, contributing to the burden of abnormal development costs across the Brighton Marina area.</p> <p>On further review of available information including the representations, the Council’s knowledge of the site and development area as a whole, the entire DA2 area is considered to be of strategic importance in terms of the overall planned amounts of development in City Plan Part One. Due to the combination of abnormal costs, the need for site-specific mitigation, Policy DA2 aspirations and the</p>

	<p>Outer Harbour is identified as delivering nearly half of DA2 residential allocation including affordable housing; non-residential uses including retail, community uses and health facility identified in City Plan Part One. BHCC SHLAA and identified 5 year housing land supply is reliant on delivery of 244 units in Outer Harbour – second largest identified site in terms of the 5 year housing land supply. Thus Outer Harbour should be considered as strategically important.</p> <p>The Outer Harbour would be subject to Residential Zone 1, PBSA and retail charges. Note nil CIL charge at Inner Harbour and King Alfred sites. Inconsistent approach and unfair advantage to Inner Harbour in terms of required infrastructure and site constraints. BHCC requested to take into account development costs when setting levy rates as stated in NPPG para 020</p> <p>Concerns that DCS is not robust and the consequences of adopting the rates as set out have not been properly considered in light of the NPPF and NPPG. Request Outer Harbour is identified as a strategic site with a nil CIL charge and the map is updated to identify site within strategic site charging zone.</p>	<p>overall quantum of housing still to be delivered, the current nil CIL charge zone boundary for Brighton Marina Inner Harbour will be expanded to include the Brighton Marina Outer Harbour. This will be part of an expanded differential CIL approach covering the whole Policy DA2 area (boundary as mapped in the City Plan Part 1) including the Gasworks and Black Rock sites. The published DCS and Map (Appendix 1) has been amended by the Statement of Modifications.</p>
<p>Quod on behalf of St William Homes LLP (Gas Works site, Boundary Road)</p>	<p>Further to PDCS submission, there are ongoing concerns that proposed charges do not strike an appropriate balance between infrastructure needs and CIL guidance, which requires that allocated sites should not be threatened by CIL whatever their scale. BHCC is incorrect in asserting that CIL is a relatively small influence on overall development viability.</p> <p>The Viability Appraisals do not reflect significant abnormal costs associated with brownfield sites, in particular the DA2 Gas Works site. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan suggests significant site-specific requirements to be factored into Viability Study appraisals. The Viability Assessment does not test a</p>	<p>Policy CP1 of City Plan Part 1 identifies 1940 residential units to come forward within the DA2 'Brighton Marina, Gas Works and Black Rock Area'. Policy DA2 (para 3.12) sets out 'the long term aspiration of the council is to address the deficiencies of the Marina and the wider area to facilitate the creation of a mixed use area of the city'.</p> <p>The representation identifies the site has potential for significant residential delivery. The council also acknowledges that the site may have capacity for a significantly higher amount of residential development than set out in the City Plan Part 1 site allocation, subject</p>

	<p>mixed use scenario or provide an appropriate basis for the assessment of site viability. The negative RLV for commercial uses has site implications not reflected in rate setting. The viability report has unclear assumptions for site preparation and remediation - gaswork sites can have significant cost as well as ongoing operational requirements.</p> <p>Adjacent Brighton Marina is part of the same allocation as Gas Works with similar viability issues but whose viability issues are recognised with a nil CIL rate - risk of State Aid through selective advantage.</p> <p>Whilst the individual site capacity is currently identified as relatively low it has the potential capacity to significantly exceed 85 residential units. BHCC must maximise delivery from strategic sites and when setting CIL the council should seek to ensure that allocations are viable.</p> <p>Due to the above the Gas Works site and the whole DA2 area should be nil CIL rated.</p> <p>The proposed boundaries of the charging zones are unduly complex and unclear and bisect the Brighton Gasworks site. A simple charging zone would include all DA2 sites in one zone. Otherwise include whole gasworks site in Zone 2 as it is without direct sea frontage unlike most of zone 1.</p> <p>Future proposal to remove pooling restrictions would allow a case by case basis of affordable housing provision and developer contributions for DA2 sites.</p>	<p>to the satisfaction of other policy considerations. It is also acknowledged that there are abnormal costs associated with site preparation and development delivery. For clarity, on review of representations made, the Gasworks site, which had not been nil-rated owing to its relatively small scale in planned development terms, is now to be recognised as significant within delivering the quantum of development to come forward within the wider DA2 site (including Black Rock</p> <p>On further review of available information including the representations and given the Council's knowledge of the site and development area as a whole, the entire DA2 area is considered as being of strategic importance in terms of the CIL. Due to the combination of abnormal costs, site-specific mitigation, Policy DA2 Area aspirations and the quantum of housing still to be delivered through the development plan including extant permissions which may require further planning consents, the current nil CIL charge zone boundary for Brighton Marina Inner Harbour will be expanded to include the Gas Works site as part of an expanded differential CIL approach covering the whole DA2 area (boundary as mapped in the City Plan Part 1). The published DCS and Map (Appendix 1) has been amended by the Statement of Modifications.</p> <p>Proposed new CIL Regulations have not yet been published. The council considers that the proposed nil-CIL rating approach is appropriate.</p>
Carter Jonas on Behalf of National Grid properties and	<p>Support St William Homes representation for nil CIL on Gasworks site</p> <p>Clear precedent for strategic sites has been set – concerned</p>	<p>Please see council's response as set out above.</p> <p>The statement of modifications indicates that the current nil CIL charge zone boundary for Brighton Marina Inner</p>

<p>Southern Gas Networks. (Gas Works Site, Boundary Road)</p>	<p>that proposed CIL rate here does not take in account viability concerns of Gasworks site. Abnormal costs associated with development of Gasworks should also lead to a zero rating as the neighbouring Brighton Marina site.</p> <p>Landowners have consistently made representations to other emerging planning policy documents including City Plan Part 1 and Waste and Minerals Sites Plan setting out viability concerns.</p> <p>Site has capacity to significantly exceed the delivery of 85 units, particularly in a City with limited available sites.</p> <p>Great importance in ensuring maximum delivery of new homes – making full and efficient use of PDL.</p>	<p>Harbour will be expanded to include the Gas Works site as part of an expanded differential CIL approach covering the whole DA2 area (boundary as mapped in the City Plan Part 1). The published DCS and Map (Appendix 1) has been amended by the Statement of Modifications</p>
<p>GL Hearne on behalf of JTC Fund Solutions (Churchill Square, Black Rock, Waterfront Project)</p>	<p>Unique relationship between Churchill Square and Black Rock due to the Waterfront project is not captured in the general development scenarios of the Viability Study and its Addendum. The development of DA1 site cross subsidises the delivery of public benefits delivered by overall project. Neither of the emerging schemes are viable and Waterfront project already requires £100m public subsidy. Lack of viability for Waterfront Project evidenced by £12.1m LEP funding. Delivering Churchill Square is challenging and since PDCS consultation the retail climate has significantly worsened. Extra burdens will impact upon the delivery of the waterfront project which would deliver significant economic benefits.</p>	<p>City Plan Part 1 does not identify a specific delivery link between Churchill Square (DA1) and Black Rock (DA2). CIL charges are underpinned by planned development as set out in the adopted City Plan Part 1.</p> <p>Although part of a larger Waterfront Project; Coast 2 Capital LEP funding of £12.1m is for the Blackrock Regeneration project and the Black Rock site is proposed to be included in the expanded differential CIL approach covering the whole DA2 area (boundary as mapped in the City Plan Part 1) within a nil CIL charge zone. This is clarified in the Statement of Modifications.</p> <p>The Council must strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure and considering the economic viability of development. The Viability Addendum (Feb 2018) further considered the potential impact of a modest CIL on the Churchill Square retail development following matters raised at PDCS stage and</p>

		<p>concluded 'If comparison retail comes forward, it is likely to be viable and a CIL charge of £50/m<sup>2</sup> is a minor element in terms of the overall development value and costs associated with what would be a prime shopping location.' Representations received to the DCS have not submitted further evidence to demonstrate that the proposed CIL charge would be so significant as to prevent the City Plan Part 1 DA1 site allocation from coming forward. After additional consideration, the Council considers that the CIL proposals continue to achieve the appropriate balance and proposes no change to the applicable £50/sq. m rate on the retail here. This is considered to represent a very small cost element that will not prejudice the overall viability.</p>
<p>Lewis &amp; Co on behalf of Rider Levett Bucknall. Savills is author of Viability Assessment (Brighton General Hospital)</p>	<p>Sufficient land values are required from residential development to deliver proposed D1 health hub, which will not benefit from NHS investment funding. Abnormal costs - converting listed buildings to modern health / residential standards, topography, demolition, potential remediation of land. Pre-app proposals include 10,462Sq.m health hub and 577 residential units. Request nil-CIL rate further to findings of Savills viability testing and on same basis as Inner Harbour and King Alfred/RNR strategic sites.</p> <p>Savills VA comments on BHCC Viability Study: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BGH</b> allocated for 200 dwellings – no generic and strategic modelling for this typology – only tested up to 100 units and then 700 units; urge that appropriate allowance is modelled for abnormal costs at BGH; advocate minimum allowance of 20-25% GDP for previously developed land including BGH due to inherent risks of unknown costs.</li> <li>• Concerns over: BHCC VS Benchmark Land Value (BLV); lack of transacted land evidence; application of viability buffer; use median not mean BCIS data; 15%</li> </ul>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes as 'important' the requirement for a New Healthcare campus at this site, and notes site redevelopment to provide joint facilities hub including GP surgery and continuing healthcare space. Saved Local Plan Policy HO25 'Brighton General Hospital' seeks a new community centre as part of any large scale housing residential development. The Draft City Plan Part Two allocates the site for 200 residential units and also requires the provision of a new Health Hub.</p> <p>Given the representations received the Council has subsequently commissioned an expanded viability assessment. This additional viability review work includes a typology which is broadly representative of the nature of planned development for this site.</p> <p>On further review of the representations, and taking account of planned site requirements, including the delivery of Healthcare campus and community facilities, alongside further review of submitted viability evidence</p>

	<p>allowance for communal space within flatted typologies not included; on-site infrastructure cost calculation not clear; no additional allowance for external works or planning promotion costs; developers contingency should be applied to wider development costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity requested over landowners premium; gross or net BLV; commentary outlining how supporting new build evidence has been used to benchmark value range within value zone; which approach has been adopted for affordable housing values; sales periods adopted for typologies;</li> <li>• Carried out alternative viability modelling for CIL examination purposes on 200 and 400 dwelling typology schemes in zone 2, concluding that these typologies would only support a nil-CIL charge. From this it is proposed that nil-CIL should be levied at BGH.</li> </ul>	<p>and the council's knowledge of the site, (including the presence of significant heritage assets), the Brighton General Hospital site is now proposed to be nil-rated for CIL charging. This is consistent with CIL principles and the significance of the relationship of this single site with the development plan. The published DCS and Map (Appendix 1) has been amended by the Statement of Modifications</p>
<p>Enplan (Toad's Hole Valley)</p>	<p>Toad's Hole Valley allocation (DA7) provides a significant element of housing and affordable housing provision in City Plan Part 1. Council proposes CIL and s106 obligations including delivery of on-site education - likely to affect site delivery at Toad's Hole Valley. Significant credit against CIL should be made for school site provision reflecting relevant land value for the most appropriate alternative use, considered to be residential.</p> <p>Site abuts zone 3 – an acknowledged low value area. Payment in Kind policy mentioned in DCS – but no details are given.</p> <p>Comments on Viability Assessment typology assumptions: Assumed mix of residential development unachievable due to challenging topography resulting in smaller than average dwellings to accommodate required City Plan Part 1 minimum 50 dph; equating to average unit size approx. 80 sqm rather than viability study assumption of 93 Sqm for this typology; increasing the number of required flats over housing – 43%</p>	<p>City Plan Part 1 Policy DA7 and the Toad's Hole Valley Supplementary Planning Document (THV SPD) 15 acknowledge site specific issues such as topography. However, a range of similar site characteristics are quite common in other areas of the City. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that abnormal costs would need to be supported to any particularly unusual extent.</p> <p>The requirement for community facilities to be provided at the site to share with adjacent neighbourhoods has been established through policy DA7. Adopted planning policy requires the provision of space for school provision not onsite delivery of education facilities.</p> <p>It is considered that proportionate, appropriate available evidence is in place to support the DCS rates. In the Council's view, the proposed CIL charge would not be so significant as to prevent the City Plan Part 1 site allocation from coming forward, and furthermore it is not considered</p>

	<p>flats rather than assumed 29%. Viability assessment typology assumes market housing totals higher than can be delivered at Toad's Hole Valley equating to more than total expected to be available for CIL/s106 payments. Assumed build costs in viability typology inadequate due to high ratio of flats from topography– also costs of required community management schemes are not reflected in viability typology.</p> <p>Insufficient allowance for infrastructure, groundworks and abnormal foundations, or profit on assumed 2-bed market flat GDV. Debit finance cost for complex capital intensive development inadequate. Costs from high sustainability standards in City Plan Part 1 are not reflected in viability report. Thus Viability Assessment findings cannot support proposed CIL charge and s106 obligations so a nil-CIL rating is required.</p>	<p>that sufficient evidence has been submitted as part of the representation to the published DCS consultation to demonstrate that this is not the correct approach on balance overall. This is a greenfield site, with a relatively low existing use value and is considered to offer very good viability prospects to support planned development. with the market housing supporting CIL contributions that help to provide certainty of funding available for the R123 List infrastructure.</p> <p>The DCS sets out the Council's intention to consider the appropriateness of introducing payment in kind policy. Such a policy would not be part of the charging schedule and could be changed independently of it.</p>
<p>Turleys on behalf of MODA (Sackville Road Trading Estate and coal-yard site)</p>	<p>Moda specialises in Build to Rent development. DCS does not strike appropriate balance between funding infrastructure and economic viability across the charging area – fails to meet CIL Reg 14</p> <p>DA6 of City Plan Part 1 seeks 525 homes and 1,000 Sq.m employment floorspace – policy is key component of Local Plan delivery.</p> <p>Potential mixed use capacity of Sackville Road Trading Estate and coal-yard site is circa 800 dwellings and 5,000 Sq.m mixed use/employment. The site is integral to local, community vision of emerging Hove Station Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>CIL Viability Study concludes marginal viability of B1 use with proposed £0/Sq.m charge. Challenges include cross subsidy between uses to deliver policy compliant mixed-use development. Existing costs relate to s106, site assembly, remediation and redevelopment. CIL rate would render site delivery unviable.</p> <p>Site should be considered as strategic due to its significant regenerative scale, consistent with CIL NPPG guidance.</p>	<p>Policy DA6 in City Plan Part 1 provides for a minimum of 525 residential units across the DA6 Development Area as a whole and an additional 1,000 sq.m employment floorspace outside the Conway Street Industrial Area (which is a strategic site allocation). The Draft City Plan Part Two proposes the Sackville Trading Estate and Coal Yard site as a new mixed use strategic site allocation including a minimum of 500 C3 residential units. It is noted that the representation indicates that the site may have capacity for a higher amount of residential development, subject to other policy considerations.</p> <p>Neither the Infrastructure Delivery Plan nor the site allocation in the Draft City Plan Part Two requires the specific provision of significant infrastructure. Where necessary and justified, the council may need to consider the mix and balance of costs and obligations for any particular site as part of an overall package. The November 2018 viability assessment addendum includes</p>

	<p>CPP2 policy supports strategic importance of the site. Currently undertaking site viability assessment – invite BHCC collaboration to prepare appropriate evidence for CIL DCS. This will demonstrate existing DCS rate is too high.</p> <p>No appropriate typology in viability assessment – gap in the evidence base regarding sizes and Build To Rent model.</p>	<p>consideration of a representative site typology for a brownfield site of this scale. No further site viability evidence has been submitted to the council.</p> <p>No viability evidence has been submitted to justify a separate Build to Rent category in the DCS. At this point, there is no certainty that this or other sites will provide Build to Rent even if that is discussed in early stages of site redevelopment.</p> <p>In this context, the council considers that the balance between infrastructure investment required to support citywide development along with the need to consider development viability at this site is appropriate and does not warrant a nil CIL charging zone.</p>
<p>Oxalis / LaSalle (Sackville Road Trading Estate and coal-yard site)</p>	<p>To be read alongside Turley / Moda living Representation on Sackville Road Trading Estate and coal-yard site. Previous Trading Estate approval 2010 was unviable. Now comprehensive approach incorporating southern coal yard. Viability Study does not consider brownfield mixed use sites. Council cannot demonstrate how CIL would support implementation of key sites. Only one appraisal of large mixed use of 700 units reflecting lower density greenfield site scenario. Not an appropriate sample range for mixed use sites like Sackville Road where existing uses are to remain - benchmark land values range inadequate. Cross-subsidy issues. PPG's 'Appropriate balance' cannot be demonstrated. Viability study/BHCC has not considered Build To Rent, a possible development typology for the site. CIL here should be a nil charge or substantially below zone 2 level to reflect the brownfield nature of the site and the need for a high-quality residential and commercial environment.</p>	<p>It is not possible to set a CIL charge covering mixed-use developments as a development type, within which varying proportions of different uses (each having different viability implications) may be present. Instead, such elements of schemes are charged CIL at the commensurate rate for the relevant development type.</p> <p>Neither the Infrastructure Delivery Plan nor the site allocation in the Draft City Plan Part Two requires the specific provision of significant infrastructure. Where necessary and justified, the council may need to consider the mix and balance of costs and obligations for any particular site as part of an overall package. The November 2018 viability assessment addendum includes consideration of a representative site typology for a brownfield site of this scale.</p> <p>As outlined in the council's response above, no viability evidence has been submitted to justify a separate Build to</p>

		<p>Rent category in the DCS. There is no certainty at this point that this or other sites will provide Build to Rent even if that is discussed in early stages of site redevelopment.</p> <p>In this context, the council considers that the balance between infrastructure required to support citywide development along with the need to consider development viability at this site is appropriate and does not warrant a nil CIL charging zone.</p>
<p>Deloitte on behalf of Vita</p>	<p>Vita provides studio type accommodation with communal hub and facilities. This high-quality PBSA provision attracts students, maintaining City's dynamic reputation with resulting economic benefits. £175 city wide charge will inhibit viability of PBSA. Challenges the following viability study assumptions: Construction costs; rental values; differentiation between low/ medium / high scenarios; small room sizes; efficiency.</p> <p>Select Property Group made offer to work with BHCC in viability study preparation – offer not taken up.</p> <p>Viability evidence provided.</p>	<p>Additional viability appraisal work on PBSA was carried out in response to the consultation to the PDCS, outlined in the CIL Viability Assessment Addendum (February 2018) and changes to the PBSA rate were included in the preparation of the DCS.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given to the submitted information. In practice, there are a wide range of potential providers and models for purpose built student housing provision, and these are likely to evolve and vary further. It is noted that the scope of representations on this area has been quite narrow. The Council needs to consider this much wider picture and it is not appropriate to consider a tailored approach to a particular form or provider of development. Accordingly, a proportionate and appropriate higher level view has been taken and this is considered to be representative of the usually very strong investment model.</p> <p>On review of all available evidence it is considered that a suitable approach to both assessment and rates setting has been used and results in an appropriate balance in all the circumstances. It is considered representative of the viability of a range of such schemes and that these should be charged at a rate equivalent to the upper residential</p>

		<p>rate, and that the proposed CIL charge would not be so significant as to prevent the student accommodation allocated in the City Plan Part 1 from coming forward. It is also considered that sufficient evidence has not been submitted in the breadth or depth that may demonstrate that this is not the correct approach overall, or that a better approach exists that will still achieve the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The Council contacted <a href="mailto:info@selectproperty.com">info@selectproperty.com</a> on 1 Feb 2018 seeking further information or examples relevant to PDCS. The council's PDCS response to Select Property Group acknowledged that consultees were welcome to make any further comments on the revised approach to PBSA following publication of the DCS.</p>
Turley	<p>The Viability Study is flawed in its approach to C2 rates; being consistent with C3 uses is punitive to C2 and will undermine policy CP19 'Housing Mix' to meet the needs of specific groups including older and disabled people. Viability Study and Addendum Report – high residual land values, oversimplifies differences in construction costs, fit out, design efficiency, revenue, investment yield, development costs and operating mode.</p>	<p>Comments on the C2 rates proposed within the DCS are noted. On further review of the viability assumptions, including the points made in the representation and viewed overall it is accepted that less positive assumptions are more likely to be reflective of viability given the available information at this point. The further review work outlined in the November 2018 Viability Addendum Update confirms this.</p> <p>A key distinction for the council has been to consider and define the various types of housing and care led accommodation for older and disabled people, and to consider an appropriate boundary between the two. Given the range of schemes and circumstances already seen in the city and possibly those moving ahead, in pitching an appropriate balance the Council proposes amendments to the DCS CIL rates, so that C2 (bed space based residential care, and nursing homes and similar) will be nil-rated. An intermediate grouping of private care residential homes with a degree of self containment e.g. 'extra-care' and 'assisted living' schemes (typically with</p>

		<p>self-contained apartments) will be charged at £100/sq. m City-wide (i.e. subject to a rate reduced from the upper levels for C3).</p> <p>The Council's approach will continue to make clear that, consistent with CIL charging as applies to general C3 residential across a wide spectrum of schemes, the application of the £100/sq. m rate will be to private sale schemes and not to affordable tenure/publicly provided (e.g. local authority-led) developments, i.e. not to charge CIL on the element of affordable/social provision that is likely to be part of the overall supply.</p> <p>As with other aspects, this revised approach is informed by and within the parameters of the viability evidence overall and is set out in the Statement of Modifications.</p>
<p>Savills on behalf of Crest Nicholson (South) Hyde Housing Group and Legal and General - 'the Consortium'</p>	<p>No changes made to residential rates adopted across the Charging Area in the DCS. Areas of concern in Savills PDCS representation not addressed in DCS or PDCS response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear how Brownfield BLV's ranging from £500,000 - £10,000,000 per Ha have been used to 'set' proposed levy across each Charging Zone;</li> <li>• No evidence provided to support the Existing Use Values and Benchmark Land Values adopted by DSP;</li> <li>• The methodology behind BLV calculation is unclear and so is unclear what land owner's premium has been assumed;</li> <li>• No evidence provided to support adopted infrastructure costs. The allowance of £4,500 per dwelling for sites under 500 dwellings is an underestimation of the likely servicing costs;</li> <li>• No allowance made for external works or abnormal costs;</li> <li>• Welcome inclusion of a 50% viability buffer within modelling, but unclear why the buffer has not been applied to the lowest surplus in each &amp; every typology across the 3 value areas.</li> </ul> <p>BHCC has demonstrated willingness to make some amendments to the CIL between PDCS and DCS, notably in respect of certain sites. Anticipated similar reasoning, e.g.</p>	<p>The Council remains of the view that, given the nature of the process and the difficulties involved in ensuring a fit for all situations, the approach taken is suitable and based on review of appropriate available evidence overall. It considers that the viability assessment work, as now added to with the February 2018 and November 2018 Addendum covering elements considered to merit further appraisal work, clearly acknowledges the nature of the process. This includes the need for review of a wide range of information, making of assumptions and judgements; all informing the striking of an appropriate balance between the desirability of providing infrastructure investment to support the planned new development and its viability. Following an opportunity to provide information at the stakeholders' consultation stage of the viability assessment at PDCS stage, and on review of the representations now received, the Council considers that a clear and suitable alternative approach has not been put forward in terms of the general rates proposed to apply to residential (C3) development. Acknowledging that there is</p>

	<p>anticipated build and infrastructure costs to also be applied to overall CIL rates.</p>	<p>no exact science involved, the council's own experience and the considerable experience of its viability consultants in CIL and other strategic level viability assessments and work across many site specific viability reviews supports the use of the assumptions and judgements made; including on further review. The viability considerations are based upon policy-compliant development including affordable housing provision in accordance with the Council's approach. CIL has been allowed for at the range of trial rates (at up to £1,000/sq. m for residential developments) considered as part of the cumulative costs of development, assessed in appropriate way to consider the strength of the relationship between development values and costs at a level that necessarily involves judgments and an overview, aligned to CIL principles. S106 contingency has been allowed for alongside CIL. In many cases, the development density assumptions applied are potentially cautious in the Council's view. In the viability consultants' experience, the assumptions selected, with some challenged through-representations in the normal way, are sound for the purpose. These include the finance interest rates, development timings, market and affordable housing revenue assumptions, dwelling mixes and sizes, overall construction costs allowances, contingencies and fees. In these respects, experience bears out that overall a suitable approach to the costs and values assumptions has been made and the Council notes also the very limited range of representations that have been made in such respects, balanced with the points also made by parties having the opposite view- i.e. that the CIL charging rates should be higher than the Council proposes.</p> <p>The local development market remains strong. The proposed CIL charging rates represent only a modest proportion of overall development values or costs, and are</p>
--	--	--

		<p>not out of step with the approaches adopted or being considered either within the adjoining local authority areas or when viewed more widely.</p> <p>The Council has continued its responsive, updating approach as appropriate on balance. Reflecting the Council's comprehensive reviewing approach, it can be noted that changes and modifications have been made as a result of consultation responses to the PDCS and representations to the DCS, where considered appropriate and supported by the evidence.</p>
<p>Planning Agents Forum (PAF)</p>	<p>Support principle of a transparent, fair and easy to administer CIL and suggest their clients will be generally supportive. Would welcome further engagement around methodology of CIL collection to ensure transparent and open process.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison of other residential CIL charges provided to demonstrate generally lower regional rates;</li> <li>• high CIL rates - adverse impact on housing and affordable housing delivery;</li> <li>• retail CIL charge may result in unviable or deter retail development, or disadvantage Brighton in relation to competing local centres</li> <li>• further engagement for monitoring CIL impact on delivery;</li> <li>• procedures and mechanisms for CIL review incl. R123 list;</li> <li>• instalment policy request with PAF involvement, clarity on Discretionary Social Housing Relief Policy;</li> <li>• seek procedure where developers can ensure timely provision of required infrastructure;</li> <li>• exempted strategic sites have highest potential for required city infrastructure. Sends out wrong messages. Listed buildings should be exempt;</li> <li>• clear instruction when CIL collection will start;</li> <li>• IDP lacks detailed costings. How and when will IDP be updated?</li> </ul>	<p>Support of council approach to developer contributions is welcomed.</p> <p>PAF request for further engagement in methodology of CIL collection noted.</p> <p>The bespoke CIL viability report and addendums have used an established approach and considered an appropriate range of development scenarios likely to come forward in the city for all development uses including residential and retail development.</p> <p>On comparison of submitted evidence of regional rates it is not considered that the residential rates within the DCS is too high, for example the adjoining South Downs National Park charging authority rates are of £200 and £150/sq.m as set out in the representation.</p> <p>The local development market remains strong. The proposed CIL charging rates represent only a modest proportion of overall development values or costs, and are not out of step with the approaches adopted or being considered either within the adjoining local authority areas or when viewed more widely.</p> <p>In rate setting, the council seeks to strike an appropriate balance between infrastructure provision to support city development and development viability. CIL viability</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further clarity on draft R123 list /s106 spending;</li> </ul> <p>Suggest neighbourhoods are consulted upon preferences for neighbourhood portion spending at the time of planning application as part of public consultation</p>	<p>considerations are based upon development including affordable housing provision in accordance with the Council's approach, with a contingency allowance for site specific s106 obligations and/or other site-specific matters. With CIL in place certain s106 requirements will be scaled back as part of the council's overall approach to developer contributions.</p> <p>The DCS outlines anticipated reporting monitoring and review for the CIL charging schedule. The DCS sets out the Council's intention to consider the appropriateness of introducing an instalment policy. PAF request for involvement noted. Request for Discretionary Social Housing Relief Policy noted. Neither of these policies would form part of a Charging Schedule.</p> <p>The Council is currently working to bring in a Charging Schedule. Governance procedures for infrastructure delivery from CIL receipts will be established and will include consideration of timely provision. Suggestion for consulting upon neighbourhood priorities at planning application stage noted.</p> <p>CIL charges support delivery of the local development plan and should not prevent sites with abnormal costs considered strategic in terms of CIL from coming forward. Thus nil CIL charge zone rates apply where demonstrated by supporting relevant evidence.</p> <p>The date the CS will come into effect to be specified within the published CS. An indicative CIL timetable for approval of CIL will be displayed and updated on the Council's developer contributions webpage.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a live evolving document that will be further updated mid-2019.</p> <p>The Draft R123 list and s106 section of the DCS demonstrates a framework of city wide infrastructure types suitable for CIL funding with no double-dipping between</p>
--	---	---

		CIL and s106 for infrastructure projects, and is considered appropriate relevant information for this stage.
DMH Stallard on behalf of The Community Stadium Limited	Clarify nil-CIL charge for retail stores directly ancillary to Major Sporting Venues. Significant footfall only occurs during sporting events, with a negligible impact on community infrastructure. City Plan Policy CP17 recognises the importance of Major Sporting Venues and supports proposals which secure their enhancement. A CIL charge on ancillary retail will have a negative impact on supporting their enhancement.	<p>This point has been considered but on further review, no change is proposed.</p> <p>A simple Charging Schedule is preferable and the council seeks to avoid unnecessary complication. As noted elsewhere, the CIL will be a city-wide, strategic level infrastructure investment mechanism and is unable to respond to all individual circumstances. Where chargeable, CIL rates for new ancillary retail floorspace at major sporting venues are considered likely to be negligible when the circumstances overall are viewed in terms of anticipated floor space coming forward as part of any extension or provision of new sporting venue, and related viability impact of the CIL on relevant parts. A balance needs to be struck with the desirability of funding infrastructure.</p>
<i>Comments received outside DCS consultation dates – summary and responses set out in table above</i>		
Rottingdean Parish Council	As above	Late comment included for reasons set out in introduction. Received 14 June 2018.
University of Sussex	As above	Late comment included for reasons set out in introduction. Letter dated 27 June 2018.