

1. Do you feel that the proposed rates are suitably informed by the viability evidence provided in the Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study (August 2013) and Viability Study Post Consultation Update (November 2013) produced by HDH Planning & Development?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click here to enter text.

2. Do you believe the evidence on viability is correct? If not, please set out alternative evidence to support your view.	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click here to enter text.

3. Do you think the rates proposed strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund infrastructure through CIL and the potential effects of imposing CIL on the viability of development needed to deliver the aspirations of the Local Development Plan?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click here to enter text.

4. Do you think the Council should introduce an instalments policy?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click here to enter text.

5. Do you think the Council should include discretionary relief from CIL for charitable investment or 'exceptional circumstances' as outlined in section 2.5 of the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation document?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click here to enter text.

6. Do you have any other comments on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule or supporting evidence?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

We would like to comment on this Draft Charging Schedule. The Eastern Region of the Country Land and Business Association Ltd. represents nearly 5,000 rural businesses and is the leading authority on the rural economy. For clarity, we would like to comment on each of the proposed charges as follows: We are concerned that the residential category covers all residential development. There are a number of situations where new rural dwellings are required to accommodate those employed in agriculture, horticulture and forestry. Such properties are not sold for development gain and so the charge would simply be an additional cost of construction and is likely to render many such projects unviable. As these properties are crucial to the operation of rural businesses and sustainable rural communities, we ask that they be considered separately, based on a suitable viability assessment. The All Other Uses category must clearly include buildings erected for agriculture, horticulture and forestry purposes. By not being expressly stated, there is a risk that its inclusion or otherwise will be left open to interpretation. Many buildings required by rural businesses are replacing obsolescent ones with no consequential impact on infrastructure at all. Any increase in the value of the property is directly related to the costs of the new building and there is little or no enhancement in the overall land value. We propose that "agricultural, horticultural and forestry development" is added as a separate category at a zero charge to avoid any confusion over the matter. This is the approach already taken by other local authorities and therefore would be more consistent.

