

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 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

No

Click here to enter text.

4. Do you think the Council should introduce an instalments policy?

Yes

No

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

No specific comments are made relating to the CIL rates contained within CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. It would be useful if the two residential charging zones were shown on an O.S. plan within the actual charging schedule rather than having to cross reference to the Local Development Plan. With regard to the identification of infrastructure it is welcomed in principle that the IDP recognises the requirement for mitigation measures within Chelmsford City Council's area to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on the A414 at Danbury arising from the level of development proposed within and surrounding the Maldon/Heybridge area. The City Council does not accept that the pre-signals scheme at Eves Corner is the most appropriate mitigation scheme for that junction, and that potentially a more extensive scheme may be required. Notwithstanding this, the IDP identifies a proposed highways scheme on the A414 at Eves Corner of the 'installation of pre-signals on Little Baddow Road and Mayes Lane to ensure the free flow of traffic north and south on the A414'. The estimated cost for this scheme is £120,000. It is not clear how this amount has been derived nor whether there are any further mitigation measures required on the A414 in Danbury. Given the IDP's specific reference to the requirement for traffic mitigation measures at the A414 in Danbury, Chelmsford City Council contend that this should be included as a Section 106 requirement of at least the Strategic Sites S2 (a) and S2 (d) rather than be left for potential CIL funding. As the IDP identifies the A414 highway mitigation measures in Danbury as a requirement for the levels of development growth in Maldon/Heybridge there needs to be certainty over the delivery of these highway mitigation measures. The only way that this can be secured with certainty is through Section 106 contributions.

