

<b>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 &amp; Development?</b>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Currently we feel that the level is set at a reasonable level when compared to rates set by other comparable local authorities in the UK.

We also feel that the report from HDH Planning and Development is reasonable and follows the tool – kit advices issued by the governments’ advisory boards. However we feel there are significant omissions when planning for infrastructure developments in our own area as highlighted below in section 2.

We cannot determine as yet as to whether the viability of residential projects set within the district would be compromised by the rates currently set by MDC. Our fear is that projects could be stalled if the CIL is set too high. Any objections put by developers would need very careful scrutiny indeed, in order to maintain the integrity of the projects in hand, and raise the correct level of CIL. For this reason the MDC will need to adopt a flexible approach, and yet be fair it’s setting of CIL. We recognise that this will be a difficult task to achieve.

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

We would refer to the District Councils Spatial Development Strategy Policy S6., relating to Burnham-on-Crouch.

We are unclear as to whether the infrastructure projects as yet planned and unplanned for the Burnham area , can be funded or bridge the funding gap from the CIL levy which would be returned to our “Parish”, which we estimate to be in the region of £94,000. We are disappointed that the infrastructure improvements which we see as vital in the 0-5 year time frame, (it would appear) are as yet not included on the section 123 list. We have calculated that the levy from the planned 450 dwellings could net the DC in the region of £1.7million.

The infrastructure improvements we envisage are to **drainage** (particularly in the Creeksea area i.e.alongside the envisaged development for Burnham West—please see photographs included with this email), and the already highlighted improvements in MDC documents required for the Church Road/Maldon Road junction. Additionally we see far more **road enhancements** that will be required, particularly on the route of the B1010 out of the district. We consider that the stance taken by the County Council Highways to be totally inappropriate for the future needs of the community in Burnham, and that this flies in the face of MDC’s stated aim to increase/maintain the quality of life for it’s residents? This begs the question—do people cease to be residents if they have to travel for work outside the district. We suggest that the DC, needs to liaise far more with County Highways Department on this subject?

2 cont.....

The potential CIL raised would be affected by the proportion of dwellings which would need to be provided (possibly by charitable organisations) for the demographic changes envisaged by MDC. i.e. an ageing population. However this will have the effect of reducing the CIL levied in the planned areas. If the CIL is compromised in this way MDC might wish to mitigate this loss by reducing the % of “affordable housing” from the currently high 40% rate. This would have the effect of increasing the total CIL, being funded by other properties.

<b>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?</b>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The District Council have probably got the rate per square metre about right as far as we can tell for individual properties. That is when compared with comparable rates elsewhere in the country. We have ticked the NO box for the reasons stated above. We consider the balance of the individual make up of the local developments as alluded to above is critical and could well need reassessment.

We appreciate that the final levy imposed is a little way off, and that the District Council is seeking views from within and outside the immediate area, as well as taking quasi government and non government advice. We hope therefore that the District Council will look at the balance of the developments in order to maximise CIL, if funding from other sources is compromised.

We consider that the imposition of what we consider to be excessive football pitches being planned for Burnham West is an example whereby CIL payments could be increased by residential /industrial use.

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"/>

**Yes, we consider that this would allow developers to plan payments throughout the life of their respective projects and plan cashflows accordingly. This we feel would help have the effect of ensuring the continuity of the proposed developments, and would help prevent “stalling” on the part of developers.**

Click here to enter text.

--	--	--

<b>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?</b>	Yes	√
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Yes—as indicated in the draft LDP proposal documents MDC has indicated that an ageing population is to be expected in this area (see above comments on demographic changes.) It would follow that as a result of this likely demographic change that Charitable Organisations wishing to provide care facilities should be exempt from the charge as an encouragement in order to secure these aims. This would have the effect of reducing costs to the charities concerned. We appreciate that this would also have the perhaps negative effect of reducing the amount of CIL collected, but believe this could be mitigated by the suggestion we have made above, namely of reducing the % of affordable housing in favour of industrial use or residential housing attracting CIL.

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

We understand that a section 123 list is to be drawn up highlighting the infrastructure projects required within the life-span of the LDP. We calculate that MDC will raise approx £1.7million from the envisaged developments in Burnham and so we are concerned that not enough of this is being allocated for funding

6 cont.....

of the projects which we and the local populace envisage as essential. We understand that the Town Council could accrue approx £94,000.

We believe that this would be inadequate for the infrastructure projects required in our area. We do recognise that the CIL is intended to act as a "top-up" for infrastructure projects in which case the finances would need to be carefully worked out.

We cannot understand the current stance taken by Essex County Council Highways with regard to road infrastructure in which they appear to disregard what we consider to be the essential upgrading of the local road network during the 0-5 year project term. We are unclear as to whether the CIL charged by MDC could or should be diverted for this purpose however? With regard to our local infrastructure projects we intend to highlight specific areas of concern in the Pre-Submission LDP consultation document.

The other areas of the District Councils CIL proposals strike the right balance between the needs of developers and potential revenue which would be accrued for infrastructure gains. Our main concerns are that the financial gains for what may be required for the Burnham specifically for these purposes may under current thinking fall short of what is required during the 0-5 year term.