

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 NO 

Your arguments in the literature you have sent us all about the Community Infrastructure Levy are well argued and slick. A "Garden City" will only ever be a Garden City with an adequate supply of funds. It will all end in tears when (and not if) the money-saving folk in sharp suits cut CIL (=Community Infrastructure Levy). Now the term "Garden City" becomes synonymous with urban decay, mass insanity, drugs and overall joblessness. Moneterism in the hands of Tories bred the Frankenstein child of the unstoppable cost-cutter from hell whose only talent is counting small piles of money. Under "New Labour" the moneterists will be even worse. Life under not-so-red Ed Miseryband? Tories? Lying New Labour? It's too awful to contemplate .....

2. Do you believe the evidence on viability is correct?  
If not, please set out alternative evidence to support your view.

YES NO 

As regards "viability evidence" your not-so "independent" examiner is an employee of a secretary of state as opposed to being answerable to short-changed citizens when things go pear-shaped. This pear-shaping of things is always preceded by a penny-wise pound-foolish cut by a cost vandal trying to impress a boss that he/she can do so much more for £ less £. In the world of lies, spin and cover-up that follows, the talentless get promoted and the voters always come off second best. What chance has the "independent" examiner when it is these self-same rogues who pay his wages? What chance is there for citizens when they get short-changed?

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 

Here is a warning from history for the architects of CIL funding which is the life blood of this current government vogue for "Garden City" development. In the 1960s Labour and Conservative politicians promised shops, cafes, infrastructure, trees, services and employment to the exciting new high rise development which promised a new dawn. Then came the money-saving cost vandals. High rise with no shops, services, gardens etc became gang-ridden, run-down areas of mental illness, crime and despair. For Labour and Tory in the 1950s to 1970 talk was cheap. Is it any different now in the 21<sup>st</sup> century whilst the current shower get gooey about Garden Cities? Money talks and short-changes in CIL will mother a new generation of angry tenants who fill their loos with concrete in rage and despair.

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

YES

NO

If CIL money is in adequate supply, an instalment policy and discretionary relief are common-sense necessities to the smooth running of things.

Can we rely upon our existing government of talentless burns to keep the CIL supply adequate? I doubt it .....

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

NO

Of course CIL money should include discretionary relief for charities and be discounted altogether in exceptional circumstances.

Can we rely upon the not-so dynamic duo of Dave and his Lib-Dem yes-boy to get in sufficient CIL funds for the government to afford the luxury of being generous to worthy cases? I doubt it .....

6. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft schedule or supporting evidence?

YES

NO

The theory of CIL is fine. It will all go one way at cock-up time when the cost-cutting vandals get listened to by their bosses. How can anyone trust that weakling kick-me Dave Cameron who lets nearly half a million not-always desirable souls each year just because he is an immigration masochist? And the alternative? Ed Miseryband. His dose of urge-to-merge Brussels-itis makes him just as dangerous. What choice have they but (1) to rip up the green belt or (2) trash villages like Langford/Heybridge? High rise was yesterdays sick joke just as "Garden Cities" will be tomorrows. Please planners, reassure us this time that you are socially responsible and not just them the developers yell "adios suckers" to as they go off-shore to the dancing girls and the £ good life £.

...the ... of ...

...

...

...

...