Bristol City Council

Community Infrastructure Levy

Draft Charging Schedule Regulation 19(1) Statement

18 April 2012

Background

Bristol City Council invited representations on its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule for a four-week period from 2 March 2012 to 30 March 2012.

Statement of Representations

In accordance with Regulation 19(1)(b) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, this statement confirms that representations were made to Bristol City Council in respect of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule. Fourteen (14) representations were received in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

Information relating to the respondents making representations is contained in Appendix A, and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations is contained in Appendix B.

Right to be heard

One respondent (Representation 8 - Jeremy Blaydon, CSJ Planning) requested to be heard by the CIL Examiner. The same respondent also requested to be notified of the matters contained in Regulation 16(2)(e). These requests were made in the four-week period during which representations were invited.

Note relating to Representation 11

Due to the size of this representation from Savills, it has been forwarded as a separate document in both the electronic and paper submissions.

Note relating to Representation 14

This representation comprises an email correspondence between the Council and a property agent (Andrew Batchelor from Hartnell Taylor Cook). Whilst not formally submitted as a representation, the Council is happy for this correspondence to be considered as a representation by the CIL examiner as it raises concerns about the Council's proposed CIL charges for hotel and student accommodation.

Modifications to the Draft Charging Schedule

The Council has not made any modifications to the Draft Charging Schedule after it was published in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

APPENDIX A

CIL DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION						
2 March 2012 to 30 March 2012						
Respondents						
Response No.	Respondent	Organisation	Representing	Date of response	Request to be heard at Examination	Request to be kept informed of progress
1	John Frenkel	Bristol Civic Society		03-Mar-12		
2	Peterjohn Smyth	Esha Architects		05-Mar-12		
3	Sally Miles	RPS Planning	IKEA	26-Mar-12		
4	Rose Freeman	Theatres Trust		27-Mar-12		
5	Jamie Sullivan	Tetlow King Planning		29-Mar-12		
6	Barbara Morgan	Network Rail		30-Mar-12		
7	Liz Summers	GVA Grimley	Unite	30-Mar-12		
8	Jeremy Blaydon	CSJ Planning	University of Bristol, Avon & Somerset Police Authority	30-Mar-12	√	√
9	Gary Parsons	Sport England		30-Mar-12		
10	Bill Marshall	University of the West of England		30-Mar-12		
11	Nick Matthews	Savills	House Builder Consortium Group	30-Mar-12		
12	David Westbrook	Natural England		30-Mar-12		
13	Dorothy Brown	Bristol Visual and Environmental Group		30-Mar-12		
14	Andrew Batchelor	Hartnell Taylor Cook		29-Mar-12		

APPENDIX B

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Representation
1	John Frenkel (Bristol Civic Society)	The Civic Society do not wish to respond to the Draft Charging Schedule
2	Peterjohn Smith (ESHA Architects)	There should be a larger number of CIL charging rates to take account of different values across Bristol
3	Sally Miles (RPS - on behalf of IKEA Properties)	1. Differential CIL rates should be set for different types and sizes of retail development, and there should be a cap on the maximum CIL charge associated with an individual unit 2. Discretionary relief from CIL should be offered to major developments requiring substantial infrastructure works
4	Rose Freeman (Theatres Trust)	No comment to make on the Draft Charging Schedule but is concerned that theatres do not benefit appropriately from Planning Obligations
5	Jamie Sullivan (Tetlow King - on behalf of South West HARP)	1. Concern that CIL will adversely impact on the delivery of affordable housing 2. Considers that Bristol's CIL Instalment Policy should allow for payments to be made on occupation 3. Discretionary relief from CIL shold be offered 4. Those areas of Bristol in need of regeneration should have a £nil rate of CIL for residential development
6	Barbara Morgan (Network Rail)	Refers to comments on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule, that identified rail schemes that Network Rail would welcome CIL contributions being applied to
7	Liz Summers (GVA Grimley - on behalf of Unite Group)	1. Concern that Bristol's proposed CIL rate for student accommodation is significantly higher than that proposed by Plymouth or Exeter 2. Considers it inappropriate for student accommodation schemes to contribute to infrastructure that students have little or no impact on 3. Concern that CIL does not allow for site specific circumstances
8	Jeremy Blaydon (CSJ Planning - on behalf of Bristol University and Avon & Somerset Police)	Restates points made in three letters responding to the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation, which are as follows (please note that that a number of points also related to the Council's Draft Planning Obligations SPD, which was consulted on at the same time as the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule): 1. The development of student accommodation by Bristol University should be exempt from CIL as the University is a charitable institution 2. The University has concerns over the level of CIL proposed for student accommodation 3. Development by the University should be specifically mentioned in the Charging Schedule 4. The "Other Chargeable Development" charge provides uncertainty, and should specifically identify the types of development that will be subject to the charge 5. CIL was debated by government at a time of economic prosperity. The current economic circumstances are not the time to introduce CIL 6. CIL will result in double charging by the Council 7. CIL will render student and hotel development unviable

Response No.	Respondent Name	Summary of Representation
9	Gary Parsons (Sport England)	The Council should ensure that the need and demand for sport and recreation provision should be taken into account in setting a CIL Charging Schedule
10	Bill Marshall (University of the West of England)	1. Student accommodation provided by universities should be exempt from CIL as universities are covered by Regulation 43 (charitable exemption) 2. All student accommodation should be exempt from CIL as the additional cost will be passed onto students in the form of increased rent
11	Nick Matthews (Savills - on behalf of the House Builder Consortium Group)	The CIL rate for residential development should be reduced to £30 per square metre for development of less that 15 dwellings and to £nil for development of over 15 dwellings. This is based on running the viability model using the following amended inputs: A) using lower sales rates B) adding a cost for abnormals at a rate of £12,069 per dwelling C) reducing the gross to net floorspace ratio for flats from 85% to 80%
12	David Westbrook (Natural England)	1. Pleased to see Green Infrastructure is identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Programme 2. Bristol may wish to follow Plymouth's example and develop a review mechanism for CIL
13	Dorothy Brown (Bristol Visual & Environmental Group	Suggests that Section 106 agreements should be flexibly worded and provides examples of how Section 106 and CIL monies could be used to improve the Castle Park area of Bristol
14	Andrew Batchelor (HartnellTaylor Cook)	Concern that CIL will render student and hotel development unviable