



Partnership for Urban South Hampshire

Office of the Executive Leader, Fareham Borough Council,
Civic Offices, Civic Way, FAREHAM, Hampshire PO16 7PU

T: 01329 824752 M: 07803 222845 F: 01329 824354

email: swoodward@fareham.gov.uk

Paul Martin
Communities and Local Government
CIL Team
Zone 1/E2 Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU

23 October 2009

Dear Mr Martin

PUSH Response on Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations

PUSH welcomes the opportunity to comments on the draft Regulations. Set out below are what it considers to be the key issues together with more specific comments relating to the questions asked in the consultation.

PUSH welcomes:

- the proposed scope of CIL to fund sub-regional infrastructure;
- the option for forward funding of schemes by regional agencies with a clawback from CIL;
- the option of districts collecting CIL for sub-regional projects;
- the option for variable rates within PUSH;
- the ability to use CIL to fund schemes already in place;
- the flexibility to build up contributions for projects over a longer period particularly for schemes which have a long lead time;
- the proposal to continue to secure affordable housing via Section 106 Agreements.

PUSH has a number of concerns regarding the implementation of CIL, in particular:

- the lack of certainty regarding what comprises infrastructure i.e. omissions (see response to Q1 below);
- the length of the transitional period;
- the time and resources necessary to develop a robust methodology and figure to be charged and administer its implementation;
- the timing of the introduction of CIL and its impact on the economy of South Hampshire;

Cont/.....

- the relationship between CIL and other funding sources and a real concern that there will remain a serious funding gap for the provision of the necessary infrastructure needed to deliver the scale of development proposed in South Hampshire.

There is concern that it may prove to be inflexible over the 20 year period it may take to deliver large scale projects like particularly if infrastructure costs are underestimated or change over time.

There is a need for further advice in terms of what could be considered to be a sub regional infrastructure and for an approach on pooling of contributions. It is unclear how CIL will reflect changing economic circumstances over the longer term.

In response to the specific questions raised in the consultation PUSH would respond as follows:

Q1 PUSH is concerned that there is uncertainty around what comprises infrastructure. Section 216 of the 2008 Act sets out a list of topics but also allows the Regulations to amend the list. No amendments are proposed which PUSH considers to be a serious omission, in particular the list in section 216 would appear to exclude cultural facilities such as libraries, archives museums and arts infrastructure. PUSH requests that the list is amended as provided for in the Act to include these facilities.

Q8 PUSH has concerns with respect to the charge being based on a per square metre calculation. A number of authorities operate their existing contributions policies on a per dwelling figure and do not experience the shortcomings identified in the consultation paper. Providing flexibility for each district to determine its own approach is PUSH's preferred alternative.

Q15 PUSH has concerns with respect to the charge being based on a per square metre calculation. A number of authorities operate their existing contributions policies on a per dwelling figure and do not experience the shortcomings identified in the consultation paper. Providing flexibility for each district to determine its own approach is PUSH's preferred alternative.

Q24 – PUSH supports the principle of a reduced rate for affordable housing.

Q27

Q45/ 49 PUSH considers that the transitional period at the end of which section 106 agreements would be restricted to impacts solely caused by the development should reviewed. The guidance requires authorities to have an up to date development strategy (an adopted core strategy) before implementing CIL. It would be appropriate to link the transition period to the time required to achieve an adopted charging schedule post adoption of the core strategy, rather than an arbitrary time period. The period of two years referred to would not provide sufficient time to have all the necessary policy documents in place.

Q47 PUSH considers that the option to pool section 106 contributions should be retained in certain circumstances to facilitate the efficient provision of small scale infrastructure e.g. open space.

The introduction of CIL is welcomed in terms of increasing the potential to secure increased funding from development; however PUSH has a number of concerns regarding its implementation. PUSH is also concerned that even with CIL in place there will be insufficient funding to provide all the necessary infrastructure required by the development proposed for South Hampshire.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Seán Woodward". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Councillor Seán Woodward
Chairman of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire