

Rep ID	Details
5404	<p data-bbox="225 237 1445 315"><b>(Comment) Section 2: What is CIL? - Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule</b></p> <p data-bbox="225 376 1150 432">Respondent: <b>Kirton and Falkenham District Council (Mr Colin Shaw) [2564]</b> Received: <b>3/7/2014 via Email</b></p> <p data-bbox="225 439 1445 546">The PC does not see how it would be possible to ensure that money collected outside the scope of this grant is channelled to where it is most needed; i.e. if the houses on a new Greenfield in the village were to require a new classroom in the village school, would the necessary money be extracted from the developer and spent on that classroom?</p> <p data-bbox="225 573 1401 629">In the case of Kirton and Falkenham the fees proposed are higher than for neighbouring Trimley St Mary whereas it has less infrastructure to begin with and is less likely to benefit from improvements.</p> <p data-bbox="225 640 544 674"><b>Full Text:</b> (<a href="#">Show Full Text</a>)</p> <p data-bbox="225 674 1422 730">Kirton and Falkenham Parish Council (the PC) has reviewed the above document and would like to submit the following comments/observations for consideration.</p> <p data-bbox="225 752 1422 887">Although a percentage of money collected will be available to local councils, the PC does not see how it would be possible to ensure that money collected outside the scope of this grant is channelled to where it is most needed. As an example of this, if the houses on a new Greenfield in the village were to require a new classroom in the village school, would the necessary money be extracted from the developer and spent on that classroom?</p> <p data-bbox="225 909 1393 965">In the case of Kirton and Falkenham the fees proposed are higher than say for neighbouring Trimley St Mary whereas it has less infrastructure to begin with and is less likely to benefit from improvements.</p> <p data-bbox="225 987 1437 1099">The CIL levy being proposed is partly based on a survey of what the market could stand and on the assumption that house prices will continue to rise. As house price inflation is likely to exceed inflation in general then logically the rate of the levy should reduce over time. Setting CIL on the basis proposed could also potentially exacerbate the problems caused by housing unaffordability.</p> <p data-bbox="225 1122 1437 1256">Small developments are often, though not exclusively, carried out by smaller builders, with fewer economies of scale and higher overheads, and the levy seems to unfairly penalise small developers in that they are larger per house for a scheme of a few houses than for one with many houses. Further to this, evidence would point to small developments usually resulting in little, if any, improvement to local services and facilities compared to larger developments.</p> <p data-bbox="225 1279 1401 1391">The PC welcomes recent changes in legislation proposed that mean that self-builders building single houses will not be subjected to the CIL, however SCDC could choose to go further and might consider it desirable to exempt all builds on infill plots or for just 1 or 2 houses and levy a much lower CIL on developments of up to 5 houses.</p> <p data-bbox="225 1413 1401 1525">By exempting Adastral Park zone from the CIL SCDC are in effect confirming that they do not think that this blanket change works in all cases and that CIL would make it this particular scheme unviable. This seems to set a precedent for other developers to claim exemption in the future which would then mean that eventually the CIL would eventually only be applied to smaller developments.</p>