

PERSIMMON HOMES SOUTH WEST

Mallard Road
Sowton Trading Estate
Exeter
Devon
EX2 7LD

Our ref: Written Reps/EDDC CIL Charging Schedule Examination

February 2020

FAO Planning Dept
East Devon District Council Blackdown House
Border Road
Honiton
EX14 1EJ

Sent Via Email: idxkemp@icloud.com and planningpolicy@eastdevon.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to further comment on the draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule for East Devon District Council (EDDC). These comments are made on behalf of Persimmon Homes South West Ltd (PHSW)

As previously stated in our previous representations, the following additional and sperate written representations made by PHSW are to be considered separately from representations that will be made on our behalf by David Lock Associates in regard to Cranbrook and the associated expansion areas.

In accordance with the Statement of Representations procedure, and in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (Regulations 21), PHSW reserve the right to be heard by the inspector at an examination on the 18th February 2020, in respect to of the matters set out below, and other related matters, concerning the proposed CIL Charging Schedule at East Devon, in particular:

- Part One - The Proposed CIL Rates – ALL development at Cranbrook
- Part Two - Residential Developments - Residential Development on Strategic Sites.
- Part Five - Other Matters

The Inspectors questions, relevant to PSHSW comments are included in *italics* for ease of reference throughout these representations.

I look forward to your confirmation in due course, of our participation in the examination. PHSW comments relating to only specific elements and are detailed below:

Part One – All development at Cranbrook

- a. Is the local levy rate of £0sqm for All development at Cranbrook justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for East Devon?*
- b. Overall, does the All development at Cranbrook NIL rate strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability (viability buffer)?*

PSHSW would like to reiterate our support for the zero CIL rate proposed for both residential and retail at Cranbrook. PHSW understand that EDDC recognise the substantial S106 burden, which was outlined in the Cranbrook IDP, the Viability study and as highlighted further still during the recent and ongoing Cranbrook DPD examination. As stated above further representation shall be made in more detail, on our behalf, by David Lock Associates with regards to this matter.

The extent of this area should be consistent with the Cranbrook DPD's proposed Built Up Area Boundary, whatever this maybe following the conclusion of the Cranbrook DPD's examination or the Cranbrook Allocation boundary as identified in the Local Plan 2016 should the inspector undertaking the Cranbrook DPD examination judge them to serve no relevant planning purpose and are subsequently removed as a result.

Confirmation that the zero CIL rate at Cranbrook will be a necessary requirement, irrespective of the outcome of the Cranbrook DPD examination, a commitment to this is sought via the examination of the draft CIL Charging schedule.

Part Two – Residential

Residential Development on Strategic Sites.

- 1. Is the local levy rate of £100sqm for Strategic sites justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for East Devon?*

- m. Does the levy rate apply to all residential development on Strategic sites or should it be defined as general residential development falling within Use Class C3?*
- n. Overall, does the local levy rate of £100sqm for Strategic sites strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability (viability buffer)?*

Previously PHSW have argued for a zero rate on Strategic Sites identified within the Local Plan 2016, particularly in relation to the Axminster allocation and the subsequent Axminster Development Plan. The reason for this previous stance is as follows; the Axminster Eastern expansion has a large forward funded S106 infrastructure deriving mainly from the link road between the B3261 and the A359, as well as associated open space, community facilities, employment land and a primary school. Having to pay CIL when we are already going to provide a considerable amount of infrastructure of community benefit may possibly make the whole eastern expansion unviable and could threaten the deliverability of the site, and with it jeopardise the Eastern Expansion and the bypass that is desired.

PHSW position on previous reps had regard to the fact that the bypass road was going to benefit from significant Highways Infrastructure Funding (HIF) from Homes England. This has now been lost, it recognised that there is still a desire to provide the bypass road for the Axminster expansion, but the substantial cost is associated with the provision of this road, which is a burden that cannot be levied on developers of site. As a result, persimmon homes reluctantly now support the universally applied £100 per sq.m CIL charge for the Axminster expansion, provided the road is further funded from CIL receipts across the district. This is as an alternative to the full burden of the bypass road being applied to developers on the expansion land. Hence the change in our position

It should be caveated that the inclusion of this £100 per sq.m charge, although now reluctantly supported will require the viability of any subsequent development proposals for the expansion land at Axminster to be thoroughly tested and concessions potentially made by EDDC Council on other requirements, if evidence suggests it to be reasonable. Previous applications have been assessed at a rate of £80 per sq.m, a rate obviously lower than now proposed.

In addition to and feeding into the above, PHSW are supportive of and reiterate the comments made by County Council, that CIL should be used to fund specific education and transport projects which would be identified on the infrastructure list (eventually included in the annual infrastructure funding statement).

Expanding on the above point, to provide robustness to future development processes and to provide comfort to those who will deliver the Axminster strategic site, PHSW request, as do the County Council, that the Axminster Relief/bypass road be identified on the

infrastructure list as a specific project that should be funded by CIL, thereby ensuring that the Local Plan can deliver on its allocations that underpin the housing supply of the district.

PHSW also support the recognition that Strategic Sites should have a lower CIL rate when compared to the rest of District, substantial infrastructure and s106 burdens that are placed on larger scale developments will still be required a higher CIL rate could result in the viability of delivering these sites in to question and further impact on the deliver the policy aims of the EDDC Local Plan 2016. PHSW also recognise that the proposed levy is similar to that of surrounding Local Authorities, thus providing consistency across the wider county and associated Council boundaries.

Part 5 Other Matters

- a. Where differential rates are set by zone, does the charging schedule adequately identify the location and boundaries of zones in accordance with (Regulation 12(2)(c) that requires this to be on an Ordnance Survey map which shows National Grid lines and reference numbers)?*

PHSW also is pleased to see that issues relating to discrepancies around the CIL Charging Map have been resolved, such as the recognition of the need to include the whole area of the Axminster Masterplan and the universal rate applied across the Axminster Masterplan expansion.

It is considered that the view contained within this written representation should be given considerable weight during the examination of East Devon District Councils draft CIL Charging Schedule.

I trust that the above representations will be taken into account during the CIL examination and we look forward to these points being discussed and elaborated on further at the Inspector's examination.

Yours Sincerely,

John Rudge MRTPI | Planning Manager
Email: John.Rudge@persimmonhomes.com