

ISSUE 1 – Is the charging schedule supported by background documents containing appropriate available evidence?

(i). Infrastructure planning evidence

(a). No. I do not believe that it will produce the financial need to support the local economic context and infrastructure needs in relation, including in relation to the South Somerset Local Plan and the infrastructure delivery plan

(b). The 123 List. Yes.

Transport - Infrastructure needs should be lengthened to accommodate any transport/highway improvements needed between 2016 and 2028 - not just the listed site specific planning applications during this period as other more important highway infrastructure needs could come forward.

Flood risk management - Off site flood risk management works should be identified. Constant maintenance of the Keyford SUE SUD, is required because the local sandy soil will soon block it up and cause flooding below the site where the River Odd flows and on into Barwick and Stoford.

Outdoor Play Space, Sports, Community and Cultural facilities. - Why only Primary and Local Market Towns in both sections? Why not in the many Rural Villages of South Somerset District Area?

Sports Hall improvements or provision again in the many Villages. 3G SyntheticTurf pitch improvements or provision. Villages need to be included. These minor additions are needed to be added to keep Rural Committees fit and healthy and give them a village meeting place if needed, as much as the big Urban, eg. Westlands project needs funding.

(c). The Funding Gap. This is the most important consideration I believe. What justification or fairness is there in the discrepancy between the indicative gap of £124.1 million 106 money gained by the Council from now - 2016 until 2028 and the CIL charge which will make very little significant contribution if its value over the same period is estimated to be £14.6 million. District Executive Meeting Agenda 12th May 2016 Item 11. Neither will it be a very large or fair amount of money over this period to the Parishes, who were led to believe that they would receive infrastructure investment of 15% or 25% to offset the impact of large development up on their village's infrastructure and neither will 106's compensate them in the same way as they are not to be paid upfront as the Government has stated CIL should be.

(d). CIL. Rates should be applied fairly across the whole of South Somerset. Of course houses paying CIL will be disadvantaged having to pay higher overall prices for their new properties and in particular the Rural Villages paying CIL up front and subsidising the Urban / SUE prices against their "0" zero rated properties.

(e). Yes. Because up front payments will ensure sites are built out within reasonable time.

(ii). Economic Viability Evidence

No it is not. The CIL Viability Study and the methodology it uses is not robust and suitable for the purpose of setting an effective CIL charging rate for South Somerset.

a). The Viability study of setting effective residual valuation approach is a snapshot in time, and possibly unrealistic at this moment.

b). The SUE development, Keyford, South. With 800 dwellings consisting of 30% affordable homes and infrastructure demands not only for internal roads but includes much of the same infrastructure demands placed on the previous site plan originally designed for 1565 dwellings/2500 dwelling etc. All this site infrastructure is still contained in the 800 dwelling site today and it is no wonder that it is unviable and not all needed with the lesser number and could be reduced. Local infrastructure could help support this site until perhaps the other future adjacent Garden City sites are developed and could take some of the present infrastructure at a later date. It is a huge cost demand on 800 houses and a reduction to 25% affordable homes may be more sustainable and deliverable and pay some CIL contribution. Assumptions need to be challenged.

(c). No. 'Real World' conditions are not being presented. Where are the prospective purchasers coming from? Land values were lower when first purchased. Too high a housing density which does not relate to the local surrounding environment.

(d). No. See comment above.

(e). No. There are other large sites around the urban edge of Yeovil which are very slowly developing and house prices in many instances are out of range in our low wage economy.

(f). No. Changed economic circumstances. With the up to the minute economic climate circumstances - all development should carry some CIL. This deliberation on viability has been continuing for far to long on the SUE site. We have been through prosperous times, recession, partial recovery, to the present day. The latest viability study was published after the latest consultation in March 2016 therefore a further viability test should be carried out to include employment areas, hotels and leisure as part of the 126 List. See both Appraisal Summaries.

(g). CIL zoning map. Yes. I believe it does result in anomalies and a perception of unfairness between urban and rural areas.

(iii). Conclusion. Yes. CIL will guarantee infrastructure to minimise the impact of development on communities with local improvements to help new communities blend with the local communities and environment.