



**Andrew
Williamson/RES/SHROPSH
IRE-CC**

05/05/2011 11:00

To "Michael Ward"
<albrightonparishcouncil@btconnect.com>@SCCNET
cc Helen Howie/STAFF/SHROPSHIRE-CC@SHROPSHIRE-CC

bcc

Subject Re: Community Infrastructure Draft Charging Schedule 

Michael,

Thank you for the e-mail. I can confirm the response made by Albrighton Parish Council to the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule will also be carried forward and considered as a response to the CIL Draft Charging Schedule and therefore it will also be submitted to the Inspector as part of the Examination. I also note that you do not anticipate appearing at the Examination hearing sessions.

Regards,
Andrew

Andrew Williamson
Policy Officer
Spatial Planning Policy Team
Strategic Planning
Shropshire Council
Shirehall
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury
SY2 6ND

Tel: 01743 252501

Email: andrew.williamson@shropshire.gov.uk

Web: www.shropshire.gov.uk

"Michael Ward" <albrightonparishcouncil@btconnect.com>



"Michael Ward"
<albrightonparishcouncil@btconnect.com>

05/05/2011 10:46

To <andrew.williamson@shropshire.gov.uk>

cc

Subject Community Infrastructure Draft Charging Schedule

Andrew

Would you please take the submission authored by Cllr. David Murray which was submitted as the official response to the consultation by Albrighton Parish to the Inspector as agreed on the telephone.

No representation by the Council directly is anticipated.

Regards

Michael Ward
Clerk to Albrighton Parish Council

Response to Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**Question 1a**

The Rationale for the Levy rate (para 1.5) states that "The Levy is particularly appropriate for obtaining **standard contributions** from a large number of small scale developments." Yet in para 10.4 it claims that: "A threefold differential between the towns and rural areas is judged to be appropriate, given the different balance of considerations and Core Strategy policies."

While it is accepted that the provision of infrastructure support is greater in rural areas, the burden should be more fairly spread across the county with a differential of no more than twice that of Shrewsbury, the market towns and other key centres. A reasonable figure might be £50/m² for the latter, and £100/m² for the rural areas. The indicative infrastructure costs from new development are shown to be between £125 & £129/m². The proposed rural levy of £120/m² is almost at this figure, yet the £40/m² for other areas is well below, and is based on the average rate of developer contributions to date.

So there is no reason why this figure should not be raised, and the rural Levy lowered, in order to provide a more equitable solution, which the report says is the aim, in which smaller sites also contribute proportionally to infrastructure costs. A large differential will discourage any development in rural areas, and some might suggest there should be no differential, so that decisions can be based on need rather than financial issues of viability. The planning considerations could then be dealt with on a case by case basis.

Question 2

Should the charging schedule go ahead as planned, the evidence would become all too apparent, with the rural villages becoming even less sustainable than at present, with all the investment going into the county town and other key centres.

Question 3

The 'nil' rate for commercial development is supported, as employment opportunities of all kinds need to be encouraged. It is of limited use building affordable homes in areas where there is no local employment or public transport availability, so the three issues must be considered together, if a more sustainable future with minimum environmental impact is to be achieved.

Question 4

Incentives will be needed in order to encourage inward investment. Telford manages to succeed in this area, but the Shropshire Council needs to be more pro-active. Economic development is essential with a strong team accessing and bidding for external funds.

Question 5

Annex C of infrastructure that will benefit from the Levy seems comprehensive; maybe some craft workshops or similar, within community facilities, could be provided as well.

Question 6 – no comment.