

Hart Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
Consultation on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
5th November 2021 to 17th December 2021



Response Form

Hart District Council is preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy. Comments are invited on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and the supporting evidence. All the consultation documents are available at <https://www.hart.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>

Please return comments by email to planningpolicy@hart.gov.uk or by post to Hart District Council, Civic Offices, Harlington Way, Fleet, GU51 4AE

Deadline: 5pm on Friday 17th December 2021

Part A – Personal Details

Please provide your details as anonymous comments cannot be accepted. By responding to this consultation you are providing consent for your personal data to be collected by Hart District Council in line with terms set out in the [CIL Privacy Notice](#). Please also read the [Confidentiality Statement](#). Consultation responses will be published, but only the name, and where relevant, the organisation name, will be published with the comments. No personal contact details will be published.

	Personal details (if applicable)*	Agent's Details (if applicable)*
First Name	█████	
Last Name	██████████	
Organisation (where relevant)	Member of Parliament	
Address	████████████████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	
Postcode	██████████	
Email	██████████	

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Name and Organisation boxes to the personal details but complete the full contact details of the agent. All correspondence will be sent to the agent.

Part B – Representations

The Council is consulting on:

- Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (setting out the proposed CIL rates)

You may also comment on the supporting evidence base:

- CIL Viability Assessment September 2021
- Hart Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update October 2021
- Infrastructure Funding Gap Assessment October 2021

Your Comments

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this consultation, on behalf of my constituents. I hope their views will be taken into account, as I have undertaken significant engagement with them on this.

Where a local Council decides that development should go ahead, my constituents want to see beautiful places built, with traditional architecture and a joined-up design aesthetic that genuinely adds value to the area. This should include the right mix of homes that local people genuinely want to buy, as well as the gardens, parks and other green spaces in between beautiful buildings, which should generate net gains for the quality of our built and natural environments.

Any significant development must commit to infrastructure improvements. The commitment to capital expenditure on transport, community and leisure facilities – preferably in advance of the homes – is critical.

Local residents do not want to see developers' contributions – CIL, s106, or otherwise – used for any revenue spending.

Exemptions:

Whilst there are fixed rules on which developments can officially be 'exempted' from CIL, we understand that the local authority can vary the rate (including zero rate) in order to encourage the type of development that would work for our area and that local people want to see.

My constituents agree with the exemption from CIL for "Houses, flats, residential annexes and residential extensions which are built by self-builders (CIL regulation 42A, 42B, 54A and 54B)." However, my constituents want to see this cover 'custom build' – by zero rating – too, on small developments.

The current proposals will levy CIL on any development of greater than 100m² of new build floor space or that creates one or more dwellings. My constituents are telling me that they want to see slow, organic growth of our town and villages – rather than major new greenfield developments – so that local people's children and grandchildren can afford to buy in the places they grew up in a way that used to

happen before the Town and Country Planning Act. That's why they believe that CIL should zero rate all developments of ten homes or less – regardless of square footage – to encourage organic, rather than speculative development!

CIL rates

In addition to the above 'zero rates' that my constituents would like to see, my constituents believe it is crucial that the other development classes have appropriate rates set.

The CIL rate/m² for the four subcategories of Class C cited in the proposed schedule (below) should be set the same as C3 (Dwellinghouse):

- *“Housing for older people: this includes what was referred to in the SHMA as ‘sheltered’ and ‘enhanced sheltered’”*
- *“Specialist housing for older people with care”*
- *“Residential care for older people: provides live-in accommodation, typically in en-suite rooms, with 24 hour-a-day supervised staffing for residents, who may need extra help and support with their personal care”*
- *“Nursing care for older people: provide 24-hour care and support, as with residential care, but with added nursing care and assistance for residents who require input from and supervision by a registered nurse, who is in situ to devise and monitor care plans and provide and administer treatment”*

Classes B2 (General or industrial); B8 (Storage or distribution); C2 (Residential institutions); C2A (Secure Residential Institution); and E(g) (Uses which can be carried out in a residential area without detriment to its amenity) should be set significantly higher than C3 (Dwellinghouse).

Finally – and crucially – the rate for “Large sites of 400 homes or more (gross) or a site area of 10 hectares or more (gross) irrespective of land use” should be set the same, or higher, than C3, with s106 collected on top of, not instead of, CIL.

Spending CIL receipts

As stated above, CIL receipts must be committed to capital infrastructure improvements on transport, community and leisure facilities – preferably in advance of the homes.

Some of the infrastructure they would like to see CIL spent on (non-exhaustive) includes:

joined-up cycle routes, with dedicated off-road cycle lanes that do not take away road space from other users, connecting local towns and villages to form a ‘North Hampshire Cycle Network’;

new bypasses around communities to redirect through traffic away from residents;

enabling brownfield regeneration of Fleet, Hook and Yateley retail centres;

dualling / re-dualling stretches of the A30 in North East Hampshire;

local train station improvements, including cycle parking and accessibility upgrades;

contributions towards a new Free School for north Hampshire.

In order to make sure that smaller, more local priorities are delivered, my constituents support the 15 per cent Neighbourhood Portion (and, in particular, the 25 per cent proportion in areas covered by a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan) – however, the 5 per cent administrative charge should not be levied, in order that all of the funding can go toward improving local infrastructure.

HM Government's recent change to CIL recognises the need to combine contributions from multiple developments for vital infrastructure. Further, North East Hampshire is an expensive place to live, and the cost of building any dwelling is much higher than elsewhere, given land values. To make sure that more 'starter homes' are built, my constituents and I would wholly support the council in changing its wider policy to collect 'offsite affordable housing contributions' on new developments, to allow more 'starter homes' to be built elsewhere, instead of seeking onsite delivery.

Thank you, once again, for the opportunity to respond and I hope that my constituents' views will be heeded.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary or append your response

Date: 16th December 2021