<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Asked to appear at EiP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCS001</td>
<td>Equality and Human Rights Commission</td>
<td>No observations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS002</td>
<td>Office of Rail Regulation</td>
<td>No observations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS003</td>
<td>B.Line Housing Information</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The charging schedule should be variable according to the land values, the degree of uplift in them, and hence residual values in different areas of the city, which will be reflected in land and house prices. Sub market areas with high house prices, such as Stoneygate, Knighton, etc, should be subject to a higher CIL rate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS004</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>No observations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contact NHS England and the local commissioning group for their views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS005</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The percentage split in funding appears to be far too heavily weighted in favour of transport, with green infrastructure and open spaces (and education) getting a disproportionately small percentage cut. The good work that is being carried out in partnership between your council and the Environment Agency should be more openly supported in order to reduce the high level of flood risk which currently exists in the city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS006</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>No Observations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS007</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Council should see if there are any projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Asked to appear at EiP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which could be funded via CIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Council should consider if CIL relief could be offered where an opportunity to regenerate a heritage asset comes forward which may be unviable if CIL is charged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The council should also consider creating charging zones with a lower CIL charge where there are clusters of listed buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS008</td>
<td>Thurmaston Parish Council</td>
<td><strong>General comment</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collected CIL from developments near or on the border with Thurmaston should fund infrastructure with the Thurmaston Parish Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS009</td>
<td>EMH Group</td>
<td><strong>General Comments</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We strongly support the approach to exclude affordable housing from CIL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The introduction of CIL may have a negative impact on development viability and disadvantage schemes in the City in terms of the competitiveness of grant bids and other resources as compared to other local authority areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We have some concerns about the mechanics of CIL i.e. if it is set at a level where the viability results in a reduction of the affordable housing percentage to be delivered on the site, especially where there is a S106 requiring other priorities linked to the site infrastructure requirements. This could impact on the overall level of affordable housing delivered in the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS010</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td><strong>General Comments</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Asked to appear at EiP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 123 list - This is too generic as reference and non-site specific we understand that this means that no S106 contributions can be collected for off-site contributions to outdoor sports space in light of the Council's proposed playing pitch strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS011</td>
<td>Mr C Narrinen</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS011</td>
<td>Support funding percentage for neighbourhoods once CIL is adopted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS012</td>
<td>Marine Management Organisation</td>
<td>No Observations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS013</td>
<td>Leicester NHS property services</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS013</td>
<td>Discussions are ongoing with Planners relating to the development of the Local Plan; however the timing of this does not coincide with healthcare strategic planning and the public consultation of the 'Better Care Together' programme. Therefore a specific heading and reference to Healthcare is required within the CIL Draft Charging Schedule now in advance of that formal planning exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS014</td>
<td>CgMs Consulting on behalf of Hammerson PLC (owners of highcross)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS014</td>
<td>We support the requirement to exempt retail development in Leicester City Centre from CIL, and request that a footnote is included within the proposed Charging Schedule to this effect in order to ensure clarity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS015</td>
<td>Midland Heart</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS015</td>
<td>Agree with EMH groups representations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep ID</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>Asked to appear at EiP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS016</td>
<td>Gateley LLP on behalf of the University of Leicester</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leicester University are a major provider of student accommodation at affordable rates and should not have to pay any CIL on any future student accommodation it may choose to build in the future. This is because we charge affordable rent and we are in charity &amp; so should have charitable CIL relief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCS017</td>
<td>Leicestershire Police</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         |                                                   | • Leicester City Council have underestimated the infrastructure cost for Leicestershire Police as a result of new development.  
• The council therefore needs to update its infrastructure list & regulation 123 to meet the defined requirements for policing needs in Leicester. |                         |
<p>| DCS018  | Savills on behalf of Barrett Homes                | Objection                     | Yes                     |
|         |                                                   | • The charge of 25 per square metre will make some sites unviable in Leicester. Leicester City Council’s viability evidence is not correct. |                         |
| DCS019  | NHS England                                       | General Comments              | No                      |
|         |                                                   | • Following discussions with Leicester City Council it has been accepted that reference to support for health care infrastructure cannot be included within this document. However to address this in future years, the relevant commissioning organisation will input into the forthcoming Local Plan with the aim that healthcare infrastructure will be part of the CIL. |                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep ID</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Asked to appear at EiP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in subsequent years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Jeevan Dhesi

Subject: Your email titled ‘Leicester City Council - Community Infrastructure Levy - Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule’

Thank you for your email dated 09 February 2015.

The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, but will respond to consultations where it considers they raise issues of strategic importance.

Local and other public authorities have obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 to consider the effect of their policies and decisions on people sharing particular protected characteristics. We provide advice for public authorities on how to apply the PSED, which is an on-going legal obligation and must be complied with as part of the planning process. Thus, the PSED is the mechanism through which public authorities involved in the planning process should consider the potential for planning proposals to have an impact on equality for different groups of people. To assist, you will find our technical guidance here.

Yours sincerely

Philippa Bullen
Corporate Communications Officer

Correspondence Unit
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Arndale House
The Arndale Centre
Manchester
M4 3AQ

Telephone: 0161 829 8323
Textphone: 020 7832 7880
Dear Sir /Madam

Community Infrastructure Levy – Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule – Notice of Consultation

Monday 9th February 2015 to 5.00 pm Tuesday 10th March 2015

The Council intends to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and is in the process of preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.

CIL is a new charge that local authorities can place on new development. The levy will be used to fund infrastructure to support growth.

Before a Charging Schedule can be adopted by the Council it must be subject to two rounds of consultation and an examination in public. This is the second stage of the consultation process – the Draft Charging Schedule. The first consultation, the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule took place from 28th May to 10th July 2014.

The Council has prepared a Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) along with the supporting evidence base documents. The DCS sets out the proposed charging rates for Leicester.

The Council invites comments on the Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents. The documents are available on:

http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

The consultation period runs from Monday 9th February 2015 and ends on 10th March 2015 at 5.00pm.

Representations should be made using the Council’s representation form which is available on:

• The Council’s online consultation system: which can be accessed on:
  http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

• You can post the form to:

Planning Policy Team, DCS Consultation, Leicester City Council, Planning, Transport, & Economic Development
City Hall (Halford Wing, 2nd Floor)
115 Charles Street
Leicester LE1 1FZ

  • By email: planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk

Copies of the DCS documents are available at all City Council customer service centres and Council libraries and can be accessed at all public libraries via the free internet access provided there.

Regards

Jeevan Dhesi
Planning Policy
Leicester City Council
Tel: 0116 4542983
Our vision

We live in a country with a long history of upholding people's rights, valuing diversity and challenging intolerance. The Commission seeks to maintain and strengthen this heritage while identifying and tackling areas where there is still unfair discrimination or where human rights are not being respected.

Legal disclaimer

This email has been originated in the Equality and Human Rights Commission, which is an information and guidance service and not a legal advice service. If you require legal advice, please contact a solicitor. This paragraph does not apply to an individual who is assisted under section 28 Equality Act 2006. This email message, including any attachments, is from the Equality and Human Rights Commission and is intended for the addressee only. It may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance of it.

Security warning: Please note that this email has been created in the knowledge that Internet email is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and accept this lack of security when emailing us.

If this email message has been sent to you in error, please notify us immediately by replying to this email. The Equality and Human Rights Commission accepts no responsibility for any changes made to this message after it has been sent by the original author. This email or any of its attachments may contain data that falls within the scope of the Data Protection Acts. You must ensure that any handling or processing of such data by you is fully compliant with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1984 and 1998.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission was established by the Equality Act 2006 as the Commission for Equality and Human Rights.
Dear Sir/Madam

Community Infrastructure Levy – Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule – Notice of Consultation

Thank you for your e-mail dated 9.2.15 in regard to the Community Infrastructure Levy consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule. ORR has no comment to make on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Kind regards

A Harrison
Planning Executive

Office of Rail Regulation | One Kemble Street | 2rd and 3rd Floors | London | WC2B 4AN
Tel: 020 7282 3829 | e-mail anneli.harrison@orr.gsi.gov.uk
Web: www.orr.gov.uk |
The consultation period runs from Monday 9th February 2015 and ends on 10th March 2015 at 5.00pm. Representations should be made using the Council’s representation form which is available on:

• **The Council’s online consultation system** : which can be accessed on: [http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/](http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/)

• You can post the form to:

Planning Policy Team, DCS Consultation, Leicester City Council, Planning, Transport, & Economic Development
City Hall (Halford Wing, 2nd Floor)
115 Charles Street
Leicester LE1 1FZ

  • By email: planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk

Copies of the DCS documents are available at all City Council customer service centres and Council libraries and can be accessed at all public libraries via the free internet access provided there.

This email was scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisations IT Helpdesk. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

**********************************************************************

We cannot accept any liability for any loss or damage sustained as a result of software viruses. You must carry out such virus checking as is necessary before opening any attachment to this message. The information in this email and any files transmitted with it may be of privileged and/or confidential nature and is solely for the addressee(s). If you are not intended addressee please notify us immediately, and note that any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. The views expressed in this email are not necessarily the views of the Office of Rail Regulation

**********************************************************************

The original of this email was scanned for viruses by the Government Secure Intranet virus scanning service supplied by Vodafone in partnership with Symantec. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) This email has been certified virus free. Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
DCS003

Mr Bob Line
B.Line Housing Information
To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

Document name:
Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

Section, paragraph or Appendix title.:
4.2 Community Infrastructure Levy Rates

Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document. Please provide a brief summary of your comments here.

Q2:
The charging schedule should be variable according to the land values, the degree of uplift in them, and hence residual values in different areas of the city, which will be reflected in land and house prices. Sub market areas with high house prices, such as Stoneygate, Knighton, etc, should be subject to a higher CIL rate. There may be arguments for having lower CIL rates in some areas too, for example Highfields, Braunstone, etc, as in the Strategic Regeneration Area.

Detailed statement - please give further details and the reasons for it.:
A flat rate will lose potential CIL income for more expensive areas, but may deter development in cheaper, usually more deprived, areas. While a flat rate may be an easier policy to develop, in practice it will lead to more arguments and delay. The data on house prices is fully and freely available, and could be used to develop a more sophisticated and accurate policy rather than a lazy one-size-fits-all. The CIL Viability Study update appears to look mainly at types of sites for development, and not the variation in the value of these sites according to their location within the city - that is there is insufficient spatial differentiation.

Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008., (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations., (iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council.

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address.
Our ref: DE00000919258

Dear Mr Dhesi,

Thank you for your correspondence of 10 February about Leicester City Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy and Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule. I have been asked to reply.

In line with the Government’s commitment to devolve power to communities, decisions about NHS services are essentially a matter for the NHS locally. You may therefore wish to send your notice of consultation to the local NHS England area team and clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) for their responses.

The contact details for NHS England Midland and East Area Team can be found at:

http://www.england.nhs.uk/mids-east/l-l-at/

The CCGs are:

NHS East Leicestershire and Rutland which can be contacted at:

http://www.eastleicestershireandrutlandccg.nhs.uk/contact-us

NHS Leicester City CCG, which can be contacted at:

https://www.leicestercityccg.nhs.uk/contact/

and NHS West Leicestershire CCG, which can be contacted at:

http://www.westleicestershireccg.nhs.uk/page/contact-us

I hope this reply is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Joanne Miles
Ministerial Correspondence and Public Enquiries
Department of Health

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please do not reply to this email. To contact the Department of Health, please visit the 'Contact DH' section on the GOV.UK website.
Leicester City Council

Community Infrastructure Levy: Response Form
Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Monday 9th February 2015 – Tuesday 10th March 2015

This form may be photocopied or downloaded from the Councils Community Infrastructure Levy Citizen [http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/](http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/).

Further printed copies can also be obtained from the Council by contacting Planning Policy on 0116 4542983

**COMMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY 5.00 PM TUESDAY 10TH MARCH 2015.**

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your Representation(s)

You can also return this form by e-mail to planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk or by post to

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (CIL DCS) Consultation, Planning Policy, 2nd Floor Halford Wing, 115 Charles Street, Leicester LE1 1ZF. Email is the Council’s preferred method of receiving comments, as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

Comments should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify the comment.

The CIL regulations require that any representations made during the consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule must be submitted to the examiner together with a summary of the main issues raised. Therefore, comments cannot be treated as confidential. They will be attributed to source and made available as public documents, although personal addresses will not be made publicly available.

Leicester City Council will consider all representations made if returned by the deadline. However, please note that late representations cannot be accepted.

**PART A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Details</th>
<th>Agents Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation Name:</strong></td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td>Geoff Platts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART B

#### Q1
To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document name:</th>
<th>Draft Charging Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section, paragraph or Appendix title</td>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q2
Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document

Please provide a brief summary of your comments here

The percentage split in funding appears to be far too heavily weighted in favour of transport, with green infrastructure and open spaces (and education) getting a disproportionately small percentage cut. The good work that is being carried out in partnership between your council and the Environment Agency should be more openly supported in order to reduce the high level of flood risk which currently exists in the city.

**Detailed statement**

Please give further details and the reasons for it (continue on a separate sheet as necessary).
Q3  Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

☐

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

☐

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

☐

Q4

*Please note, the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i)  That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008

☐

(ii)  The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations

☐
(iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address

Geoff.platts@environment-agency.gov.uk

Signature:  
Date: 02/03/2015
Hi Jeevan

Thank you for consulting Natural England on the Community Infrastructure Levy. I can confirm that Natural England has no further comments to make in addition to those made at the Draft document stage. If there is anything further that you would like to discuss on this matter please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards

Roslyn Deeming

Roslyn Deeming
Adviser
Sustainable Development Team
East Midlands Area
Ceres House
2, Searby Road
Lincoln
LN2 4DT
0300 060 1524
roslyn.deeming@naturalengland.org.uk

In an effort to reduce Natural England's carbon footprint, I will, wherever possible, avoid travelling to meetings and attend via audio, video or web conferencing.

We are here to secure a healthy natural environment for people to enjoy, where wildlife is protected and England’s landscapes are safeguarded for future generations.

Natural England is accredited to the Cabinet Office Customer Service Excellence Standard
This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.
DCS007

Miss Ann Plackett
Historic Environment Planning Adviser (temporary)
English Heritage (now Historic England as of 1st April 2015)
3 March 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

Community Infrastructure Levy – Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule

Thank you for your letter of 9 February 2015 advising English Heritage of the consultation on your Council’s Preliminary Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. As the Government’s Statutory Advisor on the Historic Environment, English Heritage is pleased to make the following comments.

English Heritage advises that CIL charging authorities identify the ways in which CIL, planning obligations and other funding streams can be used to implement the policies within the Local Plan aimed at and achieving the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting.

The Community Infrastructure Levy covers a wide definition of infrastructure in terms of what can be funded by the levy and is needed for supporting the development of an area. This can include:

- Open space: as well as parks and green spaces, this might also include wider public realm improvements, possibly linked to a Heritage Lottery Fund scheme, conservation area appraisals and management plans, and green infrastructure;
- ‘In kind’ payments, including land transfers: this could include the transfer of an ‘at risk’ building;
- Repairs and improvements to and the maintenance of heritage assets where they are an infrastructure item as defined by the Planning Act 2008, such as cultural or recreational facilities. Although the historic environment is not mentioned
explicitly by Section 216 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended), it can form part of different infrastructure types. Roads and other transport facilities may include historic structures (such as bridges); school facilities can include historic buildings; and open/recreational spaces can contain archaeology and/or form part of the character and setting of designated heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation areas. Heritage assets can also be described as community infrastructure in their own right (such as specific tourist attractions).

The Localism Act 2011 also allows CIL to be used for maintenance and ongoing costs, which may be relevant for a range of heritage assets, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges or green and social infrastructure such as parks and gardens.

Historic buildings may offer opportunities for business or employment use – infrastructure to support economic development. Investment in heritage assets (e.g. listed buildings at risk) and the wider historic character of a place (e.g. conservation areas at risk) may also serve to stimulate and support the tourism offer and attractiveness of a place to retain and attract economic development, which may be particularly important in supporting the viability of town centres. Conversely, vacant or underused heritage assets not only fail to make a full contribution to the economy of the area but they also give rise to negative perceptions about an area and discourage inward investment.

We therefore suggest that the City Council should consider whether any heritage-related projects within Leicester would be appropriate for CIL funding. The Local Plan’s evidence base may demonstrate the specific opportunities for CIL to help deliver growth and in so doing meet the Plan’s objectives for the historic environment.

Paragraph 3.3 of the Summary makes reference to viability; the Council should also be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on the viability and effective conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals. For example, there could be circumstances where the viability of a scheme designed to respect the setting of a heritage asset in terms of its amount of development could be threatened by the application of CIL. There could equally be issues for schemes which are designed to secure the long term viability of the historic environment (either through re-using a heritage asset or through enabling development).

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that local planning authorities set out, in their Local Plan, a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In relation to CIL, this means ensuring that the
conservation of its heritage assets is taken into account when considering the level of the CIL to be imposed so as to safeguard and encourage appropriate and viable uses for the historic environment.

We consider it essential, therefore, that the rates proposed in areas where there are groups of heritage assets at risk are not such as would be likely to discourage schemes being put forward for their re-use or associated heritage-led regeneration. In such areas, there may be a case for lowering the rates charged.

In addition, we are encouraging local authorities to assert in their CIL Charging Schedules their right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances e.g. where development which benefits heritage assets and their settings may become unviable it was subject to CIL. We also urge local authorities to then offer CIL relief where these circumstances apply. We note that in paragraph 4.4 of the Summary document, it states that you are not proposing to offer exemptions or relief beyond those set out as a statutory requirement or to operate an exceptional policy at present. We trust that the Council will bear our comments in mind in deciding whether or not to offer discretionary relief.

We would recommend that if such exceptional circumstances are recognised, the conditions and procedures for CIL relief be set out within a separate statement following the Charging Schedule. The statement could set out the criteria to define exceptional circumstances and provide a clear rationale for their use, including the justification in terms of the public benefit (for example, where CIL relief would enable the restoration of heritage assets identified on English Heritage’s Heritage at Risk Register). For clarity, the statement could also reiterate the necessary requirements and procedures which would be followed in such cases, including the need for appropriate notification and consultation.

It should also be remembered that development-specific planning obligations (S106) may still continue to offer further opportunities for funding improvements to and the mitigation of adverse impacts on the historic environment, such as archaeological investigations, access and interpretation, and the repair and reuse of buildings or other heritage assets.

English Heritage strongly advises that the City Council’s conservation staff are involved throughout the preparation and implementation of the Draft Charging Schedule as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues.

I attach an Appendix to this letter that sets out some background information on the relationship of infrastructure with the historic environment which I hope will be helpful in explaining English Heritage’s position on infrastructure and CIL.
Community Infrastructure Levy Infrastructure Project List

We note the potential projects that could be priorities for a part CIL contribution. Some will have historic environment implications, including specific road improvement schemes and city centre linkages, such as the New Walk Extension/Pocklington’s Walk and the Grand Union Canal Footbridge scheme. Opportunities to enhance heritage assets should be considered. Open Space and public realm projects, such as the improvements to the River Soar Corridor and improvements to (historic) parks could also enhance the historic environment.

As I am only on a temporary, part-time, contract until the end of March, any future contact regarding our representations should, in the first instance, be made with Claire Searson (Direct Line: 01777 860072 (Mon, Weds-Fri) 01604 735447 (Tues Only), Mobile phone: 07917 596058).

Yours faithfully,

AE Plackett

Ann Plackett (Miss)
Historic Environment Planning Adviser (temporary)
E-mail: ann.plackett@english-heritage.org.uk

APPENDIX

INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Infrastructure

The National Planning Policy Framework endorses the role of the historic environment in sustainable development. It notes that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the historic environment. There can often be a range of ways in which the historic environment can contribute to and benefit from the range of infrastructure and investment needs that are required for sustainable development and communities.

Physical Infrastructure

Heritage assets can help to deliver a range of infrastructure needs associated with housing, economic development and sustainable transport networks.
Historic buildings within or in the vicinity of a settlement may offer opportunities for residential reuse, including for affordable housing [see Affordable Rural Housing and the Historic Environment, http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.00h015005004].

Heritage assets can be economic assets in their own right and support the regeneration of areas as well as the tourism economy. For example, the adaptive reuse and repair of historic buildings may offer opportunities for business or employment use. More generally the investment in heritage assets (e.g. buildings at risk), and the wider historic character of a place (e.g. conservation areas at risk) may also serve to strengthen and reinforce the attractiveness of a place to retain and attract economic development and to stimulate and support the area’s tourism offer. Investment could be directed to establishing or extending area-based schemes aimed at regenerating valued historic townscapes, as exemplified by Townscape Heritage Initiatives funded through the HLF. Specific opportunities may also exist to further develop the tourism offer of established heritage assets open to the public and their links to nearby settlements.

The following publications illustrate practical examples of where the protection and adaptation of historic places through active management (constructive conservation) has delivered social and economic benefits:


Improvements to the public realm in town and village centres can help encourage walking and cycling and support the delivery of sustainable transport objectives. They can also support the delivery of the objectives for the historic environment through helping to deliver conservation area management plans and tackling issues related to conservation areas being identified as at risk. Improvements could include promoting community based de-cluttering audits and the better coordination of signage and street furniture as promoted through English Heritage’s Streets for All programme. Improvements in the overall quality, character and indeed functioning of areas can also contribute to wider policy aims linked to tourism, the economy and the built environment. Practical guidance on community audits and managing, designing and maintaining the public realm is available at: http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.19637.

In certain cases the direct investment in a heritage asset might be required for supporting the development of an area. For example, this could include investment in the improvement and or maintenance of a historic bridge where it is part of the transport infrastructure for the planned development.

Social and Community Infrastructure

Historic buildings, including places of worship, can accommodate many social and community services and activities as well as represent a focus for the community in their own right. Investment in their continued or improved maintenance could be warranted in supporting and extending the capacity of existing infrastructure. Promoting the adaptive reuse of a vacant or underused building or facilitating the multiple-use of existing buildings for a wider range of community services might also offer the opportunity to support the repair
and maintenance of historic buildings, particularly where identified nationally or locally as a building at risk.


The community transfer of assets may also be an option for delivering infrastructure and the sustainable management of a heritage asset. Guidance for local authorities, public sector bodies and community groups on the transfer the ownership and management of historic buildings, monuments or landscapes is available on the English Heritage website ([Pillars of the Community: The Transfer of Local Authority Heritage Assets, 2011](http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/pillars-of-the-community-the-transfer-of-local-authority-heritage-assets/)).

In supporting access to green space and encouraging walking and cycling, extensions to the public rights of way network can include improving access to heritage assets and their improved interpretation and enjoyment. The provision of open space might also be linked to improving public access to historic landscapes in the vicinity of a settlement.

Social and community infrastructure may also include cultural facilities such as a local museum. Investment may offer opportunities to widen and improve its use by existing and new communities as well as support the tourism economy.

**Green Infrastructure**

The historic environment and heritage assets can make a valuable contribution to green infrastructure networks and its wider functions, as for example in providing leisure and recreation opportunities, encouraging walking and cycling and strengthening local character. Historic places such as historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, the grounds of historic buildings and green spaces within conservation areas can form part of a green infrastructure network as well as underpin the character and distinctiveness of an area and its sense of place. Other heritage assets can also offer a range of opportunities such as canal networks and churchyards and the wider countryside including networks of ‘green-lanes’, common land and historic parkland.
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Tracey Kunne
Clerk to the Council
Thurmaston Parish Council
Response ID ANON-JXQQ-KMQW-4

Submitted on 2015-02-26 09:43:50.767713

Consultation questions

Contact Details

Name:
Tracey Kunne - Clerk to the Council

Organisation:
Thurmaston Parish Council

Address:
Elizabeth Park Sports & Community Centre
Checkland Road
Thurmaston
Leicester
LE4 8FN

Email:
clerk@thurmastonpc.gov.uk

Date:
26th February 2015

1  To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

Document name:
Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation

Section, paragraph or Appendix title.: 

2  Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document. Please provide a brief summary of your comments here.

Q2:
Thurmaston Parish Council would like to request that where any future developments border Thurcaston, could we please request that provision is made within the CIL towards the improvement of services and facilities in Thurcaston, as these will be of benefit to new residents who will require access to our services and facilities.

Detailed statement - please give further details and the reasons for it.: 

3  Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.: 

4  Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008., (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations., (iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council.

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address.: 

DCS009

Purnima Wilkinson
Head of New Business
EMH Group
Emh homes response to Community Infrastructure Levy consultation by Leicester City Council – March 4\textsuperscript{th} 2015

Introduction

Emh homes welcomes the opportunity to comment on the City Council’s proposals for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Emh homes is a key Registered Provider (housing association) working in partnership with the City Council to deliver affordable homes to meet priority housing needs. We own 1400 homes in the City and over the past 5 years have developed a further 92 homes.

Our comments are provided below:

Comments on CIL – Draft Schedule Consultation document

1. Clause 3.4
   • We strongly support the approach to exclude affordable housing from CIL where the units are provided as part of S106 obligations and also where developed by a Registered Provider (RP) in its own right.

   • However the introduction of CIL may have a negative impact on development viability and disadvantage schemes in the City in terms of the competitiveness of grant bids and other resources as compared to other local authority areas. CIL could either:

     a) Threaten viability and therefore stop schemes coming forward in the City.
     b) Disadvantage schemes seeking grant as they will not be as competitive.

   • The proposal to charge a ‘zero rate’ if viability testing shows that a particular use / area cannot withstand the charge – whilst positive it would be beneficial to have clarity on the methodology to be adopted in assessing viability. RPs currently use the Homes and Communities Agency – viability model.

   • We have some concerns about the mechanics of CIL i.e. if it is set at a level where the viability results in a reduction of the affordable housing percentage to be delivered on the site, especially where there is a S106 requiring other priorities linked to the site infrastructure requirements. This could impact on the overall level of affordable housing delivered in the City.

2. Clause 3.5

   • Timing of payment – to encourage the development of sites by smaller developers or larger sites could the timing of CIL payments be phased or split between a start on site and completion of phases?
3. **Clause 3.7**

- Who will decide on what locally determined infrastructure is required in different areas of the City and how?
- There needs to be transparency on the use of CIL to deliver the infrastructure set out in the list.
- Feedback to neighbourhoods and monitoring on what the funding has been spent on.
- Transparency and feedback to developers also to say what their contributions have been spent on.

4. **Clause 4.2**

- It would be useful to have a definition of ‘Supported Living Accommodation’

5. **Clause 5.3**

- How long will these CIL rates apply and will there be a review in conjunction with a review of the infrastructure list?
Good Morning,

I can confirm that Sport England does not wish to comment on the Draft Charging Schedule.

However we would wish to make two points.

1. Section 123 list this refers to generic areas in particular our concern is’ Outdoor Sports Space’. This is to generic as reference and non –site specific we understand that this means that no S106 contributions can be collected for off-site contributions to outdoor sports space. Work has just started on a Playing Pitch Strategy for this city, which will identify which facilities need to be protected, which need to be enhanced and the need for new facilities. The above means that S106 cannot be used to deliver new off-site facilities or seek contributions to existing off-site facilities rather than provision on site.

2. Work is also underway on a built sports facility how will the conclusions of this work feed into the CIL work as evidence re provison of on site or ofsite facilities or contributions to such facilities can this be achievd through S106 contributions.

Regards Steve
Consultation questions

Contact Details

Name:
Mr C Narrainen

Organisation:

Address:
143 Nailsworth Crescent
Redhill
RH1 3JE

Email:

Date:
09/03/2015

1 To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

Document name:
Draft Charging Schedule

Section, paragraph or Appendix title.: 
Section 3.7

2 Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document. Please provide a brief summary of your comments here.

Q2:
Support

Detailed statement - please give further details and the reasons for it.:
n/a

3 Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.:

4 Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008. (ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations. (iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council.

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address:

Mr C Narrainen
143 Nailsworth Crescent
Redhill
RH1 3JE
DCS012

Angela Gemmill
Relationship Manager
Marine Management Organisation
12 February 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Leicester City Council Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation.

If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo

Yours sincerely

Angela Gemmill
Relationship Manager

E stakeholder@marinemanagement.org.uk
DCS013

Adrian Middleton
Property Manager
Leicester NHS property services
Leicester City Council

Community Infrastructure Levy: Response Form
Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Monday 9th February 2015 – Tuesday 10th March 2015

This form may be photocopied or downloaded from the Councils Community Infrastructure Levy Citizen http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

Further printed copies can also be obtained from the Council by contacting Planning Policy on 0116 4542983

COMMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY 5.00 PM TUESDAY 10TH MARCH 2015.

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your Representation(s)

You can also return this form by e-mail to planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk or by post to
Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (CIL DCS) Consultation, Planning Policy, 2nd Floor Halford Wing, 115 Charles Street, Leicester LE1 1ZF. Email is the Council's preferred method of receiving comments, as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

Comments should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify the comment.

The CIL regulations require that any representations made during the consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule must be submitted to the examiner together with a summary of the main issues raised. Therefore, comments cannot be treated as confidential. They will be attributed to source and made available as public documents, although personal addresses will not be made publicly available.

Leicester City Council will consider all representations made if returned by the deadline. However, please note that late representations cannot be accepted.

PART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Details</th>
<th>Agents Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation Name:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organisation Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust, University Hospitals of Leicester, NHS Property Services</td>
<td>Leicester Leicestershire and Rutland Estates and facilities Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Webster - Head of estates Transformation &amp; Property</td>
<td>Mike Webster - Head of estates Transformation &amp; Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adrian Middleton - Property Manager</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adrian Middleton - Property Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estates and Facilities Building,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicester Royal Infirmary,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LE1 5WW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tel:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tel:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0116 258 6936/7629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fax:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail:</strong></td>
<td><strong>E-mail:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.webster@uhl-tr.nhs.uk">mike.webster@uhl-tr.nhs.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:adrian.middleton@uhl-tr.nhs.uk">adrian.middleton@uhl-tr.nhs.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q1</strong></th>
<th><strong>To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Document name:</strong> 3.0 Methodology and Preparation of the CIL Infrastructure Projects List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section, paragraph or Appendix title</strong> 3.5, 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please provide a brief summary of your comments here:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a heading on the Infrastructure Projects list entitled 'Healthcare provision' and reference in the text to a potential requirement under this head for investment in Acute, Community and Primary care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Detailed statement**

Please give further details and the reasons for it (continue on a separate sheet as necessary).

**The letter dated 8 July 2014, from Andrew Chatten, referenced in the appendices of Community Infrastructure Levy Statement of Consultation document, Draft Schedule February 2015 is relevant to this process and in particular the 'Better Care Together' programme, which remains a core part of the strategy for provision of healthcare within the region. A copy of this letter is appended to this form.**

**Whilst the statement refers to health infrastructure recognising the need for investment, there has been no costing undertaken at this stage. Discussions are ongoing with Planners relating to the development of the Local Plan; however the timing of this does not coincide with healthcare strategic planning and the public consultation of the 'Better Care Together' programme. Therefore a specific heading and reference to Healthcare is required within the CIL Draft Charging Schedule now in advance of that formal planning exercise.**
Q3 Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

X

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Q4 Please note, the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:
(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008  

(ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations  

(iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council  

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address:

mike.webster@uhl-tr.nhs.uk  
adrian.middleton@uhl-tr.nhs.uk

Signature: [Signature]  
Date: 10/3/2015
Dear Jeevan

Re: Community Infrastructure Levy consultation

I write on behalf of the principal Leicestershire Health Trusts and Commissioners responsible for the planning, co-ordination and delivery of major healthcare services within the city of Leicester. Horizons is the strategic property services organisation charged with ensuring the physical infrastructure of land and buildings are fit and appropriate to deliver a high quality Health Care service to the citizens of the City.

I felt it appropriate that we make representation on behalf of University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust (UHL) and Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust (LPT) and the commissioning authorities that health care is appropriately recognised within the CIL consultation taking into account the future provision of healthcare services within the City (and County).

The consultation CIL schedule is based on the evidence base associated with the 2010 Core strategy. In terms of Healthcare many of the assumptions made in 2010 are now out of date. Horizons/UHL/LPT and the Commissioners would welcome the opportunity to present new evidence that can inform CIL policy in the future. The impacts that growth and new development will have on the healthcare system will need careful and detailed consideration going forwards.
We understand that there will be an opportunity to work with the local authority through consultation engagement during the Local Plan Development process which is planned to commence in October 2014.

It is important that the final adopted CIL schedule timetabled for April 2015 and the Local plan take full account of the Health Infrastructure required and that any Regulation 123 list also takes account of and does not preclude the potential for site specific s106 requirements in relation to Health Assets. You will be aware that the healthcare organisations are publicly funded bodies and so can receive CIL and section 106 funding without breaching ‘state aid rules’.

The Trusts accept that in order to inform policy in the future the Local Authority will require some clear site specific delivery plan principals and project definitions and costs so that investment levels can be quantified and allocated timescales.

The Trusts have been working in this area for some time and have put in place a work stream to radically alter the way care is delivered across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. The initiative is known as ‘Better Care Together Programme’ where Horizons are taking the lead on the estates workstream. The work has been the subject of substantial consultation across all of the Healthcare providers and commissioners in the City (and County), to essentially redesign the estate infrastructure to support the commissioning and service strategies. This presents an opportunity to move forward with a change program in a coordinated manner for the majority of all healthcare assets in the city (and County).

An initial report has been produced by the ‘Better Care Together’ programme and it is anticipated this will inform a delivery and investment plan which will be completed by the autumn and will inform future discussions with the Local Authority.

We note that there is no provision in the current CIL draft for Healthcare facilities and that within the consultation document it is proposed that there be a structured formal engagement with the local authority in the Autumn. In that context it is assumed that account will be taken of the Healthcare infrastructure needs in future drafts of the CIL policy/schedule and the draft local plan.

You will be aware that the healthcare organisations are publicly funded bodies and so can receive CIL and section 106 funding without breaching ‘state aid rules’.
We look forward to meeting with you to discuss the health care strategy and plans later in the year. In the meantime if you require any more clarification at this stage please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Chatten
Managing Director Horizons

For and on behalf of:
Leicestershire Partnership NHS Trust
University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust
Leicester City CCG
DCS014

Tanya Jordan
Director
CgMs Consulting on behalf Hammerson plc
Leicester City Council

Community Infrastructure Levy: Response Form
Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Monday 9th February 2015 – Tuesday 10th March 2015

This form may be photocopied or downloaded from the Councils Community Infrastructure Levy Citizen http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

Further printed copies can also be obtained from the Council by contacting Planning Policy on 0116 4542983

COMMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY 5.00 PM TUESDAY 10TH MARCH 2015.

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your Representation(s)

You can also return this form by e-mail to planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk or by post to

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (CIL DCS) Consultation, Planning Policy, 2nd Floor Halford Wing, 115 Charles Street, Leicester LE1 1ZF. Email is the Council’s preferred method of receiving comments, as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

Comments should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify the comment.

The CIL regulations require that any representations made during the consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule must be submitted to the examiner together with a summary of the main issues raised. Therefore, comments cannot be treated as confidential. They will be attributed to source and made available as public documents, although personal addresses will not be made publicly available.

Leicester City Council will consider all representations made if returned by the deadline. However, please note that late representations cannot be accepted.

PART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Details</th>
<th>Agents Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation Name:</strong></td>
<td>Hammerson plc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B

Q1  To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

Document name: Draft Charging Schedule

Q2  Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document

Please provide a brief summary of your comments here

Detailed statement

Please give further details and the reasons for it (continue on a separate sheet as necessary).

We refer to the Council’s Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Supplementary Paper published in May 2014, which notes that City Centre shops will not be subject to CIL. We support the requirement to exempt retail development in Leicester City Centre from CIL, and request that a footnote is included within the proposed Charging Schedule to this effect in order to ensure clarity.

The definition of retail warehousing should make reference to the fact that this type of development occurs in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations and the CIL charge should not apply to Leicester City Centre.
Q3 Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

☐

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

☐

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Q4 Please note, the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008

☐

(ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations

☐

(iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council

☐

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or e mail address

tanya.jordan@cgms.co.uk
DCS015

Ann McNamee
Interim Head of Development
Midland Heart
Paul Statham

From: Pardeep Singh
Sent: 10 March 2015 14:39
To: planning-policy
Subject: FW: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

Importance: High

Please see below comments from Midland Heart re: CIL.

Regards.

Pardeep Singh
Admin and Business Support Officer
T: (0116) 454 1755 / Int: 37 1755; Fax: (0116) 254 6905
www.leicester.gov.uk

Leicester’s King Richard Ill Visitor Centre is now open! Book your tickets at krii.com

From: Janet Callan
Sent: 10 March 2015 14:35
To: Pardeep Singh
Subject: FW: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

As discussed, please ensure MH’s comments sent to appropriate planning contact by today’s deadline.

Cheers,
Janet

Janet Callan
Housing Development Manager (Job-share, M-W)
Leicester City Council
Tel Ext: 0116 4541752
Tel Internal: 37 1752
Email: janet.callan@leicester.gov.uk

Leicester’s King Richard Ill Visitor Centre is now open! Book your tickets at krii.com

From: Pardeep Singh
Sent: 06 March 2015 09:47
To: Janet Callan
Subject: FW: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

Please see e-mail below from Ann fyi.

Pardeep Singh
Admin and Business Support Officer
T: (0116) 454 1755 / Int: 37 1755; Fax: (0116) 254 6905
www.leicester.gov.uk

Leicester’s King Richard Ill Visitor Centre is now open! Book your tickets at krii.com

From: Ann McNamee [mailto:Ann.McNamee@midlandheart.org.uk]
Sent: 06 March 2015 08:41
To: Pardeep Singh

Subject: RE: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

Thanks

Ann McNamee
Interim Head of Development
20 Bath Row, Birmingham, B15 1LZ
Tel: 0845 8501020 EXT 6317
Mob: 07795641165

---

From: Pardeep Singh [mailto:Pardeep.Singh@leicester.gov.uk]

Sent: 06 March 2015 08:33

To: Ann McNamee

Subject: RE: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

Hi Ann,

The e-mail below will do as your confirmation.

Kind regards.

Pardeep Singh
Admin and Business Support Officer
T: (0116) 454 1755 / Int: 37 1755; Fax: (0116) 254 6905
www.leicester.gov.uk

---

From: Ann McNamee [mailto:Ann.McNamee@midlandheart.org.uk]

Sent: 04 March 2015 17:33

To: Pardeep Singh

Subject: RE: Community Infrastructure Levy - LCC consultation : emh comments

Hi Pardeep. Thanks. Can you accept this e mail confirmation that this also reflects Midland Hearts views or is it better for me to reply separately?

Ta
Ann

Ann McNamee
Interim Head of Development
20 Bath Row, Birmingham, B15 1LZ
Tel: 0845 8501020 EXT 6317
Mob: 07795641165
Hi all,

Please find attached EMH’s comments on CIL consultation by Leicester City Council.

Regards.

Pardeep Singh
Admin and Business Support Officer
T: (0116) 454 1755 / Int: 37 1755; Fax: (0116) 254 6905
www.leicester.gov.uk

Leicester's King Richard Ill Visitor Centre is now open! Book your tickets at kriii.com

Dear both,

We touched on the consultation which is underway on the CIL charging proposals (deadline for comments March 10th). Jim and I agreed to send you our comments and are happy for you to circulate to the other RPs on the Affordable Homes Programme Board. I will send onto planning also.

Purnima Wilkinson I Head of New Business I emh group
Memorial House I Stenson Road I Coalville I Leicestershire I LE67 4JP

t. 01530 276041
m. 07767 646979
e mail address: Purnima.Wilkinson@emhgroup.org.uk
www.emhgroup.org.uk

This email, together with any attachments, is for the exclusive and confidential use of the addressee(s). Internet communications are not secure and therefore emh group and subsidiaries do not accept any legal responsibility for the content of this email. Any other use, distribution, disclosure, copying or reproduction of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the material from your computer.

East Midlands Housing Group Limited operates under the name of emh group and it's subsidiary companies are:
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Mr Andrew Piatt
Gateley LLP on behalf of the University of Leicester
Leicester City Council

Community Infrastructure Levy: Response Form
Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Monday 9th February 2015 – Tuesday 10th March 2015

This form may be photocopied or downloaded from the Councils Community Infrastructure Levy Citizen http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

Further printed copies can also be obtained from the Council by contacting Planning Policy on 0116 4542983

COMMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY 5.00 PM TUESDAY 10TH MARCH 2015.

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your Representation(s)

You can also return this form by e-mail to planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk or by post to

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (CIL DCS) Consultation, Planning Policy, 2nd Floor Halford Wing, 115 Charles Street, Leicester LE1 1ZF. Email is the Council’s preferred method of receiving comments, as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

Comments should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support or justify the comment.

The CIL regulations require that any representations made during the consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule must be submitted to the examiner together with a summary of the main issues raised. Therefore, comments cannot be treated as confidential. They will be attributed to source and made available as public documents, although personal addresses will not be made publicly available.

Leicester City Council will consider all representations made if returned by the deadline. However, please note that late representations cannot be accepted.

PART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Details</th>
<th>Agents Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Name:</td>
<td>University of Leicester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1**  
To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document name:</th>
<th>Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section, paragraph or Appendix title</td>
<td>Section 4.2 Community Infrastructure Levy Rates of the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2**  
Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document

Please provide a brief summary of your comments here

**Detailed statement**  
Please give further details and the reasons for it (continue on a separate sheet as necessary).

Please see attached document.
Q3  Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

☐

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

☐

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The University of Leicester plays a significant part in the economy within Leicester City.

Q4  

Please note, the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(i) That the draft CIL Charging Schedule has been submitted to the CIL Examiner in accordance with section 212 of the Planning Act 2008

☐

(ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations

☐

(iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council

☐

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or e-mail address
REPRESENTATIONS
ON BEHALF OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER
TO
THE LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION DOCUMENT
INTRODUCTION

The University of Leicester is a key driver of economic activity within the City and its hinterland. It is home to 23,000 students and directly employs 3,300 and indirectly supports the employment of another 4,300. Its annual turnover is in excess of £260,000,000 and that combined with its research status and ability to attract funding has a massive positive social and economic benefit to the local economy.

The accessibility of the University from the city centre and main public transport hubs and student residencies is a crucial issue for the University as are the key gateways to the main University road campus.

The availability and quality of student accommodation is a significant factor in encouraging students to choose the University of Leicester as the location for their further education. There is a highly competitive market in relation to student accommodation between various universities.

UNIVERSITY SCHEMES VS PRIVATE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

The University of Leicester over the past 10 years has focused largely on improving and updating its student residential bed stock rather than expanding its portfolio. However, CIL will impact on an ability to provide new student accommodation in the future.

It is important that the University is able to deliver a competitive accommodation offer as this is an important factor in most students' decision making process when choosing where to study. With the funding changes that have taken place in HE, namely the £9,000 tuition fees, students are more than ever focusing on value for money and their total university experience. Our accommodation is compared against other key competitors in the HE market with increased scrutiny by potential students.

The University recognises the important role that student accommodation plays in the student experience and knows that the majority of first year students, particularly those from the UK, prefer to live in for at least that first year. This is of benefit, as the University guarantee the standard of accommodation received and provides a community in which all of its residents are students at the University.

The University residences also dedicate resources from the residential estate to the Residence Life programme, our residence support system. The relationship with academic and support services across the institution cannot be replicated by private providers and supports the University's core education activities by creating a home from home environment in which residents; feel happy, can learn new skills and combine study and play as they see fit. The Residence Life programme includes a team of over 40 student peers employed by the University living in our residence to support and develop the residential community.
APPROACH TO INVESTMENT IN STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

The most recent residential development at the University has been the building of 281 bed spaces at Nixon Court, off Putney Road, in 2009. This development increased the standard of the accommodation in close proximity to the main University Road campus, an important factor for many students particularly international and postgraduate students.

The Nixon Court development was part of a broad accommodation strategy focused on delivering the best quality student accommodation offer and residential experience. The return on investment, although important to retain commercial viability, was not driven by the same profit goals as per any private commercial development. The development was not projected to generate a surplus until 6 years into the development and is projected to be well below the proposed developer’s profit within the first 10 years. If a CIL charge were added such developments would not be viable. At 9800m² a charge of nearly £1m would have been levied.

RENTAL CHARGES, POLICY AND PROCESS

The rent takes into account the wide range of added extras that are included in the fee. This includes all utilities, Wi-Fi broadband, personal contents insurance, use of the social study spaces and grounds and the Residence Life programme. This package makes direct comparison with other accommodation providers but certainly adds to the value received by the resident. A key part of the provision is to simplify the fee payment to the student so there are no hidden living costs allowing for easier budgeting and focus on their core focus studying at the University.

The University residences offer a range of contract lengths designed to best suit the requirements of the academic calendar. The University currently offers one of the shortest contracts in the accommodation market at 30 weeks including other contracts at 39 and 42 week contracts. The ability to do this benefits students, but does impact on viability. The shorter contract reduces the annual rent burden on the student and is favourable compared with PBSA contract lengths, which generally run between 42 to 52 week contracts.

The residences are required to be commercially viable and provide a positive contribution to the University. This contribution is wholly integrated in the University to support its teaching and research activities, a factor that should not be underestimated. The benefits, which the University already contributes to its city and community such as health and education, would be directly affected, with knock-on effects to the overall impact on the growth of the local economy.
THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK
The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations as amended provide that in setting the rates of community infrastructure levy,

"a charging authority must strike an appropriate balance"

between the desirability of funding infrastructure from CIL and the potential effects of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development.

The economic viability of delivering student accommodation by the University will be adversely affected by the imposition of the CIL charge at the rate proposed, or indeed at any lower rate. The inability to provide student accommodation viably will have a significant impact upon the University and in turn upon the contribution that the University is able to make to the wider economy and social structure of the City of Leicester. An imposition of a CIL charge at the level proposed is therefore contrary to regulation 14 because there would not be the required balance.

Guidance is provided in relation to these issues in the National Planning Practice Guidance and attention is drawn particularly to paragraph references ID 25-008-20140612 and ID 25-009-20140612. The former paragraph addresses the requirement to strike an appropriate balance and the latter paragraph considers what is meant by that. The guidance notes that the aim of the Community Infrastructure Levy is to have a positive economic effect on development and that charging authorities must be able to show and explain how the proposed levy will contribute towards implementation of development.

In this particular instance the proposed levy on student accommodation will not contribute towards the achievement of development but indeed will make development non-viable which will frustrate the ability of the University to provide further student accommodation and in terms frustrate its ability to contribute to the social economic structure of the City of Leicester.

That consequence is clearly contrary to the Planning Practice Guidance which indicates that the ability to develop out viably should not be threatened. That in turn relies upon the National Policy Framework and in particular paragraphs 173-177 which deal with “ensuring viability and deliverability”. This threat to the viable deliverability of student accommodation developments is quite clearly contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance and in turn to the statutory requirements within the regulations.

VIABILITY
The University notes that in relation to the representations that it made on the preliminary draft schedule consultation the Council asserts that the level of charge has been set in accordance with viability evidence.
The University has instructed surveyors on its behalf to review the viability position which is set out within the “CIL Viability Study Update” of December 2014. Section 8 of that deals with student accommodation and sets out a viability appraisal of an indicative scheme. The University does not accept the income and cost components of that appraisal and consequently does not accept its conclusions.

The position of the University is that a Community Infrastructure Levy at the rate proposed will render accommodation schemes non-viable. Detailed technical evidence will be produced at the examination in public to justify the University’s position.

The Council in its response states:

“Other local authorities with student accommodation are charging the appropriate rates for their respective area.”

Whether the authorities are, or are not, charging CIL is irrelevant for the purposes of the application of the statutory test in regulation 14. The exercise is specific to the Council area of the City of Leicester; it is irrelevant what is being charged in other authority areas. The Regulation 14 test is specific to the infrastructure funding within the City of Leicester and the effects of CIL upon the delivery and viability of development within the City of Leicester.

THE NATURE OF THE ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED
The nature of accommodation which is provided by the University to students is accommodation which is akin to social housing and hence as a matter of principle should not be subject to the charging of Community Infrastructure Levy.

CHARITABLE POSITION
The University is a charity and hence is exempt from the requirement to pay Community Infrastructure Levy under the provisions of Regulation 43 because it is a charitable institution and the chargeable development will be used wholly or mainly for charitable purposes, namely the provision of education.

The Charging Schedule should therefore make it clear that any accommodation provided by or on behalf of the University is exempt from Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Charging Schedule could, alternatively, provide for a zero rate per square metre for student residential accommodation provided by the University, as distinct from student residential accommodation provided by other providers.
TIMING OF THE DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

It is noted that the Charging Schedule is being brought forward at a time when the City Council is at a very early preparatory stage of the preparation of its Local Plan with the Local Plan issues and options consultation only just having completed its period for representations. In the circumstances it is premature to bring forward a Charging Schedule at this stage in any event and not in accordance with paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

THE REGULATION 123 LIST

The Regulation 123 List is included within Appendix 5. The issue highlighted above in relation to the synchronisation of the Community Infrastructure Levy with the Local Plan is particularly emphasised in the context of the Regulation 123 list which sets out infrastructure which is to be brought forward in accordance with the Plan and to be funded in whole or in part by the Community Infrastructure Levy. Clearly it is inappropriate to do these matters where the Community Infrastructure Levy is ahead of the Local Plan.

The University does not accept the Regulation 123 List as presently drawn up. The University in recognition of the importance of its presence and activities to the social and economic strength of the City of Leicester believes that the project should incorporate projects which will enhance accessibility and connectivity between the University and the City Centre and public transport hubs and student accommodation areas, together with improving the gateways to the main University Road Campus. To that end a series of specific proposals should be incorporated in the Regulation 123 List to do that:

(a) enhance access from the railway station in London Road to University Road;
(b) improve pedestrian and cycling connections between University Road and the City Centre;
(c) rationalise the junction of Welford Road and University Road to make a right turn movement so facilitating access;
(d) improve pedestrian and cycling connections between Freemens Common, Nixon Court, Putney Road, Welford Road and University Road;
(e) insofar as they are within the City of Leicester improve pedestrian, cycling and public transport connections between Victoria Park, University Road and the Odeby Student Village.
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Michael Lambert
Growth and Design Officer
Leicestershire Police
Dear Planning Policy

Thank you for consulting me at this stage. I attach our previous consultation responses. I have read through the additional/changed documents on your website.

We deploy about half of our assets to provide for the safety of the City community. Crime rates and Policing demand are higher there than anywhere else in our sub region. Growth in the city population will have particular impacts on Policing.

NPPF is clear about the role of Planning to deliver infrastructure and Community safety features along with the need for co-operation between LPAs and infrastructure providers. CIL guidance likewise is clear that Policing infrastructures/facilities are eligible to be included.

We have expressed a concern about the infrastructure base the City are using to justify CIL. This dates back to before the Core Strategy was adopted in 2010 and the debate then about levels of growth and the trigger of necessary infrastructures. Subsequent work identified by the Inspector has not taken place and there have been no developer contributions to Policing to mitigate the impact of growth in the City. That is of particular concern in relation to the City’s Greenfield 3500 home scheme at Ashton Green now commenced and beyond the scope of this CIL proposal.

Although revisions to your Core Strategy have recently been made the Base for infrastructure planning is still the pre 2010 assessment. This is out of date in our view. In part this depended upon prior work in the GIA assessment which identified policing needs beyond what is in the Core Strategy and certainly within the ambit of CIL. As important, the very large infrastructure projects triggered by, and dependent upon, major new development and re investment, dwarfed the day to day needs of services like police. These are predicated upon the need to maintain existing levels of service, and the infrastructure this depends upon, to an increased population. They were not step change improvements of the order of those in the Assessment. Police infrastructure needs are comparatively small against what will be required to complete new development however the sums are large for Police. On the other side of the coin the potential community safety repercussions of a police service unable to access these small sums will be significant in our view.

Police have sought to bring your infrastructure schedule up to date by providing a robust assessment of our objectively assessed needs against the additional 2772 residual population proposed, the subject of the Core Strategy and CIL. Provided to the Council on the 30/10/14, that assessment has considered our funding position identifying an infrastructure gap of £1882551 relating to our equipment and IT needs, vehicles and premises. Unfortunately that up to date assessment does not feature in the Council’s latest draft charging schedule. By contrast a single premises project in one part of the City appears and is drawn from the pre 2010 infrastructure assessment. The policing part of the funding gap identified by the Council is 0.38%. Meeting the up to date and objectively assessed Police needs will increase the Police content of this gap to 1.3%.

The view of police is that the Charging schedule and project list should include this level of resourcing for Police if the additional impacts of growth are to be mitigated through CIL. Without this the level of Policing to the City will be reduced as police struggle to spread existing asset deployment to meet the additional demands of an additional population.

Turning to the revised viability testing there is nothing therein to suggest that meeting the up to date objectively assessed needs of police through CIL will adversely impact the viability of new development.
Police nationally have taken advice on the operation of CIL and particularly the relationship between what is sought by providers/the Charging schedule and the funding decisions of the LPA on allocation of CIL. Ian Dove QC advised

“Regulation 61 enlarges the powers of the charging authority to include for the reimbursement of expenditure which has already been incurred. Obviously the detailed administration of funds raised through CIL may vary from authority to authority but plainly it would be perverse for a charging authority having levied monies against a CIL schedule in which Police contributions featured to then fail to pass that element of the levy on which was intended to support the provision of further Police infrastructure”

Conclusion

In all the above circumstances Police are of the view that the draft charging schedule and projects list should be changed to include what is identified in our up to date OAN and that CIL should be levied on this basis and passed by the Council to meet the additional costs Police will face as a result of additional growth it is pursuing.

Best regards

Michael Lambert
Growth and Design Officer
Leicestershire Police
michael.lambert@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk
0116 248 2201

Been subject to a crime? Or want to prevent one from happening? Go to www.leics.police.uk/support

Internet email is not to be treated as a secure means of communication. Leicestershire Police monitors all internet email activity and content.

This communication is intended for the addressee(s) only. Please notify the sender if received in error. Unauthorised use or disclosure of the content may be unlawful. Opinions expressed in this document may not be official policy.

Thank you for your co-operation.

(c) Leicestershire Police
Greetings Andrew

Paul Dawkins and I recently met with your planning colleagues and I believe you were instrumental in setting this up and we are grateful for this. He has asked me to follow up to offer our position and thoughts post that meeting.

CIL infrastructure projects list. City Council are going to rely on the Core Strategy infrastructure list for this content. We appreciate that is for you to decide however this was prepared at least 4 years ago. At the Examination a lot of time was spent by the inspector on the deliverability of the housing proposed. We were told at the meeting that the reality is that delivery levels are now well below what was expected then. It seems to us that this must impact on housing trajectory and infrastructure requirements to time in the Core Strategy. These circumstances may point to the need to review what is necessary.

I attach our up to date assessment of infrastructure need relating to the residual 2772 additional homes to be the subject of CIL across the City. It would be good to work with other infrastructure providers on similar up dates. We are however demonstrating that bringing the schedule/projects list up to date is possible even in the timescale you are working to on CIL.

The projects in the IPL are very large indeed and it would be good to understand how this limited residual requirement triggers infrastructure necessary to support the development of the area.

The new Local Plan. With an up to date SHMAA reflecting these trends and a requirement to include infrastructure in the Plan perhaps this might be the best opportunity to provide the necessary update and best infrastructure information to inform your CIL charging schedule.

The Police example and viability. Thank you for including one of our premises projects identified in the Examination back in 2009 however comparing this with our current objective assessment demonstrates how much things have changed since then. We will need to find circa £1.8m just to maintain our service to meet the demands of this residual/additional growth and in our funding situation look to CIL for this. That will increase your CIL funding gap and Police content therein from 0.38% to 1.3%. I need to ask whether this very small increase will significantly impact the viability testing that you have carried out? My view is that this isn’t the case and that the schedule could be amended however I would like to hear your view please.

What CIL might yield to policing. Based on the expectation of your colleagues and what is currently in your proposals CIL might yield £1575 PA to meet Policing needs. Even against the single project you have identified what, realistically, would you expect us to deliver with this against the needs we have identified if this additional housing is to be adequately Policed. Related what is the attraction of CIL to the City Council and what would you expect it to pay for?

Reg 123. I understand that it is this that is driving your proposals at this time. We are very concerned about the unexpected impact of this on our s106 work and ACPO nationally have taken legal advice on it and are likely to pursue representations to Government. We would be happy to look at this with you alongside the other matters I have raised here and in a spirit of Partnership. The current deadline needs to be extended including consideration of removing it until councils adopt charging regimes.

We were looking for an understanding of these issues and some consideration in the next round of your process. It would be good to hear from you about this before this takes place if possible please.

Underpinning all this is the reality that the daily Quality of Life for City residents means a greater dependence on Policing than anywhere else in our sub region. We can’t underestimate this in looking at what CIL might provide for.

To confirm I have provided Geoff Mee with our up to date assessment of needs for Ashton Green and hope to hear from him soon re meeting conditions there.

Best regards
Michael Lambert
Growth and Design Officer
Leicestershire Police
michael.lambert@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk
0116 248 2201
Greetings Paul

Thank you for making contact and seeking comments about your proposals for CIL. I now offer my comments on this first round of consultation and on behalf of Leicestershire Police. As you will see as an essential infrastructure provider we do believe that some dialogue is overdue on our involvement in CIL and I would appreciate your dates in order to commence this and to cover the issues I raise.

The overarching back drop to the need for Planning to secure and deliver infrastructure is provided by NPPF. You will see that I am attaching two recent contribution requests we have made in the City and you will find therein our synopsis of what NPPF has to say on this. In particular NPPF para 162 perhaps provides the encouragement to work together on infrastructure planning. You will see that I have already asked for discussion of what we will need to adequately serve your Ashton Green development. That needs to happen asap please.

I think it would be helpful to outline a little of the journey we have been engaged in re Infrastructure Planning for Leicester City. As you acknowledge Police made an effort to support the GIA that Councils commissioned back in 2008. The Executive Report concluded at para 82 in relation to Policing that "It is sensible to assume that most of the capital requirements incurred by growth will not be covered by existing mainstream central and local funding". In the concluding sessions on this work a number of providers including Police highlighted the number of large expensive transport projects that made up the overwhelming bulk of the list and also that, by comparison, services like Police, who are working to maintain existing service levels through growth, appeared to have minimal needs. The difficulty was captured by the Judge in the recent Lubbesthorpe JR decision * Police have statutory responsibilities to carry out and although the sums at stake are small in comparison with what will be required to complete the development the sums are large for Police “.

*Our first comment is therefore to seek some dialogue with the City Council about how CIL will address this difficulty and ensure that the infrastructure we need is provided through such an environment. To illustrate the point what you do identify as far as policing is concerned at £450k is only some 0.38% of the total infrastructure cost in the projects list. Is there any real prospect for your CIL to deliver anything like this and especially bearing in mind there will be no charge in the SRA which is precisely the area Mansfield house is serving in some of its functions?*

In October 2009 we provided information about the impact of growth proposed in your Core Strategy on Policing and at the Examination we made a series of submissions to substantiate this and in particular to demonstrate that the GIA could not be the definitive infrastructure Plan for the City and that other infrastructures needed to be considered. The Inspector agreed requiring an amended Appendix 7 infrastructure schedule which included Mansfield Hose as well as expansion of our facilities at Beaumont Leys and Keyham Lane in response to growth. In her report the Inspector said that “the plan is not the end of the matter....that refinement of requirements for Policing and other infrastructure will take place through subsequent plans and negotiations on developer contributions....and that the council will collaborate with the police and other infrastructure Providers to devise an appropriate framework for the negotiation of developer contributions to the provision of infrastructure”. I followed up on this expectation on a number of occasions in respect of the developer guidance you were committed to prepare and indeed seeking further information on your preparations for CIL. I have not received a response to these approaches and it is the case, despite the inspectors findings, that Policing Infrastructure Planning ceased in this regard at that time.

*Our second comment is therefore a query as to how up to date the Infrastructure Planning is in relation to growth proposed in the City? The normal assumption, bearing in mind the up to date expectation in NPPF, should be that this process was either followed up after 2010 when the plan was adopted or at any point since. I see from the Projects List that there has been a review and I wonder when the Council will work with Police on this. Third in view of the lack
of any review work to date and, if for no other reason than the Inspectors findings and your adopted infrastructure Schedule, it would be good to hear, hopefully through a dialogue, why only works to Mansfield House are identified in the project list. I do understand that this is to demonstrate that there is a funding gap however some testing of the list is perhaps necessary if it is to be considered robust and up to date. It is the case that, just in relation to premises, our needs have changed over this period anyway eg in the development of our facility at Euston Street as the Emergency response hub for the City. Further, growth in other parts of the City, outside planned locations, may warrant expansion of our local premises beyond Mansfield House. How will your CIL proposals capture these changes and when should we discuss this?

We have moved on in our infrastructure work anyway and under advice have prepared our objective, up to date and robust assessments of the infrastructure needs related to Planning documents across our area. At Melton this information and the lack of attention paid to it was part of the reason that plan was found to be unsound. At Hinckley the Planning Inspector has required a Main Modification to include adequate Policing infrastructure identified through this approach. At NWL and Charnwood, agreed Infrastructure schedules and topic papers have contained what we will need to serve planned growth. Core Strategies at Blaby, Oadby and Wigston and Harborough include what we will need. The methodology we have used has been found to be CIL compliant on all occasions it has been challenged. We have applied this to your proposed development at Ashton Green indicating an infrastructure gap of £2.8m on a 3500 home scheme and at Hamilton indicating a gap of £45k on a 73 unit scheme. Applying this methodology to the City wide housing growth that CIL will apply to, 2772 homes, suggests the Police funding gap at some £1.79m or about 4 times what you currently include for us. Our methodology goes beyond just premises to consider vehicles, [also identified in the GIA report], communications systems, IT systems, personal equipment and CCTV. We have taken legal advice from Ian Dove QC on the applicability of these infrastructures to CIL and s106 and this has been distributed to all local Councils. I can supply again if this will assist you.

Suffice to say that this together with our work to identify impacts and mitigations has been sufficient to justify our s106 requests, local Plan content and indeed, in relation to Rutland what we will require from CIL. Related are the ongoing changes to CIL to widen its application eg to maintenance and other infrastructures and we believe our objective assessment and wider application of contributions, beyond just premises, is supported by this. This all prompts our next comment which is to understand how this up to date, objective and robust information will be used to justify and inform what is in the CIL infrastructure list and necessary update of this not only to inform the funding gap issue but to prompt the necessary agreement of what CIL will be spent on. We say that this is all relevant evidence which should form the basis for preparing the schedule. Further that any attempt to limit expenditure to just police premises in the face of this current position will be too much of a constraint especially if there is likely to be a need to prioritise items.

We asked Mr Dove to look at this as well and he concluded “Regulation 61 enlarges the powers of the charging authority to include for the reimbursement of expenditure which has already been incurred. Obviously the detailed administration of funds raised through CIL may vary from authority to authority but plainly it would be perverse for a charging authority having levied monies against a CIL schedule in which Police contributions featured to then fail to pass that element of the levy on which was intended to support the provision of further Police infrastructure” We would appreciate your assurances in these respects in view of what you say at para 36 of the projects list and 2.5 in the supplementary paper. With regard to the comparatively small amount likely to be dedicated to policing we do not believe that increasing that content from 0.3% to 1.2% of the overall infrastructure cost in order to include all our compliant items will in itself suggest any significant additional viability impact. Would you agree?

Springing from our analysis and in comparison with impacts and mitigations elsewhere in our sub region it is clear that Policing the City consumes nearly as much Policing resource as that deployed to all the other areas combined. 47% of total call demand comes from the City, The equivalent of 47% of our workforce either work directly in the City or deliver parts of their work to assist City policing. 49% of all recorded crime in our area occurs in the City. City crime rate to households is one incident per year to 25 households as opposed to 1 to 54 beyond it. Clearly the Life of the City depends on adequate policing far more than any other area and in a similar vein the quality of the daily life of city residents and occupiers depends more on adequate policing than elsewhere. If anything these dependencies demonstrate the importance of maintaining the police service through growth rather than effectively reducing it by allowing additional un mitigated development. We would appreciate your assurances as to how what you show as regards meeting Policing needs through CIL, will make an effective contribution to this.

It is clear that viability assessment is having a significant effect on the anticipated CIL rates and receipts and this would apply even if the charging list was more up to date. This was a factor in the GIA work at the outset of the global banking and credit crisis. Since then we have also endured recession and ongoing austerity in the public sector. Because of these factors the current anticipated total CIL receipt from 2772 houses is £5.5m yet current s106 receipts is £689k pa. With this in mind we would appreciate a dialogue on the value and contribution that CIL in the City will genuinely make. Whilst the principles of CIL and the shortcomings of s106 in service planning are obvious, and indeed we support the former because of this, we are unclear as to the particular case for CIL that would apply in the City over and above that evidenced for continuing your s106 regime. An update of the viability work to reflect improvement in the economy and projections based on further improved economic performance might be a useful aid
Looking at the Policing content of s106 contributions, which is zero despite the forces best efforts, will CIL make any difference to this? Whilst reg 123 and the “5 and out rule” might drive the City Council to CIL as the only option, as far as policing is concerned we may still have better prospects in the s106 regime however that will depend on the ability of the City to deliver. There has been no progress so far. The applicability of that rule is likely to change in the next Parliament anyway, as it has relatively recently. ACPO are taking advice on the impact of “5 and out”. Again a dialogue would be useful on this.

To conclude then we ask for a constructive dialogue to consider these comments and adequate Policing infrastructure to support growth you propose. The Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable will be meeting your Chief Executive and Leader in the near future and it seems to me that this subject could be a good one to highlight within the discussions.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards

Michael Lambert
Growth and Design Officer
Leicestershire Police
michael.lambert@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk
0116 248 2201

From: Paul Statham [mailto:Paul.Statham@leicester.gov.uk]
Sent: 28 May 2014 12:24
To: planning-policy
Subject: Leicester City Council - Community Infrastructure Levy – Consultation on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

The Council intends to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and is in the process of preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. CIL is a new charge that local authorities can place on new development. The levy will be used to fund infrastructure to support growth. Before a Charging Schedule can be adopted by the Council it must be subject to two rounds of consultation and an examination in public. This is the first stage of the consultation process. The Council has prepared a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) along with the supporting evidence base documents. The PDCS sets out the proposed charging rates for Leicester. The Council invites comments on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents.

The consultation period runs from Wednesday 28th May 2014 and ends on Thursday 10th July 2014 at 5.00pm.

The summary PDCS, a PDCS supplementary document (which includes a draft instalments policy), CIL Infrastructure Projects List, Draft Regulation 123 List and supporting documents can be viewed on the Council’s website:

http://www.leicester.gov.uk/your-council-services/ep/planning/plansandguidance/cil/

Copies of the PDCS documents are available at all City Council customer service centres and can be accessed at all public libraries via the free internet access provided there.

You can comment by:


- By writing to: The Planning Policy Team, PDCS Consultation, Leicester City Council, A 11 New Walk Centre, Welford Place, Leicester LE1 6ZG
The PDCS contains a number of questions on which the Council would like your views. Please be aware that your comments will be published on the Council’s website together with your name.

Regards

Jeevan Dhesi
Planning Policy
Leicester City Council
Tel: 0116 454 2983

• By email: planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk
Att Mike Richardson,
Leicester City Council,
Planning,
New Walk Centre,
Welford Place,
Leicestershire,
LE1 6ZG.

16/4/14

Dear Mr Richardson.

RE: Ashton Green growth Point. 3,500 dwellings, employment and related infrastructure.

I refer to the recent application to vary conditions here and I note that this was permitted despite objections raised by Police. If you recall we were concerned that the former condition to meet the Policing needs of the development through its phases was being abandoned for something which was geared to secure built community facilities. In considering this your conclusions were “I consider a strategic approach to the delivery of community and governance facilities will see an appropriate level of facilities provided at suitable times within the overall build timeframe” and “Whilst the requirement for meeting the policing needs of the development is not contained within its own specific condition, its inclusion in the community condition still secures adequate provision to meet the policing needs of the development. I consider the deletion of the condition to be acceptable”. I am concerned that the new wording [condition 29 page 36] doesn’t actually say this and further that no reason is given in the report as to why deletion of the bespoke condition was necessary. Nevertheless in an attempt to move things forward I thought it would be helpful to apply what is currently regarded as our compliant request approach to this development to identify Policing impacts and necessary mitigations.
The nature of the development
The application seeks to develop a number of open fields to north west of the City as an urban extension. 3500 houses are proposed together with an area for employment development, schools and medical facilities as well as access, open space and other infrastructures. Illustrative plans show that the development will be aimed at family occupation with a mix of uses not dissimilar to those in the surrounding area. This existing development locality provides a reliable basis for gathering “baseline” data in terms of policing demand and deployment.

Current levels of local Policing demand
Policing is a 24/7 service resourced to respond and deploy on an "on demand" and "equal access" basis and is wholly dependent on a range of facilities for staff to deliver this. Calls and deployments via our control room at Force Headquarters Enderby are monitored and can give an indication of the level of service demand in different areas such as to the 19520 existing households in the Beaumont Leys LPU and the 6459 households in the Beaumont Leys beat [C03].

In the 2011 year we dealt with 73564 calls from the Beaumont Leys LPU area, we dispatched emergency attendances to 13616 locations and non emergency follow ups to 3464 addresses. Attributing to the CO3 beat 24276 calls were handled, emergency attendances were sent to 4493 addresses and there were 1143 non emergency attendances.

The site represents most of the north of this beat which is undeveloped unlike the the south of the beat which has large areas of residential, retail and commercial development. Crime incidents are concentrated in the built areas of the beat with 1722 recorded incidents in the last year. Crime mapping shows an even but dense spread of incidents across the adjoining areas with burglary and theft the main content. There is a concentration of incidents at the Beaumont Leys shopping centre where local people visit and shop. Forcewide the total crime level has been static since late 2011. Burglary levels rose late last year to a 3
year high. Levels of theft remain static. Turning to the beat Total crime and theft has remained static over this period however has been increasing steadily in the last year. The trend in local burglaries reflects that Force wide. Police also deal with Anti Social Behaviour incidents with 1009 of these in the beat in the 2011 year.

Perhaps a further demonstration of response to demand is the regular patrolling of the locality and local community contact maintained by the Neighbourhood Policing team located at the Beaumont Leys LPU building.

**Current levels of deployment and infrastructures to Police Charnwood District.**

*Staff* delivering Policing to the Beaumont Leys LPU area are spread across the following functions:

- 66 staff in the Neighbourhood team operating from Beaumont Leys LPU station.
- 77 staff in the City Basic Command Unit at Mansfield House Leicester City Centre, delivering response Policing, investigations, intelligence, and LPU management
- in delivery teams mainly at Force HQ Enderby - Criminal justice including courts case management and prisoner detention and processing, control centre/contact management, Intelligence research, Operations planning, dogs and firearms, special branch, forensic, Road Policing, Workshops/garages, Tactical Support Group, Road Safety Unit, IT and communications, Safeguarding/ vulnerability, Child abuse team, Economic crime team and in Regional/major crime working.
- in organisational support functions at Force HQ Enderby providing finance, human resources, welfare, estates, training and top level management of the Force. 158 staff are employed delivering these later two functions to the LPU area.

301 staff deliver Policing to The Beaumont Leys area.
Because of the integrated nature of Policing - there no longer being one local police station serving all the local need - all these functions will be called upon to deliver Policing to the proposed development. Across our 301 staff employed to deliver Policing to Beaumont Leys, Policing an existing development of this size would fully occupy 54 members of staff. Staffing levels are under constant review to ensure that minimum acceptable numbers are deployed to meet existing levels of Policing demand. This has the benefit of much needed savings in costs, but as a result there is no additional capacity to extend existing staffing to cover additional development.

Where additional development is proposed we will seek to deploy additional staffing and additional infrastructures at the same level that is required to deliver Policing to the locality. It would be complacent not to do this because without additional support unacceptable pressure will be put on existing staff and our capital infrastructures which will seriously undermine our ability to meet the Policing needs of this development and maintain the current level of Policing to the rest of the local beats and across Beaumont Leys and the wider City area. The impacts of the development are so significant that they cannot be met without additional staff deployed at a level consistent with the current Policing of the locality of the development.

The following infrastructure is required for all Policing activities in Leicester City.

- **Personal equipment for staff** comprising workstations, radios, protective equipment, uniforms and bespoke training in the use of these. In general we retain this equipment when existing staff leave and are replaced however additional staff will require additional equipment. There are practical limits to the extent to which existing equipment can be reused eg with uniforms or where technology has moved on.

- **Police vehicles** of varying types and functions covering existing patterns of development and community demand. The 36 fully equipped vehicle fleet
is kept at a level to meet existing patterns of demand from the LPU with reductions made whenever possible. Vehicles are used by staff on patrol, deployed to deal with emergency responses and for follow up of recorded crimes eg by Scene of Crimes Officers. There is no capacity in this deployment for increases to meet the demands of this development.

**Radio cover** in the form of a number of base stations sufficient to cover the existing pattern of development and investment in hardware, signal strengthening etc to ensure the capacity of this system to meet existing call levels costs £20,000 pa.

**Police National Database** is a vital tool for law enforcement purposes with hardware costs to ensure this capacity at £10976 pa in Beaumont Leys. The system is now at planned capacity including dealing with 1561 hits pa as a result of Policing the existing communities there.

**Control room telephony** We employ 20 staff to take and deploy responses to calls from Beaumont Leys. The control centre is maintained to capacity use and there are particular times when our telephony runs close to overload eg at weekends and evenings.

**CCTV technologies** including 12 ANPR cameras at strategic road locations in the City to detect crime related vehicle movements. In addition two mobile CCTV units are deployed with local partners to detect and deter crime at hotspots in the locality. Cameras have in the past been deployed as funding has permitted, including s106 receipts, in an attempt to cover the existing pattern and size of development. There is no capacity to meet the additional demands that growth places upon these. New developments should benefit from the same technology as elsewhere in the Police District where it has been shown to detect and deter crime.
**Premises** sufficient to accommodate the staff and services outlined above in Beaumont Leys LPU, Mansfield House BCU City Centre and Force HQ Enderby. The Force have an active estates review function minimising our premises need to meet existing Policing demand. We just can't afford to have buildings under used and will dispose of these wherever necessary using receipts to re invest where there are known difficulties. The existing LPU, BCU and HQ premises are used to capacity and this is maintained through the processes I have described. All will need to be extended to accommodate additional staff as a result of the development.

At Force HQ a number of specialist functions and support teams are located at our 11 hectare site. It is typical for our control room to be at capacity at peak times and where 20 existing staff are employed to process existing calls from Beaumont Leys. Additional staff will need to be employed to take additional calls from the new development and to deploy our resources as responses to these. These additional staff will need to be accommodated.

**Other capital infrastructures** such as specialist equipment in use by Forensics, our tactical teams eg in firearms and dog handling, freestanding IT and data recording in relation to vulnerable groups, prisoner detention, transportation and processing including cells at core locations. We do not seek contributions towards these infrastructures at this stage since they have some spare capacity to deploy.

**The disposition of Leicestershire Police as regards major growth development**

A primary issue for Leicestershire Police is to ensure that new development of this scale makes adequate provision for the future Policing needs that it will generate. Like some other public services our primary funding is insufficient to be able to add capital infrastructures to support major new development when and wherever this occurs. Further there are no bespoke capital funding regimes, eg
like Building Schools for the Future or the Health Lift, to provide capital re
investment in our facilities. We fund capital infrastructures by borrowing.
However, in a service where over 90% of our budget is staffing related, our
capital programme can only be used to overcome pressing issues with our
existing facilities eg premises replacement Loughborough, or to re provide
essential facilities like vehicles once these can no longer be used. This situation
has been recognised by the Association of Chief Police Officers nationally for
some time and there are public statements which explain our particular funding
difficulties. The position of Police funding was examined and verified by external
consultants employed by Local Councils - The Leicestershire Growth Impact
Assessment of 2009 which concluded at para 82 in relation to Policing “It is
sensible to assume that most of the capital requirements incurred by growth will
not be covered by existing mainstream central and local funding”.

Faced with unprecedented levels of growth being proposed across our sub
region Leicestershire Police have resolved to seek developer contributions to
ensure that existing levels of service can be maintained as this growth takes
place. We are a regular and constant participant in the statutory Planning
process evidencing the impact of growth through work with local Councils in their
Plan making, preparation of guidance, preparations for CIL and the consideration
of individual Planning applications including attendance at appeals. Police
nationally encourage this approach to offset the impact of growth on the Police
service.

The Policing impact of 3500 additional houses at the site.
The proposed development will increase the overnight population of this
settlement by 9345 people. It is a fact that 3500 additional dwellings will bring
additional Policing demands and particularly as there is no Policing demand from
the existing site as open fields. I do not doubt that there will be a corresponding
increase in crime and demand from new residents for Policing services across a
wide spectrum of support and intervention as they go about their daily lives at the
site, in the locality and across the Policing sub region. There will be a significant
daytime population swelled by employees and users of the facilities to be built on the site.

Empirical data based on existing crime patterns, and policing demand and deployment from existing residential areas in the local beat indicates the direct and additional impacts of the development on local Policing that will be manifested in demand and responses in the following areas -

- 13,300 additional calls and responses per year via our control centre.
- Attendance to an additional 2573 emergency events within the proposed development and locality each year.
- 625 additional non emergency events to follow up with public contact each year.
- 933 additional recorded crimes in the development and locality per year based on beat crime and household data. In addition 547 recorded anti social behaviour incidents each year within the new development and locality.
- The demand for increased patrol cover.
- Additional vehicle use relating to 13 additional vehicles over a 6 year period.
- Additional calls on our Airwaves system where our funding seeks to maintain capacity for call demand at current levels.
- Additional use of our PND systems to process and store crime records and intelligence and based on existing levels of use equating to 280 additional hits and data entries per year.
- Additional demand for deployment of Mobile CCTV technologies
- Additional demand for local access to beat staff from the Beaumont Leys LPU.
- Additional Policing cover and interventions in all the areas described when considering staffing and functions above and for additional accommodation from which to deliver these.
Planning Policy justifications for a Policing contribution

The National Policy position to support our request exists in NPPF. Securing sufficient facilities and services to meet local needs is a Core Planning Principle [para 17]. Planning is to deliver facilities and services that communities need [para 70] and Supplementary Planning documents can assist applicants in this. Plan policies should deliver the provision of security infrastructure and other local facilities [para 156]. Plan policy and decision making should be seamless [para 186]. Infrastructure Planning should accompany development planning by LPAs [177] who should work collaboratively with infrastructure Providers [162]. NPPF seeks environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life and community cohesion [58] and Planning Policies and decisions should deliver this.

Leicester City CS Policy 19 forms local policy justification for a policing contribution and through the Examination of your Core Strategy policing requirements, accepted as primary, feature in the attached infrastructure schedule. These include works to Mansfield House and the LPU at Beaumont Leys to accompany growth proposed at Aston Green.

The City Council are aware of the Policing impact of additional development through Police submissions to the Core Strategy Examination and Planning applications with significant additional housing content. In relation to Ashton Green the City Council have recognised that Policing needs should be met through the phases of the development. Police have made approaches to City Council officers dealing with CIL with no response. A consistent approach will be pursued here following guidance in the CIL Regulations and NPPF. This is an approach recognised in recent public Examinations of Core Strategies where soundness of Plans is dependent on provisions for adequate infrastructure to accompany growth proposed.

The Police contribution request
£2,840,072 is sought to mitigate the additional impacts of this development because our existing infrastructures do not have the capacity to meet these and because, like some other services, we do not have the funding ability to respond to growth whenever and wherever proposed. We anticipate using rates and Home Office revenues to pay for staff salaries and our day to day routine additional costs [eg call charges on telephony and Airwaves, vehicle maintenance and so on]. As already confirmed these sources do not have the capacity to fund additional borrowing for additional capital infrastructures necessitated by the development.

Police expect to agree a programme to procure these additional facilities and have no difficulty including this as a clause in a legal agreement. We are committed to procure these items subject to the contribution sought. Contributions are only sought that are related in scale and kind to the development.

As a further justification of our request, we confirm that the contribution will be used wholly to meet the direct impacts of this development and wholly in delivering Policing to it. Without the development in place it is reasonable to forecast the impacts it will generate using information about the known Policing demands of comparable local development. Assumptions about pupil numbers and health needs similarly depend on comparables and we believe the Framework encourages this.

The development should make provision to mitigate the direct and additional Policing impacts it will generate and cannot depend on the Police to just absorb these within existing facilities with limited capacities and where Police have no flexibility in our funding to do this. This has been the situation since 2006 when Leicestershire Police started to seek contributions. It is not forced by current spending reductions although strictures across the public sector re-enforce the need to ensure that developments mitigate the direct impacts they cause.
Because of the very serious implications for Policing of very significant and large developments, like this one, Police nationally have taken advice about the best way to proceed in the transition period prior to the CIL regime. As a result Leicestershire Police no longer make requests based on a formula but solely in relation to the development under consideration; its direct impacts on Policing and the necessary mitigations that it should provide. I should add that this is consistent with Inspectors views in recent appeal decisions. What follows is a detailed explanation of Methodologies used to calculate the contribution and our application of the NPPF tests to justify each part.

Mitigation of impacts and methodologies identified by Leicestershire Police

Baseline background. At October 2012 total floorspace occupied by the Force to deliver Policing to this locality and the subregion more generally was 54,274m2. We employed 3606 staff to do this. Existing households in the Police district [2011 census] was 405,500 with 19520 in Beaumont Leys. Across the Force 301 Police staff deliver Policing to the LPU area.

Households to staff for Beaumont Leys is 65:1
Floorspace to staff Forcewide is 15 m2.

Equipping staff.
Additional staff needed to Police the development will require additional equipment.
For a Police Officer the additional equipment items are uniform £873, radio £525, Workstation £1508, De Montford University foundation/basic accreditation £2333, Other external Training £2182. Uniformed officers work in shifts where workstations can be shared and as a result start up cost will be £7421 per uniformed officer.
For other staff the additional equipment items are workstation £2286 and training £687, total £2973.
We employ staff to officers at a ratio of 0.33 to 0.66 and so the average cost of equipping a new member of staff is £5879.
Because the development is forecast to generate the need to employ 54 additional members of staff the contribution for equipment should be £317466 from this new development.

The Force could not have officers attending this development with less than adequate equipment with un-necessary risks to themselves and occupiers served.

Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?
Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and the Council's Core Strategy content demonstrates this further. The Framework identifies the need to achieve security in new development and makes provisions to deliver this through the planning system. Deployment of equipped staff is fundamental to delivering community safety and mitigating crime.

Is it directly related to the development?
The Policing demands of this development are identified and Police mitigation of these can only be delivered by adequately equipped staff.

Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?
This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate are known by comparison with local residential development. That is the only satisfactory way of determining the need from development that is not yet built. Such comparables are used in identifying the impact of additional populations on most if not all public services. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Police vehicles** In managing and responding to crime a number of different vehicles can be deployed ranging General Response Vehicles[patrol cars], unmarked general support vehicles, Public Service Unit vans and minibuses,
scientific [eg SOCO] vehicles, pursuit vehicles - 4x4 and high speed, motorcycles and so on. Current fleet deployment to Beumont Leys is 36 vehicles serving 19520 existing households. The average equipped cost of a vehicles is £15,774 and this is very close to the actual cost of a GRV. Our guideline for the majority of marked vehicles is to replace every three years or 120,000 miles. The condition of vehicles at the end of their Police life varies however we forecast that we will redeem on average 10% of a vehicles original value on disposal.

36 vehicle units at net value £511077
Existing households 19520 = £26.18 per H hold x 2 to give 6 year life of provision.

In relation to this particular development additional vehicle costs to deliver Policing and meet community safety needs will be £183260. Impact of the development without the contribution will be pressure to spread existing transport too thinly to the extent that service delivery is prejudiced. Residents of the new development and their representatives will expect the same degree of cover as elsewhere in the locality and existing residents will expect existing cover to be maintained and not reduced as a result of the new development.

Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?
Vehicles are a fundamental capital infrastructure and facility to deliver community safety and address crime especially at Neighbourhood level.

Is it directly related to the development?
Fleet deployment is related to the known Policing demands of comparable development in the locality. The direct demand from the new development can be accurately forecast. Delivering Policing direct to this development will not be possible without additional vehicles to do so.
Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?

This is a residential development and the Police vehicle demands it will generate are known by comparison with deployment to other local residential development. Level of demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Radio Cover/capacity** It is necessary to expand the capacity of our existing system to cater for additional calls as a result of the development. The development will increase the use of our radio system which is maintained at existing capacity by investing in additional hardware including servers, system refinement signal strengthening and improved transmission technologies. We spend £20,000 pa adding such capacity to the existing system in Beaumont Leys which serves 19520 households. Annual cost of these capacity increases to an existing household is £1.02. Capacity improvements are expected to last for 5 years and without these the system will fail to adequately carry both existing and additional calls as a result of this additional development. The additional cost of the additional capacity in relation to houses in this development will be **£17850**.

The impact of the development on Policing with reduced Airwaves capacity will be increased attendance times, delays in message passing and the implications of this for attendance and apprehension. Occupiers and those that represent them will expect existing performance and attendance levels to be maintained.

Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?

Deployment to adequately deliver community safety and security will not be met where this is prejudiced by insufficient radio system capacity. Crime, community safety and security are Planning considerations.

Is it directly related to the development?
The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of additional radio calls, are known by comparison with similar local residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Police Database capacity.** It is necessary to expand the capacity of our existing system to cater for additional calls as a result of the development. This is a secured stand alone information source integrating a variety of data nationally and allowing this to be compared over time in relation to individuals and locations. Additional hits as a result of the development to access existing crime information and add more crime data to be accessed by more staff generate a need to add capacity to this system. The current system and access to it reached planned capacity usage this year. Dedicated hardware is used with our contribution to this at £1,456,000 through the 14 year growth period at today's prices. In addition, local servers are replaced every 2.5 years at £83k each time to add further capacity to meet the demand placed adding £464,800 to PND costs through to 2026. We spend £10976 on PND system enhancements to serve Beaumont Leys at £0.56 per household per year. Over 5 years the development should contribute **£9800.**

Failure to increase PND capacity in step with growth the subject of this application will directly impact the ability of the Force to rapidly access and respond to crime information.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*
Deployment to adequately deliver community safety and security, will not be met where this is prejudiced by insufficient capacity in the Police PND system.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is primarily a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of PND use, are known by comparison with existing local residential development. The development is not built and this is a reasonable way to forecast this impact. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Control Room telephony** Police control room call handling equipment is used to capacity at peak times. Our call handling centre at Force HQ Enderby directs all calls and deploys resources to respond and continue monitoring. We know the capacity of the technology and the calls it currently handles [fixed around minimum times with callers] and will be expected to handle as a result of the proposed development. In order to deal with additional calls as a result of additional planned development across our sub region additional telephony, lines, licenses, workstations and monitoring screens will be required at a total cost of £199,000. 8% of all calls handled relate to the 19520 households in Beaumont Leys LPU area and additional calls forecast from this development are identified. The Council proposes 3,500 additional houses for Beaumont Leys in their plan period. Each new household in the LPU area will generate a need to invest an additional £4.54 in this system. The development should contribute **£15890** towards the additional equipment needed to answer the additional calls it will generate. Police preference is to use this money when the existing telephony is extended and renewed at 2018 however this does not prevent procurement of additional capacity in the meantime as a result of the impact of this development.
There will be a call handling impact and delays in response times if we attempt to
serve this development with our current telephony systems.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning
terms?*

Crime and community safety are Planning considerations. NPPF identifies need
to achieve security in new development and makes provisions to deliver this
through the planning system. These considerations will not be met where
Policing delivery is prejudiced by insufficient telephony capacity to take calls and
deploy responses in good time.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have
been identified as have mitigations.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the
development?*

This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in
terms of use of control room telephony, are known by comparison with other local
residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the
scale of the development.

**ANPR CCTV Deployment** Police are deploying fixed ANPR cameras on main
road network and close to or in settlements. These cameras are server linked to
identify number plates of vehicles in use for crime. This type of camera offers
particular benefits to the immediate surrounding area especially where vehicle
related crime is present. We deploy these as resources permit however our
financially constrained programme makes no provision for the impacts of
additional areas of housing. The use of these technologies has a beneficial
impact in terms of minimising staff attendance. Unit cost is £8000 which includes
installation and satellite links. Additional server capacity will be required to
process and store images and integrate to PND at £222 per new camera. Police take the view that in the light of the stand alone nature of the development, the additional road links and accessibility proposed and existing crime patterns, it should fund 3 additional cameras to be sited on a main access points serving the development at **£24,666**.

Impact without this contribution will be an inability to monitor crime related vehicle movements and address incidents effectively. Our response would be less than available elsewhere in Charnwood District where this cover is provided.

**Mobile CCTV Deployment** Units are acquired as funding, including s106, permits however our financially constrained programme makes no provision for cover of additional areas of development. Cameras are deployed in partnership with other local agencies to detect and deter crime and can be moved to follow crime patterns. There are two such cameras in use in the LPU area. Typical locations are where there is an expressed fear of crime, at emerging crime hotspots that residents use eg near commercial premises, or where there are increasing levels of anti social behaviour. Unit cost is £1500 and Police pay the revenue costs for movement. Bearing in mind the location and nature of the development as previously described, purchase of three additional mobile units is required to serve the development and its hinterland at a cost of **£4500**.

Impact without this contribution will be less access to deployment of this equipment than elsewhere in Leicester City and the wider Police District, and would give rise to a lower rate of detection and deterrence of crime that would in turn have consequences for other police resources.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Policing is a Planning consideration and NPPF provides guidance about local facilities and the provision of security. Core Strategy policy and content supports this consideration. Deployment of CCTV technologies significantly increases
detection and deterrence with reduced need for staff presence and particularly contributes towards achieving community safety. This will be prejudiced where new development places additional demands on existing deployment without mitigation and the ability of these technologies to deliver safety is undermined where new development creates additional accessibility and network gaps.

Is it directly related to the development?
The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations. The nature of the development and its size and location in relation to the existing settlement and camera deployment are a direct consideration in these technologies.

Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?
This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of additional crime and vehicle movements, are known by comparison with other similar residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Premises** For Beaumont Leys Policing is delivered from the LPU, Mansfield house BCU and HQ premises. Additional staff will need to be accommodated to serve the development. Occupation of local and Force wide premises is maintained to capacity. Premises cost is amount of floorspace per staff member \([15]\) x number of staff generated by the development \([54]\) x Build and land/lost opportunity cost \(\£2794\text{pm}^2\) giving a total of \(\£2263140\) from this development. The latter is the build cost in use by Force Estates and has been externally verified by tender.

This will be spent to extend and or increase floorspace in these premises used to Police the area and in proportion to the numbers of staff located in these as described above. In relation to HQ and Forcewide premises a number of functions necessary to Police the development are already using these to
capacity. Typical of these is the Force Control room which is secured constructed, perimeter secured and attack resistant and is at capacity.

Impact of this development without premises expansion to accommodate additional staff will be an unacceptable degree of overcrowding and inefficiencies in responses and delivering Policing as a result. With the level of local Policing demand and the numbers of staff employed to meet this impact will be significant without mitigation.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and accommodating staff in the optimum location to serve the development is essential if this is to be achieved.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional staffing needs the development will generate have been established by reference to existing local deployment reflecting the actual Policing demands and crime patterns of the locality. In a similar vein the premises requirements that result from the need to accommodate additional staff at these levels is known. A direct relationship between the development, additional staffing and accommodation is demonstrated and it is appropriate to mitigate this through the planning system.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the accommodation needs of staff delivering Policing to meet local demands of development of this nature are known. It is based on the scale and kind of residential development.

**Additional Crime Prevention equipment.** This sizeable new development will increase the demand for local accessibility to Policing and the deployment of
crime prevention initiatives. We have restricted funds to deliver such initiatives to existing development to pay for equipment eg Smartwater kits[fluid, sprays, detectors] or signage for local occupiers to use. Each initiative budgets for capital expenditure of £4,000 with the developer asked to contribute £1 per new unit as a fair and proportionate contribution from this development.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*
Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and ensuring accessibility for the public to Policing is important to community safety, combating and reducing crime and the fear of crime.

*Is it directly related to the development?*
These crime prevention initiatives will specifically serve the development and a proportionate contribution towards increasing their equipment capacity is sought.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*
This is a residential development and experience with existing development locally demonstrates the need to invest in additional crime prevention measures. The contribution is based on the scale and kind of residential development.

**SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTION REQUESTED**
The Police contribution request considers the amount and type of development proposed and compares this with existing Policing demand and crime information for the beat and LPU areas in which it will be situated. The existing deployment of Police assets to Police the locality are identified and applied to the application site to forecast the impact of this individual development. The funding and capacity position of the Force is defined. NPPF and local Policy supporting a Policing contribution are identified. Commitments are made to manage the
contribution. Finally the contribution is itemised as below with individual methodologies applied to this development and the CIL tests of compliance are applied to these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start up equipment</td>
<td>£317466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>£183260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional radio call capacity</td>
<td>£17850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PND additions</td>
<td>£9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional call handling</td>
<td>£15890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR</td>
<td>£24666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile CCTV</td>
<td>£4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional premises</td>
<td>£2263140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub equipment</td>
<td>£3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2840072</strong> [£811pd]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

Without the necessary contribution the development will be unacceptable in Planning terms and permission should not be granted as indicated in NPPF Guidance. The lack of capacity in existing infrastructure to accommodate the population growth and associated demands occasioned by the development means that it is necessary for the developer of the site to provide a contribution so the situation might be remedied. The request is directly related to the development and the direct Policing impacts it will generate based on an examination of demand levels in the LPU and local beat in which it is situated, adjacent areas and existing Policing demands and deployment in relation to this. The request is wholly related to the scale and kind of the application development.

Leicestershire Police have refreshed our approach to contributions taking account of the advice of leading Counsel and recent reductions in our
deployment. We are advised that the contents of this letter are sufficient to justify the contribution sought and that the request is compliant with NPPF tests. Without the necessary contribution to meet Police needs there is a **formal objection to the development on sustainability grounds and because the development is unacceptable without the necessary contribution.**

I refer to the 7 Planning appeal decisions attached where the current approach of Police in seeking contributions was determined as compliant by Inspectors and the Secretary of State.

I confirm that the methodology employed in this request is similar to that used in all of these appeals subject of course to local data about Policing demand and deployment to each development. Policing the development will depend on all of the capital infrastructures I have identified including delivery from premises inside and outside the City again as I have described and as identified in your Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan.

My conclusion at this stage is in several parts.

a] the development will have very significant impacts on Policing and these will need to be adequately mitigated if it is to be sustainable and the safety of the local community assured. That has to be a mutual interest between the City Council and Leicestershire Police.

b] Necessary primary Policing infrastructures need to be considered in the viability of the development alongside for example schools and medical facilities.

c] Police believe the planning permission for the development as recently amended does not adequately consider nor reflect necessary infrastructures to meet Policing needs.

Please give this your consideration and I suggest that we meet at your earliest convenience to hear how the LPA will make adequate provision to meet Policing needs as a result of the development.
Without prejudice to any other obligation imposed upon it, it shall be the duty of each local authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can, to prevent crime and disorder in its area: Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
Dear Daryl Watson,

RE:  73 new dwellings Hamilton Community College.

Many thanks for consulting the Police and Crime Commissioner on this planning application. Following consistent success at Planning appeals considering additional homes on greenfield sites Police are making a contribution request in relation to this outline planning application. We are using the same methodology as deployed in all recent appeals and requests albeit with the inclusion of data about this site and locality.

The nature of the development
The application seeks to develop scrubland/playing fields for housing. 73 houses are proposed with access from an adjoining estate Road. Illustrative plans show that the development will be for family occupation similar to that in the area and being built locally. Existing development in the locality provides a reliable basis for gathering “baseline” data in terms of local policing demand and deployment.

Current levels of local Policing demand
Policing is a 24/7 service resourced to respond and deploy on an "on demand" and "equal access" basis and is wholly dependent on a range of facilities for staff to deliver this. Calls and deployments via our control room at Force Headquarters
Enderby are monitored and can give an indication of the level of service demand in different areas such as to the 25007 existing households in the Keyham Lane LPU and the 6830 households in the C 12 Humberstone Beat.

In the 2011 year we dealt with 71725 calls from the Keyham Lane LPU area, we dispatched emergency attendances to 13276 locations and non emergency follow ups to 3381 addresses. Attributing to the C 12 beat 19807 calls were handled, emergency attendances were sent to 3633 addresses and there were 958 non emergency attendances.

Open fields surrounding the site are being developed to the extent that most of the C12 beat will soon be built up. Local crime mapping reveals crime incidents spread across existing housing with incidents spreading across recently developed estates. There were 827 recorded incidents in the beat in the last year with burglary, damage and vehicle related crime the main elements. Crime mapping shows an even but dense spread of incidents across the adjoining areas with burglary, damage and vehicle crime the main content. There is a concentration of incidents at the shopping centre on Hamilton Way which local residents regularly visit. Forcewide the total crime level has been static since late 2011. Burglary levels rose late last year to a 3 year high. Levels of vehicle crime are static. Levels of damage are reducing at the moment. In the beat total crime and burglary is static, damage reducing and vehicle crime increasing. Police also deal with Anti Social Behaviour incidents with 875 of these in the beat in the 2011 year.

Perhaps a further demonstration of response to demand is the regular patrolling of the locality and local community contact maintained by the Neighbourhood Policing team located at the Keyham Lane Police Station.

**Current levels of deployment and infrastructures to the locality.**

*Staff* delivering Policing to the Keyham Lane LPU area are spread across the following functions:
- 51 staff in the Neighbourhood team operating from Keyham Lane LPU station.
- 71 staff in the City Basic Command Unit at Mansfield House Leicester City Centre, delivering response Policing, investigations, intelligence, and LPU management.
- in delivery teams mainly at Force HQ Enderby - Criminal justice including courts case management and prisoner detention and processing, control centre/contact management, Intelligence research, Operations planning, dogs and firearms, special branch, forensic, Road Policing, Workshops/garages, Tactical Support Group, Road Safety Unit, IT and communications, Safeguarding/ vulnerability, Child abuse team, Economic crime team and in Regional/major crime working.
- in organisational support functions at Force HQ Enderby providing finance, human resources, welfare, estates, training and top level management of the Force. 154 staff are employed delivering these later two functions to the LPU area.

276 staff deliver Policing to Keyham Lane LPU area.

Because of the integrated nature of Policing - there no longer being one local police station serving all the local need - all these functions will be called upon to deliver Policing to the proposed development. Across our 276 staff employed to deliver Policing to Keyham Lane, Policing an existing development of this size would occupy 80% of the time of an existing member of staff. Staffing levels are under constant review to ensure that minimum acceptable numbers are deployed to meet existing levels of Policing demand. This has the benefit of much needed savings in costs, but as a result there is no additional capacity to extend existing staffing to cover additional development.

Where additional development is proposed we will seek to deploy additional staffing and additional infrastructures at the same level that is required to deliver Policing to the locality. It would be complacent not to do this because without
additional support unacceptable pressure will be put on existing staff and our capital infrastructures which will seriously undermine our ability to meet the Policing needs of this development and maintain the current level of Policing to the rest of the local beats and across Keyham Lane and the wider City area. The impacts of the development are so significant that they cannot be met without additional staff deployed at a level consistent with the current Policing of the locality of the development.

The following infrastructure is required for all Policing activities in Leicester City.

**Personal equipment for staff** comprising workstations, radios, protective equipment, uniforms and bespoke training in the use of these. In general we retain this equipment when existing staff leave and are replaced however additional staff will require additional equipment. There are practical limits to the extent to which existing equipment can be re used eg with uniforms or where technology has moved on.

**Police vehicles** of varying types and functions covering existing patterns of development and community demand. The 34 fully equipped vehicle fleet is kept at a level to meet existing patterns of demand from the LPU with reductions made whenever possible. Vehicles are used by staff on patrol, deployed to deal with emergency responses and for follow up of recorded crimes eg by Scene of Crimes Officers. There is no capacity in this deployment for increases to meet the demands of this development.

**Radio cover** in the form of a number of base stations sufficient to cover the existing pattern of development and investment in hardware, signal strengthening etc to ensure the capacity of this system to meet existing call levels costs £15600 pa.

**Police National Database** is a vital tool for law enforcement purposes with hardware costs to ensure this capacity at £10700 pa in Keyham Lane.
The system is now at planned capacity including dealing with 2001 hits pa as a result of Policing the existing communities there.

**Control room telephony** We employ 19 staff to take and deploy responses to calls from Keyham Lane. The control centre is maintained to capacity use and there are particular times when our telephony runs close to overload eg at weekends and evenings.

**CCTV technologies** including 12 ANPR cameras at strategic road locations in the City to detect crime related vehicle movements. In addition two mobile CCTV units are deployed with local partners to detect and deter crime at hotspots in the locality. Cameras have in the past been deployed as funding has permitted, including s106 receipts, in an attempt to cover the existing pattern and size of development. There is no capacity to meet the additional demands that growth places upon these. New developments should benefit from the same technology as elsewhere in the Police District where it has been shown to detect and deter crime.

**Premises** sufficient to accommodate the staff and services outlined above in Keyham Lane LPU, Mansfield House BCU City Centre and Force HQ Enderby. The Force have an active estates review function minimising our premises need to meet existing Policing demand. We just can't afford to have buildings under used and will dispose of these wherever necessary using receipts to re invest where there are known difficulties. The existing LPU, BCU and HQ premises are used to capacity and this is maintained through the processes I have described. All will need to be extended to accommodate additional staff as a result of the development.

At Force HQ a number of specialist functions and support teams are located at our 11 hectare site. It is typical for our control room to be at capacity at peak times and where 19 existing staff are employed to
process existing calls from the Keyham Lane area. Additional staff will need to be employed to take additional calls from the new development and to deploy our resources as responses to these. These additional staff will need to be accommodated.

**Other capital infrastructures** such as specialist equipment in use by Forensics, our tactical teams eg in firearms and dog handling, freestanding IT and data recording in relation to vulnerable groups, prisoner detention, transportation and processing including cells at core locations. We do not seek contributions towards these infrastructures at this stage since they have some spare capacity to deploy.

**The disposition of Leicestershire Police as regards major growth development**

A primary issue for Leicestershire Police is to ensure that new development of this scale makes adequate provision for the future Policing needs that it will generate. Like some other public services our primary funding is insufficient to be able to add capital infrastructures to support major new development when and wherever this occurs. Further there are no bespoke capital funding regimes, eg like Building Schools for the Future or the Health Lift, to provide capital re investment in our facilities. We fund capital infrastructures by borrowing. However, in a service where over 90% of our budget is staffing related, our capital programme can only be used to overcome pressing issues with our existing facilities eg premises replacement Loughborough, or to re provide essential facilities like vehicles once these can no longer be used. This situation has been recognised by the Association of Chief Police Officers nationally for some time and there are public statements which explain our particular funding difficulties. The position of Police funding was examined and verified by external consultants employed by Local Councils - The Leicestershire Growth Impact Assessment of 2009 which concluded at para 82 in relation to Policing "It is sensible to assume that most of the capital requirements incurred by growth will not be covered by existing mainstream central and local funding".
Faced with unprecedented levels of growth being proposed across our sub region Leicestershire Police have resolved to seek developer contributions to ensure that existing levels of service can be maintained as this growth takes place. We are a regular and constant participant in the statutory Planning process evidencing the impact of growth through work with local Councils in their Plan making, preparation of guidance, preparations for CIL and the consideration of individual Planning applications including attendance at appeals. Police nationally encourage this approach to offset the impact of growth on the Police service.

The Policing impact of 73 additional houses at the site.
The proposed development will increase the overnight population of this settlement by 197 people. It is a fact that 73 additional dwellings will bring additional Policing demands and particularly as there is no Policing demand from the existing site as an open field. I do not doubt that there will be a corresponding increase in crime and demand from new residents for Policing services across a wide spectrum of support and intervention as they go about their daily lives at the site, in the locality and across the Policing sub region.

Empirical data based on existing crime patterns, and policing demand and deployment from existing residential areas in the local beat indicates the direct and additional impacts of the development on local Policing that will be manifested in demand and responses in the following areas-

- 212 additional calls and responses per year via our control centre.
- Attendance to an additional 39 emergency events within the proposed development and locality each year.
- 10 additional non emergency events to follow up with public contact each year.
- 9 additional recorded crimes in the development and locality per year based on beat crime and household data. In addition 9 recorded anti
social behaviour incidents each year within the new development and locality.

- The demand for increased patrol cover.
- Additional vehicle use relating to 20% of an additional vehicle over a 6 year period.
- Additional calls on our Airwaves system where our funding seeks to maintain capacity for call demand at current levels.
- Additional use of our PND systems to process and store crime records and intelligence and based on existing levels of use equating to 6 additional hits and data entries per year.
- Additional demand for deployment of Mobile CCTV technologies
- Additional demand for local access to beat staff from the Keyham Lane LPU.
- Additional Policing cover and interventions in all the areas described when considering staffing and functions above and for additional accommodation from which to deliver these.

Planning Policy justifications for a Policing contribution

The National Policy position to support our request exists in NPPF. Securing sufficient facilities and services to meet local needs is a Core Planning Principle [para 17]. Planning is to deliver facilities and services that communities need [para 70] and Supplementary Planning documents can assist applicants in this. Plan policies should deliver the provision of security infrastructure and other local facilities [para 156]. Plan policy and decision making should be seamless [para 186]. Infrastructure Planning should accompany development planning by LPAs [177] who should work collaboratively with infrastructure Providers [162]. NPPF seeks environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life and community cohesion [58 and 69] and Planning Policies and decisions should deliver this.

Leicester City CS Policy 19 forms local policy justification for a policing contribution and through the Examination of your Core Strategy policing
requirements, accepted as primary, feature in the attached infrastructure schedule. These include works to Mansfield House and the LPU at Keyham to accompany growth proposed at Hamilton.

The City Council are aware of the Policing impact of additional development through Police submissions to the Core Strategy Examination and Planning applications with significant additional housing content. The Core Strategy Infrastructure Schedule makes provision as a result. Police have made approaches to City Council officers dealing with CIL with no response. A consistent approach will be pursued here following guidance in the CIL Regulations and NPPF. This is an approach recognised in recent public Examinations of Core Strategies where soundness of Plans is dependent on provisions for adequate infrastructure to accompany growth proposed.

The Police contribution request

£44818 is sought to mitigate the additional impacts of this development because our existing infrastructures do not have the capacity to meet these and because, like some other services, we do not have the funding ability to respond to growth whenever and wherever proposed. We anticipate using rates and Home Office revenues to pay for staff salaries and our day to day routine additional costs [eg call charges on telephony and Airwaves, vehicle maintenance and so on]. As already confirmed these sources do not have the capacity to fund additional borrowing for additional capital infrastructures necessitated by the development.

Police expect to agree a programme to procure these additional facilities and have no difficulty including this as a clause in a legal agreement. We are committed to procure these items subject to the contribution sought. Contributions are only sought that are related in scale and kind to the development.
As a further justification of our request, we confirm that the contribution will be used wholly to meet the direct impacts of this development and wholly in delivering Policing to it. Without the development in place it is reasonable to forecast the impacts it will generate using information about the known Policing demands of comparable local development. Assumptions about pupil numbers and health needs similarly depend on comparables and we believe the Framework encourages this.

The development should make provision to mitigate the direct and additional Policing impacts it will generate and cannot depend on the Police to just absorb these within existing facilities with limited capacities and where Police have no flexibility in our funding to do this. This has been the situation since 2006 when Leicestershire Police started to seek contributions. It is not forced by current spending reductions although strictures across the public sector re-enforce the need to ensure that developments mitigate the direct impacts they cause.

Because of the very serious implications for Policing of major developments, like this one, Police nationally have taken advice about the best way to proceed in the transition period prior to the CIL regime. As a result Leicestershire Police no longer make requests based on a formula but solely in relation to the development under consideration; its direct impacts on Policing and the necessary mitigations that it should provide. I should add that this is consistent with Inspectors views in recent appeal decisions. What follows is a detailed explanation of Methodologies used to calculate the contribution and our application of the NPPF tests to justify each part.

Mitigation of impacts and methodologies identified by Leicestershire Police

**Baseline background.** At October 2012 total floorspace occupied by the Force to deliver Policing to this locality and the subregion more generally was 54,274m2. We employed 3606 staff to do this. Existing households in the Police district [2011 census] was 405,500 with 25,007 in Beaumont Leys. Across the Force 276 Police staff deliver Policing to the LPU area.
Households to staff for Keyham LPU 91:1
Floorspace to staff Forcewide is 15 m2.

**Equipping staff.**
Additional staff needed to Police the development will require additional equipment.
For a Police Officer the additional equipment items are uniform £873, radio £525, Workstation £1508, De Montford University foundation/basic accreditation £2333, Other external Training £2182. Uniformed officers work in shifts where workstations can be shared and as a result start up cost will be £7421 per uniformed officer.
For other staff the additional equipment items are workstation £2286 and training £687, total £2973.
We employ staff to officers at a ratio of 0.33 to 0.66 and so the average cost of equipping a new member of staff is £5879.
Because the development is forecast to generate the need to employ 80% of an additional member of staff the contribution for equipment should be **£4703** from this new development.

The Force could not have officers attending this development with less than adequate equipment with un-necessary risks to themselves and occupiers served.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*
Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and the Council’s Core Strategy content demonstrates this further. The Framework identifies the need to achieve healthy communities and security in new development and makes provisions to deliver this through the planning system. Deployment of equipped staff is fundamental to delivering community safety and mitigating crime.
Is it *directly related to the development*?

The Policing demands of this development are identified and Police mitigation of these can only be delivered by adequately equipped staff.

Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?

This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate are known by comparison with local residential development. That is the only satisfactory way of determining the need from development that is not yet built. Such comparables are used in identifying the impact of additional populations on most if not all public services. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Police vehicles** In managing and responding to crime a number of different vehicles can be deployed ranging General Response Vehicles[patrol cars], unmarked general support vehicles, Public Service Unit vans and minibuses, scientific [eg SOCO] vehicles, pursuit vehicles - 4x4 and high speed, motorcycles and so on. Current fleet deployment to Keyham Lane is 34 vehicles serving 25007 existing households. The average equipped cost of a vehicles is £15,774 and this is very close to the actual cost of a GRV. Our guideline for the majority of marked vehicles is to replace every three years or 120,000 miles. The condition of vehicles at the end of their Police life varies however we forecast that we will redeem on average 10% of a vehicles original value on disposal.

34 vehicle units at net value £482684

Existing households 25007 = £19.30 per H hold x 2  to give 6 year life of provision.

In relation to this particular development additional vehicle costs to deliver Policing and meet community safety needs will be £2817. Impact of the development without the contribution will be pressure to spread existing transport too thinly to the extent that service delivery is prejudiced. Residents of the new
development and their representatives will expect the same degree of cover as elsewhere in the locality and existing residents will expect existing cover to be maintained and not reduced as a result of the new development.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Vehicles are a fundamental capital infrastructure and facility to deliver community safety and address crime especially at Neighbourhood level.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

Fleet deployment is related to the known Policing demands of comparable development in the locality. The direct demand from the new development can be accurately forecast. Delivering Policing direct to this development will not be possible without additional vehicles to do so.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the Police vehicle demands it will generate are known by comparison with deployment to other local residential development. Level of demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Radio Cover/capacity** It is necessary to expand the capacity of our existing system to cater for additional calls as a result of the development. The development will increase the use of our radio system which is maintained at existing capacity by investing in additional hardware including servers, system refinement signal strengthening and improved transmission technologies. We spend £15600 pa adding such capacity to the existing system in Keyham Lane which serves 25007 households. Annual cost of these capacity increases to an existing household is £0.62. Capacity improvements are expected to last for 5 years and without these the system will fail to adequately carry both existing and
additional calls as a result of this additional development. The additional cost of the additional capacity in relation to houses in this development will be £226.

The impact of the development on Policing with reduced Airwaves capacity will be increased attendance times, delays in message passing and the implications of this for attendance and apprehension. Occupiers and those that represent them will expect existing performance and attendance levels to be maintained.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Deployment to adequately deliver community safety and security will not be met where this is prejudiced by insufficient radio system capacity. Crime, community safety and security are Planning considerations.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of additional radio calls, are known by comparison with similar local residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**Police Database capacity.** It is necessary to expand the capacity of our existing system to cater for additional calls as a result of the development. This is a secured stand alone information source integrating a variety of data nationally and allowing this to be compared over time in relation to individuals and locations. Additional hits as a result of the development to access existing crime information and add more crime data to be accessed by more staff generate a need to add capacity to this system. The current system and access to it
reached planned capacity usage this year. Dedicated hardware is used with our contribution to this at £1,456,000 through the 14 year growth period at today's prices. In addition, local servers are replaced every 2.5 years at £83k each time to add further capacity to meet the demand placed adding £464,800 to PND costs through to 2026. We spend £10700 on PND system enhancements to serve Keyham Lane at £0.43 per household per year. Over 5 years the development should contribute £157.

Failure to increase PND capacity in step with growth the subject of this application will directly impact the ability of the Force to rapidly access and respond to crime information.

Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?
Deployment to adequately deliver community safety and security, will not be met where this is prejudiced by insufficient capacity in the Police PND system.

Is it directly related to the development?
The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations.

Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?
This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of PND use, are known by comparison with existing local residential development. The development is not built and this is a reasonable way to forecast this impact. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

Control Room telephony Police control room call handling equipment is used to capacity at peak times. Our call handling centre at Force HQ Enderby directs all calls and deploys resources to respond and continue monitoring. We know the
capacity of the technology and the calls it currently handles [fixed around minimum times with callers] and will be expected to handle as a result of the proposed development. In order to deal with additional calls as a result of additional planned development across our sub region additional telephony, lines, licenses, workstations and monitoring screens will be required at a total cost of £199,000. 7.8% of all calls handled relate to the 25007 households in Keyham Lane LPU area and additional calls forecast from this development are identified. The Council proposes 1280 additional houses for Hamilton in their plan period. Each new household in the LPU area will generate a need to invest an additional £12.12 in this system. The development should contribute £884 towards the additional equipment needed to answer the additional calls it will generate. Police preference is to use this money when the existing telephony is extended and renewed at 2018 however this does not prevent procurement of additional capacity in the meantime as a result of the impact of this development.

There will be a call handling impact and delays in response times if we attempt to serve this development with our current telephony systems.

Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?
Crime and community safety are Planning considerations. NPPF identifies need to achieve security in new development and makes provisions to deliver this through the planning system. These considerations will not be met where Policing delivery is prejudiced by insufficient telephony capacity to take calls and deploy responses in good time.

Is it directly related to the development?
The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations.

Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?
This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of use of control room telephony, are known by comparison with other local residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.

**ANPR CCTV Deployment** Police are deploying fixed ANPR cameras on the main road network and close to or in settlements. These cameras are server linked to identify number plates of vehicles in use for crime. This type of camera offers particular benefits to the immediate surrounding area especially where vehicle related crime is present. We deploy these as resources permit however our financially constrained programme makes no provision for the impacts of additional areas of housing. The use of these technologies has a beneficial impact in terms of minimising staff attendance. Unit cost is £8000 which includes installation and satellite links. Additional server capacity will be required to process and store images and integrate to PND at £222 per new camera. Police take the view that this an accessible site close to Keyham Lane and Hamilton Lane and that this together with local crime patterns and levels warrants a part contribution to an additional camera in the vicinity. A contribution of £2055 is required.

Impact without this contribution will be an inability to monitor crime related vehicle movements and address incidents effectively. Our response would be less than available elsewhere in the City where this cover is provided.

**Mobile CCTV Deployment** Units are acquired as funding, including s106, permits however our financially constrained programme makes no provision for cover of additional areas of development. Cameras are deployed in partnership with other local agencies to detect and deter crime and can be moved to follow crime patterns. There are two such cameras in use in the LPU area. Typical locations are where there is an expressed fear of crime, at emerging crime hotspots that residents use eg near commercial premises, or where there are increasing levels of anti social behaviour. Unit cost is £1500 and Police pay the
revenue costs for movement. Bearing in mind the location and nature of the development as previously described a part contribution towards an additional camera is justified at £375.

Impact without this contribution will be less access to deployment of this equipment than elsewhere in Leicester City and the wider Police District, and would give rise to a lower rate of detection and deterrence of crime that would in turn have consequences for other police resources.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Policing is a Planning consideration and NPPF provides guidance about local facilities and the provision of security. Core Strategy policy and content supports this consideration. Deployment of CCTV technologies significantly increases detection and deterrence with reduced need for staff presence and particularly contributes towards achieving community safety. This will be prejudiced where new development places additional demands on existing deployment without mitigation and the ability of these technologies to deliver safety is undermined where new development creates additional accessibility and network gaps.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional demands of this development in relation to this infrastructure have been identified as have mitigations. The nature of the development and its size and location in relation to the existing settlement and camera deployment are a direct consideration in these technologies.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the Policing demands it will generate, in terms of additional crime and vehicle movements, are known by comparison with other similar residential development. Demand and mitigations have been determined by the scale of the development.
**Premises.** For Keyham Policing is delivered from the LPU, Mansfield house BCU and HQ premises. Additional staff will need to be accommodated to serve the development. Occupation of local and Force wide premises is maintained to capacity. Premises cost is amount of floorspace per staff member [15] x number of staff generated by the development [0.8] x Build and land/lost opportunity cost (£2794pm²) giving a total of £33528 from this development. The latter is the build cost in use by Force Estates and has been externally verified by tender.

This will be spent to extend and or increase floorspace in these premises used to Police the area and in proportion to the numbers of staff located in these as described above. In relation to HQ and Forcewide premises a number of functions necessary to Police the development are already using these to capacity. Typical of these is the Force Control room which is secured constructed, perimeter secured and attack resistant and is at capacity.

Impact of this development without premises expansion to accommodate additional staff will be an unacceptable degree of overcrowding and inefficiencies in responses and delivering Policing as a result. With the level of local Policing demand and the numbers of staff employed to meet this impact will be significant without mitigation.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and accommodating staff in the optimum location to serve the development is essential if this is to be achieved.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

The additional staffing needs the development will generate have been established by reference to existing local deployment reflecting the actual Policing demands and crime patterns of the locality. In a similar vein the
premises requirements that result from the need to accommodate additional staff at these levels is known. A direct relationship between the development, additional staffing and accommodation is demonstrated and it is appropriate to mitigate this through the planning system.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*

This is a residential development and the accommodation needs of staff delivering Policing to meet local demands of development of this nature are known. It is based on the scale and kind of residential development.

**Additional Crime Prevention equipment.** New development increases the demand for local accessibility to Policing and the deployment of crime prevention initiatives. We have restricted funds to deliver such initiatives to existing development to pay for equipment eg Smartwater kits[fluid, sprays, detectors] or signage for local occupiers to use. Each initiative budgets for capital expenditure of £4,000 with the developer asked to contribute £1 per new unit as a fair and proportionate contribution from this development.

*Is the contribution necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms?*

Crime and community safety are Planning considerations and ensuring accessibility for the public to Policing is important to community safety, combating and reducing crime and the fear of crime.

*Is it directly related to the development?*

These crime prevention initiatives will specifically serve the development and a proportionate contribution towards increasing their equipment capacity is sought.

*Is the contribution fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development?*
This is a residential development and experience with existing development locally demonstrates the need to invest in additional crime prevention measures. The contribution is based on the scale and kind of residential development.

**SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTION REQUESTED**

The Police contribution request considers the amount and type of development proposed and compares this with existing Policing demand and crime information for the beat and LPU areas in which it will be situated. The existing deployment of Police assets to Police the locality are identified and applied to the application site to forecast the impact of this individual development. The funding and capacity position of the Force is defined. NPPF and local Policy supporting a Policing contribution are identified. Commitments are made to manage the contribution. Finally the contribution is itemised as below with individual methodologies applied to this development and the CIL tests of compliance are applied to these.

- Start up equipment £4703
- Vehicles £2817
- Additional radio call capacity £226
- PND additions £157
- Additional call handling £884
- ANPR £2055
- Mobile CCTV £375
- Additional premises £33528
- Hub equipment £73
- Total £44818 [£613 pd]

**Conclusion**
Without the necessary contribution the development will be unacceptable in Planning terms and permission should not be granted as indicated in NPPF Guidance. The lack of capacity in existing infrastructure to accommodate the population growth and associated demands occasioned by the development means that it is necessary for the developer of the site to provide a contribution so the situation might be remedied. The request is directly related to the development and the direct Policing impacts it will generate based on an examination of demand levels in the LPU and local beat in which it is situated, adjacent areas and existing Policing demands and deployment in relation to this. The request is wholly related to the scale and kind of the application development.

Leicestershire Police have refreshed our approach to contributions taking account of the advice of leading Counsel and recent reductions in our deployment. We are advised that the contents of this letter are sufficient to justify the contribution sought and that the request is compliant with NPPF tests. Without the necessary contribution to meet Police needs there is a formal objection to the development on sustainability grounds and because the development is unacceptable without the necessary contribution.

The application includes a document called heads of terms for s106 however this is a statement of Policy referring to no specific contributions or infrastructures.

I refer to the 8 Planning appeal decisions attached where the current approach of Police in seeking contributions was determined as compliant by Inspectors and the Secretary of State on three occasions.

In particular I refer to the Inspectors report in the Barrow Upon Soar case where both the developer and LPA chose to resist the policing request. He found -

" 291. The Inspectors will have reached their own conclusions on the particular evidence and submissions put to them at appeal and I shall approach the evidence in this case in the
same way, i.e. on its merits. It seems to me that the introduction of additional population and property to an area must have an impact on policing, in the same way as it must on education and library services, for example. Moreover, it also seems to me that the twelfth core planning principle of the Framework, that planning should... “take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs”, can only be served if policing is adequate to the additional burdens imposed on it in the same way as any other local public service. The logic of this is inescapable. Section 8 of the Framework concerns the promotion of healthy communities and planning decisions, according to paragraph 69, should aim to achieve places which promote, inter alia, “safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.”

292. Adequate policing is so fundamental to the concept of sustainable communities that I can see no reason, in principle, why it should be excluded from the purview of S106 financial contributions, subject to the relevant tests applicable to other public services. There is no reason, it seems to me why police equipment and other items of capital expenditure necessitated by additional development should not be so funded, alongside, for example, additional classrooms and stock and equipment for libraries.

My underlining. The Secretary of State agreed with these findings.
I confirm that the methodology employed in this request is similar to that used in all of these appeals subject of course to local data about Policing demand and deployment to each development. Policing the development will depend on all of the capital infrastructures I have identified including delivery from premises inside and outside the City again as I have described and as identified in your Core Strategy Infrastructure Plan.

I have offered time to discuss this subject and indeed CIL with no response. Please copy me into your committee report as soon as it is published. If for any reason the police request is found not to be compliant in full please copy verbatim this request so that your members are aware of the impact of the development on Policing and the implications for the safety of the local community.

Best regards

Michael Lambert
Growth and Design Officer
Leicestershire Police

michael.lambert@leicestershire.pnn.police.uk

Without prejudice to any other obligation imposed upon it, it shall be the duty of each local authority to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can, to prevent crime and disorder in its area: Section 17(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
Dear Sir /Madam

Community Infrastructure Levy – Consultation on Draft Charging Schedule – Notice of Consultation

Monday 9th February 2015 to 5.00 pm Tuesday 10th March 2015

The Council intends to introduce the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and is in the process of preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.

CIL is a new charge that local authorities can place on new development. The levy will be used to fund infrastructure to support growth.

Before a Charging Schedule can be adopted by the Council it must be subject to two rounds of consultation and an examination in public. This is the second stage of the consultation process – the Draft Charging Schedule. The first consultation, the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule took place from 28th May to 10th July 2014.

The Council has prepared a Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) along with the supporting evidence base documents. The DCS sets out the proposed charging rates for Leicester.

The Council invites comments on the Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents. The documents are available on:

http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

The consultation period runs from Monday 9th February 2015 and ends on 10th March 2015 at 5.00pm.

Representations should be made using the Council’s representation form which is available on:

• The Council’s online consultation system: which can be accessed on:
  http://consultations.leicester.gov.uk/

• You can post the form to:

  Planning Policy Team, DCS Consultation, Leicester City Council,
  Planning, Transport, & Economic Development
  City Hall (Halford Wing, 2nd Floor)
  115 Charles Street
  Leicester LE1 1FZ

  • By email: planning.policy@leicester.gov.uk

Copies of the DCS documents are available at all City Council customer service centres and Council libraries and can be accessed at all public libraries via the free internet access provided there.

Regards

Jeevan Dhesi
Planning Policy
Leicester City Council
Tel: 0116 4542983
DCS018

Mr Michael Davies
Director
Savills
Dear Sir / Madam

LEICESTER CIL – Savills Response to Draft CIL Charging Schedule

As you are aware, our representations to the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule were reviewed by HDH and LCC and are presented in a summary of revised draft schedule responses and Officer comments.

We welcome this response, however, there are a number of points we feel have not been addressed satisfactorily or with an evidence based response and these are explained further below.

Savills Approach

In our assessment we have paid particular attention to the appraisal of a large greenfield infill site within the urban area as this is relevant to our clients’ land interests.

We have given particular consideration to the fact that such sites often have a value in excess of agricultural land values. We consider, as a minimum, paddock land values to be appropriate due the potential for paddock use and the proximity to the urban area. We have therefore specifically assessed such a greenfield site as this type of site has not been assessed in the HDH range of sites. The result of this exercise is that the Existing Use Value (EUV) is higher than greenfield sites on the edge of an urban area (site 2).

Our areas of concern are set out below:-

Benchmark Land Values

No further market evidence or explanation has been provided as to how HDH arrived at benchmark land values. Values quoted in the viability study (January 2013) range from £1,580,000 per hectare (source: VOA Property Market Report 2011) to £600,000 per hectare (source: suggested net developable areas from developer consultations). There does not appear to be any robust market evidence to support land values used by HDH in their report.

An assumption, which is not justified, has been made suggesting a suitable uplift for greenfield sites of £250,000 per hectare (£100,000 per acre) above EUV. HDH indicate that uplifts may range from 5% to 100% depending on the circumstances of each site. This is a significant range that can lead to an extremely high variation in the assessment of benchmark land values.

A more robust approach is to adopt the principles obtained from the Shinfield decision which sought to share the uplift between EUV and unfettered residential land value equally between landowner in the form of land
value and the local authority in the form of planning obligations. We have adopted this approach to arrive at what is considered to be a fair benchmark land value.

Build Costs

HDH adopted a base build costs for site 2, of £852 per sq m. This is considerably lower than the Median, £880, and Mean, £903, from the January 2015 Leicester General Estate Housing BCIS costs.

Section 106 Costs

In 2012, HDH assumed Section 106 costs of £1,000 per dwelling. In the most recent appraisal a lower figure of £500 per dwelling has been used, alongside CIL at £25 per m². We do not feel this is a fair reflection of the typical S106 costs that have been applied to developments to date and highlights inconsistencies within the appraisals.

Based on our review of recent s106 agreements and removing the Regulation 123 infrastructure items we would expect typical Section 106 costs to be around £1,500 per dwelling. This would exclude highway or off site infrastructure costs which would now be covered by CIL.

Sales Prices

The open market sales prices adopted by HDH in their site 2 appraisal are £2,100 per sq m (£195 per sq ft). There is very limited evidence to support this figure and it is based on an assumption made in March 2012. The figures adopted at this time were based on asking prices, rather than sold prices. It is expected that incentives will be offered through the process of negotiating asking prices and actual sale prices will be lower. This is therefore not a robust basis on which to appraise the development site. By way of a guide, we have reduced asking prices by 5% to arrive at a sale price.

Alternative Viability Appraisals

Given the concerns set out above, we have produced a set of alternative viability appraisals in order to demonstrate the impact of the under-estimation of costs on a calculation of the maximum CIL rate.

For the purpose of reaching a consensus on an appropriate residential CIL rate, and to enable the Examiner to make direct comparisons between our evidence and that of the Councils, we have focused on three key inputs (build costs, sales prices and s106) against the Base Appraisal which we consider to be the most important to model correctly. The following appraisals have been provided:

(a) Base Appraisal
(b) Build Cost Variation
(c) Sales Prices Reduction
(e) Combined BC & Sales
(f) Section 106 combined with BC and sales

In preparing further appraisals we have examined the impact variations in the appraisal inputs will have on the site viability of the generic site 2 appraisal and its ability to support CIL. For simplicity, using the same assumptions as HDH, we have prepared a base appraisal and then subsequent variations based on alternative assumptions as set out in Table 1 below.
Table 1 Alternative Viability Appraisal Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>HDH Assumption (Dec 2014)</th>
<th>Savills Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Base appraisal as set out within HDH report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Build Cost in line with updated Median BCIS costs</td>
<td>£852 per square meter</td>
<td>£880 per square metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Sales Values decrease to reflect achieved prices.</td>
<td>GDV of £27,286,369</td>
<td>GDV of £25,921,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>As HDH base appraisal</td>
<td>Variants B and C incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Section 106 increase</td>
<td>£500 per unit</td>
<td>£1,500 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have subsequently run alternative appraisals using this residual land value as our base position for comparison purposes:

Table 2 – Alternative Viability Appraisal Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Residual Land Value</th>
<th>Difference from Baseline</th>
<th>Difference from Benchmark Land Value</th>
<th>Resulting CIL Available (on 11,965 m² of private)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Base Appraisal</td>
<td>£2,812,423</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£937,423</td>
<td>£78.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Build Cost Update</td>
<td>£2,468,741</td>
<td>12% ↓</td>
<td>£593,741</td>
<td>£49.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sales Price Reduction</td>
<td>£1,995,171</td>
<td>27% ↓</td>
<td>£120,171</td>
<td>£10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Combined BC &amp; Sales</td>
<td>£1,505,012</td>
<td>46% ↓</td>
<td>-£369,988</td>
<td>-£30.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Section 106 increase combined with BC &amp; Sales</td>
<td>£1,383,244</td>
<td>51% ↓</td>
<td>-£491,756</td>
<td>-£41.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Savills appraisals attached to this letter.

The results above highlight the impact that different assumptions can have on the residual land value and in turn the level of CIL that could be supported. Where the variations are combined in appraisals (D & E), the cumulative impacts are significant and render delivery of such a site unviable. This is due to the residual land value reducing below a reasonable Benchmark Land Value of £500,000 per net ha. In our view this would result in land owners unwilling to dispose of their site, as it doesn’t incentivise them sufficiently to do so.

Summary

Our review of the key inputs we have focused on in this exercise demonstrates that such variations have a significant impact upon viability and undermine the proposal for a CIL charging rate of £25 per sq m.

The above points and those which remain unanswered from our previous Representations of 10 July 2014, are those that we wish to discuss at the CIL Examination.
We trust that this report together with our supporting appraisals, will assist the Inspector and helps to illustrate our case further. We intend to submit some further market research and viability evidence prior to the examination taking place.

Please also accept this letter as a formal request to be heard by the Inspector at Examination.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Michael Davies
Director
Savills
Development Appraisal

Savills A - Base Appraisal

Report Date: 10 March 2015
### APPRAISAL SUMMARY

**Savills A - Base Appraisal**

Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

**Currency in £**

#### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Valuation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Gross Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>2,100.01</td>
<td>236,461</td>
<td>25,064,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,155.54</td>
<td>81,235</td>
<td>2,193,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13,833.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27,258,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET REALISATION**  
27,258,255

#### OUTLAY

**ACQUISITION COSTS**

- Residualised Price (3.75 Ha 749,979.43 pHect) 2,812,423
- Stamp Duty 4.00% 112,497
- Legal Fee 1.50% 42,186

**CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>957.06 pm²</td>
<td>11,423,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,531.73 pm²</td>
<td>2,907,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>13,833.70 m²</td>
<td>14,330,481</td>
<td>14,330,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Contingency 2.50% 358,262
- Planning fee 41,500
- s106 365,627

**PROFESSIONAL FEES**

- Architect 6.00% 859,829
- Quantity Surveyor 0.50% 71,652
- Other Professionals 3.50% 501,567

**DISPOSAL FEES**

- Sales Agent Fee 3.00% 817,748
- Sales Legal Fee 0.50% 136,291

**Additional Costs**

- Arrangement Fee 10,000
- Misc 5,000

**FINANCE**

- Debit Rate 6.00% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)
- Land 862,327
- Construction 475,149
- Other 4,067
- **Total Finance Cost** 1,341,543

**TOTAL COSTS**  
21,806,606

**PROFIT**  
5,451,649

**Performance Measures**

- Profit on Cost% 25.00%
- Profit on GDV% 20.00%
- Profit on NDV% 20.00%
- IRR 21.14%
Savills A - Base Appraisal
Profit Erosion (finance rate 6.000%)  3 yrs 9 mths
Savills

Development Appraisal

Savills B- BC increase

Report Date: 10 March 2015
APPRAISAL SUMMARY

Savills B- BC increase

Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

Currency in £

REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Valuation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Gross Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>2,100.01</td>
<td>236,461</td>
<td>25,064,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,155.54</td>
<td>81,235</td>
<td>2,193,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27,258,255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET REALISATION

27,258,255

OUTLAY

ACQUISITION COSTS

Residualised Price (3.75 Ha 658,330.90 pHect) 2,468,741
Stamp Duty 4.00% 98,750
Legal Fee 1.50% 37,031

2,604,522

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>12,687,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>2,017,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,063.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,705,223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency 2.50% 367,631
Planning fee 41,500
s106 365,627

774,758

PROFESSIONAL FEES

Architect 6.00% 882,313
Quantity Surveyor 0.50% 73,526
Other Professionals 3.50% 514,683

1,470,522

DISPOSAL FEES

Sales Agent Fee 3.00% 817,748
Sales Legal Fee 0.50% 136,291

954,039

Additional Costs

Arrangement Fee 10,000
Misc 5,000

15,000

FINANCE

Debit Rate 6.000% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)
Land 763,046
Construction 515,429
Other 4,067

Total Finance Cost 1,282,542

TOTAL COSTS

21,806,606

PROFIT

5,451,649

Performance Measures

Profit on Cost% 25.00%
Profit on GDV% 20.00%
Profit on NDV% 20.00%

IRR 21.72%

File: E:\Dev\Consult\LiveJobs\LeicCC\IL\Appraisals - Mar 15\Updated appraisals 09.03.2015\Leicester - Savills B- BC 09.03.2015.wcfx
ARGUS Developer Version: 6.00.008
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Savills B - BC increase
Profit Erosion (finance rate 6.000%)  3 yrs 9 mths
Savills

Development Appraisal

Savills C- Sales Price Reduction

Report Date: 10 March 2015
**APPRAISAL SUMMARY**

**Savills C- Sales Price Reduction**

Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

**Currency in £**

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Valuation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Gross Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,995.00</td>
<td>224,638</td>
<td>23,811,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,097.77</td>
<td>77,173</td>
<td>2,083,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,895,251</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET REALISATION**

25,895,251

### OUTLAY

#### ACQUISITION COSTS

- Residualised Price (3.75 Ha 532,045.66 pHect) 1,995,171
- Stamp Duty 4.00% 79,807
- Legal Fee 1.50% 29,928

2,104,906

#### CONSTRUCTION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>11,935.60 m²</td>
<td>957.06 pm²</td>
<td>11,423,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1,898.10 m²</td>
<td>1,531.73 pm²</td>
<td>2,907,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70 m²</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,330,481</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,330,481</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>358,262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning fee</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s106</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>365,627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

765,389

#### PROFESSIONAL FEES

- Architect 6.00% 859,829
- Quantity Surveyor 0.50% 71,652
- Other Professionals 3.50% 501,567

1,433,048

#### DISPOSAL FEES

- Sales Agent Fee 3.00% 776,858
- Sales Legal Fee 0.50% 129,476

906,334

**Additional Costs**

- Arrangement Fee 10,000
- Misc 5,000

15,000

#### FINANCE

- Debit Rate 6.000% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)
- Land 621,710
- Construction 535,471
- Other 3,864

Total Finance Cost 1,161,045

**TOTAL COSTS**

20,716,202

**PROFIT**

5,179,049

**Performance Measures**

- Profit on Cost% 25.00%
- Profit on GDV% 20.00%
- Profit on NDV% 20.00%
- IRR 22.38%

---
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APPRAISAL SUMMARY

Savills D- Combined BC & Sales

Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

Currency in £

REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Valuation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Gross Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,995.00</td>
<td>224,638</td>
<td>23,811,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,097.77</td>
<td>77,173</td>
<td>2,083,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>317.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,295,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,895,251</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET REALISATION 25,895,251

OUTLAY

ACQUISITION COSTS

- Residualised Price (3.75 Ha 401,336.48 pHect) 1,505,012
- Stamp Duty 4.00% 60,200
- Legal Fee 1.50% 22,575

1,587,787

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>12,687,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>2,017,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>13,833.70</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>14,705,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency 2.50% 367,631
Planning fee s106 41,500
s106 365,627

774,758

PROFESSIONAL FEES

- Architect 6.00% 882,313
- Quantity Surveyor 0.50% 73,526
- Other Professionals 3.50% 514,683

1,470,522

DISPOSAL FEES

- Sales Agent Fee 3.00% 776,858
- Sales Legal Fee 0.50% 129,476

906,334

Additional Costs

- Arrangement Fee 10,000
- Misc 5,000

15,000

FINANCE

Debit Rate 7.000% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)

| Land | 563,886 |
| Construction | 688,192 |
| Other | 4,501 |

Total Finance Cost 1,256,578

TOTAL COSTS 20,716,202

PROFIT 5,179,048

Performance Measures

- Profit on Cost% 25.00%
- Profit on GDV% 20.00%
- Profit on NDV% 20.00%
- IRR 24.25%
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Savills E- Combined BC & Sales & S106

Summary Appraisal for Phase 1

Currency in £

**REVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Valuation</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Gross Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,995.00</td>
<td>224,638</td>
<td>23,811,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,097.77</td>
<td>77,173</td>
<td>2,083,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25,895,251</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET REALISATION**

25,895,251

**OUTLAY**

**ACQUISITION COSTS**

- Residualised Price (3.75 Ha 368,865.20 pHect) 1,383,244
- Stamp Duty 4.00% 55,330
- Legal Fee 1.50% 20,749

1,459,323

**CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>m²</th>
<th>Rate m²</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>11,935.60</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>12,687,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>1,898.10</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
<td>2,017,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,833.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,063.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,705,223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Contingency 2.50% 367,631
- Planning fee 41,500
- s106 at £500/unit plus CIL at £25 365,627
- Additional S106 133,000

907,758

**PROFESSIONAL FEES**

- Architect 6.00% 882,313
- Quantity Surveyor 0.50% 73,526
- Other Professionals 3.50% 514,683

1,470,522

**DISPOSAL FEES**

- Sales Agent Fee 3.00% 776,858
- Sales Legal Fee 0.50% 129,476

906,334

**Additional Costs**

- Arrangement Fee 10,000
- Misc 5,000

15,000

**FINANCE**

- Debit Rate 7.000% Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)
- Land 519,808
- Construction 727,734
- Other 4,501

Total Finance Cost 1,252,043

**TOTAL COSTS**

20,716,202

**PROFIT**

5,179,049

**Performance Measures**

- Profit on Cost% 25.00%
- Profit on GDV% 20.00%
- Profit on NDV% 20.00%
- IRR 24.32%
Profit Erosion (finance rate 7.000%) 3 yrs 3 mths
1 To which part of the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document does your representation relate? (please refer to the relevant document)

Document name:
Draft Charging Schedule

Section, paragraph or Appendix title.: 
Issues and Options

2 Please provide comments on the Draft Charging Schedule or other supporting document. Please provide a brief summary of your comments here.

Q2:
Following discussions with Leicester City Council it has been accepted that reference to support for health care infrastructure cannot be included within this document. However to address this in future years, the relevant commissioning organisation will input into the forthcoming Local Plan with the aim that healthcare infrastructure will be part of the CIL in subsequent years.

Detailed statement - please give further details and the reasons for it.: 

3 Any person making a representation on the Draft Charging Schedule has the right to be heard before the Examiner at the Community Infrastructure Levy Examination, if they have requested to be heard and the request has been made within the specified consultation period for the Draft Charging Schedule. If you would like to exercise your right to be heard, please tick the box below. Alternatively, the examiner will consider your written representation on the Draft Charging Schedule alongside the evidence as part of the examination.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.: 

4 Please let us know if you would like to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

(ii) The publication of the recommendations of the CIL Examiner and the reasons for those recommendations., (iii) The approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the Council.

If you have ticked any of the above options, please make sure you have provided a postal or email address.: 