

Wakefield Community Infrastructure Levy Examination

Examiner: Mr Mike Hayden BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Programme Officer: Yvonne Parker

posltd@virginmedia.com Tel: 07813 334305

Neville Ford
Service Manager – Planning and Transportation
Wakefield Council
Wakefield One
PO Box 700,
Burton Street,
Wakefield
WF1 2EB

28 July 2015

Dear Mr Ford,

Wakefield CIL Examination – Initial Questions to the Council

I have completed my initial reading of the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS), submitted evidence and the representations made on the Wakefield CIL.

Based on what I have read and the requests from interested parties to be heard at examination, I anticipate there will be a need for a hearing and estimate a full day will be required, with a reserve day in case of overrun. I have offered 29/30 September to the Programme Officer (PO) as possible dates but await confirmation. I will forward via the PO a draft programme and a list of the main issues and questions (MIQs) for examination for the Council's comments prior to the notification of the hearing.

In the meantime, I have a number of questions and requests for further information arising from my initial examination of the evidence as follows:

Legal and procedural compliance

1. With reference to the brief declaration of compliance on page 8 of the DCS (CD 101), will the Council be producing a statement to evidence that in preparing the charging schedule it has complied with the legal and procedural requirements in the 2008 Act (Part 11 and section 221) and the CIL Regulations?

Draft Charging Schedule (DCS)

2. Based on the maps provided at Appendix 2 of the DCS and in figures 3.1 and 3.2 of the Viability Evidence for February 2014 (CD 117), it is difficult to establish where the proposed Residential Charging Zone boundaries fall in relation to the residential value areas, development sites and settlement boundaries across the district. It would greatly assist my understanding and examination of the evidence if the Council could provide me with a map at a larger scale overlaying the charging

zone boundaries, residential value areas and development sites on an Ordnance Survey base of the district.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) evidence

3. As the Council has updated the IDP to support the work on the CIL since the Core Strategy was examined, the PPG confirms that it is necessary for me to test the IDP to ensure it is sufficient to confirm the aggregate infrastructure funding gap (Ref: ID 25-017-20140612). Initially, therefore, with reference to the IDP evidence for July 2013 and July 2015 (CD 119 and 104), I would be grateful if you would explain the inclusion of the two new stadium facilities for Castleford Tigers and Wakefield Wildcats as part of the infrastructure funding gap for which CIL is required, but their exclusion from the list of projects in the Regulation 123 list which the Council intends to fund through CIL?

Economic Viability Evidence (VE)

4. To assist my examination of the viability evidence, I would be grateful if you would provide a copy of the spreadsheets underpinning the results for the site specific appraisals in the Site Specific Testing Preliminary Assessment (CD 118).
5. Other than the average house price data from 2012 in Appendix 1 of the Viability Addendum (CD 112) and the sample new build sales evidence for February 2014 in Table 3.5 of CD 117, what evidence is there of sales transactions across the district to support the sales value assumptions in paragraph 3.6 of CD 112?
6. Paragraph 3.4 of CD 112 refers to a total of 211.06 hectares remaining from the allocations in the development plan and that 76% of this is greenfield. Please explain how this relates to the Housing Delivery schedule at Appendix 1 of the Site Specific Policies Local Plan which totals significantly more than 211 hectares of land and in which most sites are listed as brownfield. It would assist my examination of the evidence to receive an updated version of Appendix 1 showing the sites that remain to be delivered.
7. Please provide a worked example of the calculation by which the Maximum CIL per square metre figures for residential development are derived in tables 3.1 and 3.2 of CD 112.
8. How much additional retail floorspace is planned for the district up to 2026, where is it proposed and what remains to be delivered?

S106 contributions

9. Page 34 of the IDP evidence (CD 104) refers to an analysis of S106 agreements between April 2010 and April 2015 which indicates an average annual S106 contribution of £1.2 million. Paragraph 4.2 of the CIL Viability Addendum (CD 112) also refers to analysis of S106 agreements which support an average residual S106 cost of £1,000. Where is the analysis and breakdown of S106 contributions to support these figures?

I would be grateful for a response on these points by Tuesday 11 August 2015.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Hayden

EXAMINER