



COMMUNITY
INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING
SCHEDULE

Questionnaire

This questionnaire needs to be read in conjunction with relevant sections of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.

COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 5.15PM ON 12 MARCH 2013.

Title* TOWN CLERK

Forename* GARY

Surname* COX

Organisation (if applicable) BERKHAMSTED TOWN COUNCIL

Address CIVIC CENTRE

161 HIGH STREET

Town BERKHAMSTED

County HERTFORDSHIRE

Post Code* HP4 3HD

Email berkhamsted.towncouncil@dacorum.gov.uk

Please note that your comments and personal details will be available for public inspection (apart from telephone and email addresses) and therefore cannot be treated as confidential. Your name and address must be completed for your representation(s) to be considered.

If you have any queries, please contact Strategic Planning & Regeneration on 01442 228660

Please Return by:

Post:
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Dacorum Borough Council
Civic Centre
Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts, HP1 1HH

Email: oil@dacorum.gov.uk

Online: www.dacorum.gov.uk/cil via the online survey.

Question 1

Do you think that the Identified infrastructure needs are supported by evidence and are up to date?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

The identified needs are supported by evidence, but the list is incomplete for Beckensted. For example, an updated Urban Transport Plan sets transport priorities for the town and improves parking facilities; provision for day care for the elderly, more nursery / childcare facilities, a community centre, more green spaces.
Some existing entries in the IDP are moved and need clarification on what they relate to Beckensted.

Question 2

Do you think that a sound funding gap has been identified to justify the need for a Community Infrastructure Levy in the borough of Dacorum?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

Question 3

Do you think that the rates proposed put the overall development of the area at risk?

Yes No

If yes, please explain.

Comments: whilst saying 'No', the proposed CIL rate for Zone 2 is lower than that proposed in the viability study at £350. Those higher rates would be unlikely to put overall development proposed in the Core Strategy at risk. Indeed, development needs infrastructure to be viable + higher rates are necessary to secure that infrastructure + ~~not~~ not put the Core Strategy at risk.

Question 4

Do you think that having different residential rates in zones 1, 2 and 3 is appropriate and supported by evidence?

Yes Please go to Question 5

No Please go to Question 6

If no, please explain.

Comments:
This is subject to S106 funding, where used, being sufficient to provide infrastructure, rather than through CIL, where appropriate.

Question 5

If you support the differential rates, do you think the boundaries between the different zones are appropriate boundaries?

Yes No

If no, please say what boundaries should be used instead.

Comments:

Question 6

Do you think that it is appropriate to have a single rate for retirement housing across the whole borough?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

We would prefer 5000 rates, as for residential zones and in zone 2 to have higher rates, commensurate with the need to provide infrastructure to support such developments, rather than those needed for residential developments.

Question 7

Do you think that the proposed rate for retirement housing is appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

See the response to Q6, we would prefer zoned rates in line with residential rates for Zone 2, commensurate with the need to provide infrastructure to support such developments as well as those needed for residential developments.

Question 8

Do you think that the proposed rate for large retail is appropriate?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

We would prefer large retail rates to be zoned, in the same way as residential zones.

Question 9

Do you think that the proposed threshold for large retail is appropriate?

Yes No

If no, what would a more appropriate threshold be?

Comments:

The threshold is appropriate, and we are pleased that small retailers are excluded from CIL.

Question 10

Do you think that there should be a nil rate for all 'other' uses as stated in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule table?

Yes No

If no, which uses do you think should have a CIL charge, and why?

Comments:

Question 11

Do you think that the Council should adopt an exceptional circumstances policy?

Yes No

If no, please explain.

Comments:

We agree an exceptional circumstances policy should be adopted along the lines proposed, but would ask for more evidence + consideration of "at least partly" owned by the charity. We would suggest, in the absence of full information, this should be "wholly owned" by the charity, to be consistent with "used wholly or mainly for charitable purposes".

Question 12

Do you think that the Council should adopt an instalments policy?

Yes No

If yes, what thresholds of CIL liability would be sensible triggers for different payment stages?

Comments:

Question 13

Do you have any other comments on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule?

Yes No

If yes, please explain.

Comments:

More consultation needed between B.T.C, DBC and infrastructure providers to ensure that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is comprehensive for the town.

Acknowledgement receipt

Please complete the following if you wish to be notified that we have received your comments:

I request to be notified that my comments have been received

YES / NO

Name	ADAM COX / BUCKHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Address	CIVIC CENTRE 161 HIGH STREET BUCKHAMPTON
Postcode	BA14 3HD

(For official use only)



We confirm that your comments have been received by Strategic Planning and Regeneration Department, Dacorum Borough Council.

Thank you for your time in completing this questionnaire

Signed

Dated