Community Infrastructure Levy Examination
September 2016

## Additional material requested by Examiner

20 September 2016

## Introduction

- At the Examination on 6 September 2016 the Examiner Mr Phillip Staddon who is conducting the Examination into the Draft Charging Schedule proposed by the Borough Council requested further information / clarification of a number of issues.
- He requested responses by 20 September, to be then circulated to those making representations. He requested that any comments be returned to him by 4 October 2016.
- The Borough Council has prepared the following responses to the queries. A contents list is provided, and the responses are numbered and follow on.
- Our responses aim to clarify the assumptions we have used to calculate the potential impacts of a CIL charge. We have sought to correct material as necessary, and therefore give a more transparent set of figures. We also explain where more up to date material referred to at the Examination fits into our evidence.
- We still consider that as proposed our Charging Schedule, taking into account the revised evidence, does not threaten the overall viability of development across the Borough.

Requested information
Contents

| Item number | Subject | Action required | Output | Page number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Strategic sites <br> - S106 costs <br> (Table 9.4) | Summary breakdown of S. 106 costs assumed on Strategic Sites | Note to Inspector with additional detail | 5 |
| 2 | Strategic sites <br> - S106 costs <br> (Table 9.4) | Revised Table 9.4 with corrected notes section. | Revised text | 8 |
| 3 | Strategic sites <br> $-\quad$ Units and <br> density data <br> (Table 9.4)  | Revise unit / density data for Knights Hill and Hall Lane sites <br> (To reflect up dated information available from latest BC Housing Trajectory) | Note to Inspector with additional detail | 11 |
| 4 | Modelled  <br> typologies (ln <br> respect of <br> Table 9.5 <br> typologies 1-9)  | Provide note / table (percentages and numbers of dwellings) on typologies and site allocations by proposed Charging Zones. | Noter to Inspector with additional detail | 23 |
| 5 | Table 10.3a) Additional Profit on larger sites | Corrections to table 10.3a) required as result of the correct figures in Appendix 5 which are not reflected in Table 10.3a). | Produce revised table | 27 |
| 6 | Charging Zone | Provide a more detailed | Produce | 28 |


|  | mapping King's Lynn | map of unparished area of King's Lynn, in respect of the $£ 10 \mathrm{~m} 2$ proposed charging zone | revised mapping |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | Table 10.4b), c)  <br> and d)  <br> Residual  <br> Values  <br> proposed  <br> Charging  <br> Zones)  <br>   | Clarify / revise tables10.4b), c), and d) toreconcile with actualAffordable Housing <br> liabilities. Clarify that <br> some typologies would <br> not require affordable <br> housing e.g. smaller infill <br> etc. Amend calculations <br> if appropriate. <br> (Ensure consistent <br> approach with summary <br> figures given in Tables <br> 10.2 b), c) and d)). | Produce revised tables with explanatory note | 31 |
| 8 | Draft Charging Schedule | Provide definitions for types of retail development in Draft Charging Schedule | Produce revised Draft Charging Schedule with explanatory note | 36 |

[^0]Representors will then have until 4 Oct 2016 to comment.

## ITEM 1

| Strategic sites - S106 costs (Table <br> 9.4) | Summary breakdown of S.106 costs <br> assumed on Strategic Sites |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the assumed S .106 obligations and associated costs for each of the nine strategic sites as per table 9.4

## Table 1

| Site | Onsite S.106 obligations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Boal Quay KL2 | $£ 100,000$ public open space facilities, |
|  | $£ 5,684$ fire hydrants |
|  | Total $£ 105,684$ ( $£ 302$ per dwelling). |
| South of Parkway KL3 | $£ 100,000$ public open space facilities, |
|  | $£ 4,222$ fire hydrants. |
|  | Total $£ 104,222$ ( $£ 401$ per dwelling) |
| Lynnsport KL4 | $£ 2,680,207$ highways (link road), |
|  | $£ 50,000$ public open space facilities |
|  | 4,369 fire hydrants. |
|  | Total $£ 2,734,576$ ( $£ 9,207.32$ per dwelling) |
| Bankside KL6 | $£ 100,000$ open space facilities, |
|  | $£ 200,000$ car parking linked to West Lynn Ferry |
|  | Fire Hydrants $£ 3,248$, |
|  | Flood mitigation/defences $£ 1,000,000$ |
|  | Total $£ 1,303,248$ ( $£ 6,517$ per dwelling) |
| West Winch | $£ 12,050,000$ education |
|  | $£ 5,000,000$ highways |
|  | $£ 1,000,000$ public open space facilities |
|  | $£ 229,200$ potential sub-library |
|  | $£ 62,037$ fire hydrants |
|  | Total $£ 18,341,237$ ( $£ 4,801$ per dwelling) |
| Knights Hill, South Wootton | $£ 200,000$ open space facilities |
|  | $£ 30,000$ potential sub-library |
|  | $£ 8,120$ fire hydrants. |
|  | Total $£ 238, \mathbf{1 2 0}$ (£476 per dwelling) |
|  | $£ 400,000$ open space facilities |
|  | $£ 42,000$ potential sub-library, |
|  | $£ 11,368$ fire hydrants. |


|  | Total $£ 453, \mathbf{3 6 8}$ ( $£ 648$ per dwelling) |
| :--- | :--- |
| East of Lynn Road, Downham Market | $£ 100,000$ open space facilities |
|  | $£ 6,496$ Ffire hydrants |
|  | Totalling $£ 106,496$ ( $£ 266$ per dwelling) |
| Wisbech Fringe, Wisbech | $£ 4,206,900$ contribution to onsite school |
|  | $£ 400,000$ open space facilities |
|  | $£ 8,923$ fire hydrants |
|  | Total $£ 4,615,832$ ( $£ 8,392$ per dwelling) |

The above costs were derived from considering the policy requirements of each of the above sites and in the context of the restrictions on the use of s106 payments set out in CIL Regulation 122 and CIL Regulation 123 (pooling). Whilst these sites do have a substantial impact on the local infrastructure and require mitigation measures it would not be appropriate (or possible) for the Council to request larger amounts.

The amounts have been checked against actual S. 106 costs on sites where obligations had been secured and collected by the Council. This work looked at data over a 10 year period from 2004-2014 utilising both Borough and County Council monitoring reports and data sources. In addition the Council also contacted Norfolk County Council to establish costs multipliers where known in relation to education, libraries and fire hydrants for all of the strategic sites. For example the cost of a fire hydrant is $£ 812$.

The significant changes in the figures from those used in the 2013 Viability Study are in the main due to updating of the figures based on information received in relation to the level education contributions to be sought from Norfolk County Council. The education figures were removed where an onsite provision is not being sought (in part due to the pooling restrictions). It is assumed that education will be delivered via CIL in such cases in the future.

This is well illustrated in the differences between tables 7.2 and 7.3 of the January 2016 viability study.

The Borough Council has a strong track record of securing and achieving S. 106 obligations. As set out in table 7.1 of the report (January 2016) the average level of obligations collected across applicable sites in the borough was $£ 7,032.24$ per dwelling. With the exception of the West Winch site and the Wisbech Fringe site where new primary schools are required onsite, the amounts of CIL being sought per dwelling along with the S. 106 on site obligations set out in table 1 above, are below the level of obligations that have consistently been provided on developments across the borough.

## Conclusion

- The above table shows how the estimated S106 payments given in Table 9.4 are calculated
- Costs here reflect a post CIL Charging Schedule situation (i.e. when subject to the restrictions set out in CIL Regulations 122 and 123) where generalised contributions (e.g. secondary school payments) are met through CIL.
- Analysis of S106 agreements concluded and anticipated payments across the Borough in recent years indicates approximately $£ 7,302$ per dwelling on the larger sites.
- Assuming CIL were introduced at the proposed rates (accepting there will still be onsite S106 payments) we conclude that the burden on developers will be less than that actually sought/paid in S106 recently/currently.


## ITEM 2

| Strategic sites - S106 costs (Table <br> 9.4) | Revised Table 9.4 with corrected notes <br> section. |
| :--- | :--- |

The text in the right hand column of table 9.4 was not correct - not having been updated from an earlier iteration of the report. This is corrected overleaf. The areas and numbers of units were correct and are unchanged. However the s106 figures quoted were not consistent with those shown in Table 7.3 of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016. These are now correct as below. Subject to the comments in the response to Item 1 above, the figures in Table 7.3 are correct.

| Table 9.4 KLWN Large Sites |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Details |  | Notes |
| Boal Quay KL2 <br> King's Lynn | Units | 350 | Brownfield site with river frontage. Assume mainly flatted development. No open space allowed. <br> Allow for raised floors and additional works. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 105,684$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 4.1 ha |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 85 |  |
| South of Parkway KL3 King's Lynn | Units | 260 | Playing fields in King's Lynn. Mix of family housing and flats in higher density development. $25 \%$ open space to give net developable area of 6.6ha. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 104,222$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 8.8ha |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 30 |  |
| Lynnsport KL4 <br> King's Lynn | Units | 297 | Amenity Land within the built up area. Assume a mix of family housing on about half the site. Assume retaining of allotments etc. Net developable area of 9ha. <br> Within Flood zone 2 and 3. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 2,734,576$. <br> This site is owned by the Council. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 9.1 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 32.6 |  |
| Bankside KL6 <br> King's Lynn | Units | 200 | Previous industrial use. <br> High density with about half units as flats - no open space. <br> Possibility of high quality design given proximity to King's Lynn conservation area. <br> Provision of additional car parking to serve West Lynn Ferry. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 1,303,248$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 2.6 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 77 |  |
| West Winch King's Lynn | Units | 3,820 | Known as South East KL in 2013 Viability Study. <br> Large strategic site south of the A47. Overall site area for residential and associated development is some 171ha. Significant open space provision, assume net developable area of 100ha (about 40\% open space). <br> Restricted by gas main easement <br> Link road needed, but to serve development so no additional costs. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 18,341,237$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 192 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 20 |  |
| Hall Lane <br> South Wootton | Units | 500 | Large greenfield strategic site. 40ha in all. Assumed 36units/ha and $75 \%$ net developable to give a net area of 13.88ha and gross area of 18.52ha. <br> South Wootton Parish Council have prepared a Parish Plan. <br> Some flood issues - assumed in undeveloped parts. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 222.872$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 18.5 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 27 |  |


| Site | Details |  | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knights Hill South Wootton | Units | 700 | Large greenfield strategic site. 36.9ha in all. Assumed 36units/ha and 75\% net developable to give a net area of 20.25ha and gross area of 27ha. <br> South Wootton Parish Council have prepared a Parish Plan. Only part of the site is in South Wootton, rest is Castle Rising and King's Lynn. <br> Some flood issues - assumed in undeveloped parts. Estimated s106 payments of $£ 448,744$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 27.0 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 26 |  |
| East of Lynn Road <br> Downham Market | Units | 400 | Large strategic site. Total site area in excess of 45ha submitted for consideration in LDF process. Modelled for 400 units. Assumed 36units/ha and $75 \%$ net developable to give a net area of 11.20ha and gross area of 14.93ha. <br> Currently in agricultural land <br> Mix of family housing <br> Part of site ex-WW2 airfield - not considered significant. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 104,060$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 14.9 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 27 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wisbech Fringe Wisbech | Units | 550 | This site is assumed to accommodate 550 units, when being developed with an adjacent allocation from the Fenland Local Plan. <br> Assume 25\% open space, 19ha net developable. <br> A master plan for the whole site is required <br> Mix of family housing <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 4,616,000$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 25.3 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 21.74 |  |

## ITEM 3

| Strategic sites - Units and density <br> data (Table 9.4) | Revise unit / density data for Knights Hill <br> and Hall Lane sites |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | (To reflect up dated information available <br> from latest BC Housing Trajectory) |
|  |  |

### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Inspector requested a note with additional detail on the numbers of units and anticipated densities on the strategic sites at Hall Lane, South Wootton and Knights Hill, reflecting updated information available from the latest (May 2016) Borough Council Housing Trajectory. These details are set out below. The scenarios illustrated show that the Council's assumptions about units to be delivered and likely densities are realistic. As set out in the trajectory, all the phasing information (in terms of numbers of units and timings) was provided by/agreed with the various site promoters.

This information is presented without prejudice to any future consideration by planning committee.

### 2.0 E3.1 Hall Lane, South Wootton

2.1 The information below is largely taken from the 2015/2016 Housing Trajectory Schedule. This is available via the link below:

## https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/downloads/download/51/monitoring reports

2.2 Note that the housing trajectory listed the allocation figure of 300 dwellings for the Hall Lane site, as at that point no alternative consultations or submissions had either occurred or had been received by the Council.
2.3 The Trajectory states that "There are five land owners. The agent who represents four of them (Mr John Maxey), the majority land owners, states that they have a collaborative approach. A legal agreement is being drawn up by solicitors, planning agent (Maxey Grounds \& Co.) has been instructed with a planning application expected before the end of the year, detailing 500 dwellings. The application will be a hybrid i.e. part full and part outline, commencement is expected by the end of this year. Once planning permission has been granted they will phase the development, and start building straight away. 400 dwellings are scheduled to be delivered over 8 years at a rate of 50 dwellings per year, and the remaining 100 dwellings in the following 3 years, as these are tied to the access road." Source: Developer Survey for the 2015/16 Housing Trajectory 21/03/2016." John Maxey represents landowners on 34ha.
2.4 This does not however include the portion of the land owned by the fifth land owner who is in the process of developing their planning application. Their site of 6.2 ha, taking off $25 \%$ for open space, etc. could bring the overall total for the allocated area to some 650 units. ( $6.2 \mathrm{ha} \times 0.75=4.65 \mathrm{ha}$ developable area. 4.65ha $\times 36$ units $/ \mathrm{ha}=167$ units).
2.5 The total area of the allocation is 40ha; 19.5ha of this is located within Tidal Climate Change Flood Zone 2 (so is not developable), leaving 20.5ha of developable land. Open space, Green Infrastructure, part of the link road, etc. could be provided in the areas at a higher risk of flooding. The open space requirement is 2.8 ha. With a total of 500 dwellings divided by a 36 dwellings/ha density this results in a 13.88ha net area and then with an allowance of $25 \%$ for open space, etc., the gross site area is 18.5 ha. This is the area required to deliver the 500 dwellings in a policy compliant way and forms the basis of the modelling in the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016.
2.6 The table below illustrates the three 'number of units' scenarios. For the purpose of the CIL examination the Council believes that the second scenario, 500 units, is the most appropriate based upon available evidence.

| E3.1 Hall Lane, South Wootton (total area is 40ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Units | Gross Area (ha) | Density (Units/ha) |
| 300 | 18.5 | 16 |
| 500 | 18.5 | 27 |
| 650 | 18.5 | 35 |

2.7 Provided below is a copy of the site allocation map from the Site Allocations and Development Management Polices (SADMP) pre-submission version (2015). The SADMP is about to be adopted with modifications. Following on from this is map which illustrates the site allocation and the flood zones. The next map shows the control of the land within the site.



E3.1 Hall Lane and Flood Zones
© Crown copyright and database rights 2015

| 0 | 0.03250 .065 | 0.13 | 0.195 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Ordnance Survey 100024314



E3.1 Hall Lane Land Control Composition
© Crown copyright and database rights 2015
Ordnance Survey 100024314

### 3.0 E4.1 Knights Hill

3.1 The information below is taken from the 2015/2016 Housing Trajectory Schedule. As set out in the trajectory, all the phasing information (in terms of numbers of units and timings) was provided by/agreed with the various site promoters. The Trajectory is available via the link below:

## https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/downloads/download/51/monitoring reports

3.2 The allocation is for at least 600 dwellings. The site is likely to come forward in two parts; 15/01782/OM detailing 65 dwellings is being promoted by Clayland. The second part is according to the agent (Paul Belton) likely to come forward with an application detailing 650 dwellings, with an anticipated delivery rate of 75 dwellings per year. The Trajectory states that:
3.3 "Camland Development are promoting the land, this is in three ownerships. A promotion agreement has been signed between Camland Development and the three separate landowners. The land is greenfield and is available for development now. A full team is instructed and the preparation of an outline planning application is in a well advanced state. Pre-application advice has already been sought. The outline application is expected pre-summer 2016, hopefully in the next 6-8 weeks. Camland Developments will sell land parcels to house builders on receipt of an outline planning approval. Reserved Matters should commence in late 2017. The anticipated delivery rate will be 75 dwellings per year. They consider constraints to be known and understood and mitigation measures have been incorporated within the masterplan. It is not anticipated at this time that there will be any constraints that will limit the future delivery of housing on the site." Source: Developer Survey for the 2015/16 Housing Trajectory: 29/03/2016.
3.4 The figure of 650 dwellings is further set out by Camland Development's Knights Hill consultation website and material (February 2016): http://www.knights-hill.com/our-proposals
3.5 For information, provided below is a copy of the site allocation map from the SADMP pre-submission version (2015). Following this (page 7) is the master plan provided for the smaller portion of the site, illustrating 65 dwellings/units on 2.6ha. After this (page 8) is the master plan from the Camland Development's consultation documents detailing 650 dwellings on the larger portion of the site (34.3ha).
3.6 The area of the allocation is 36.9ha. The site is in Flood Zone 1. The open space being provided by the Camland area is 5.7 ha , with a further 4.7 ha is not developable being a required landscape buffer. This space is also performing the safeguarding / mitigation required through the Habitats Regulation Assessment. There is no double counting or extra land required to satisfy this item. With 700 dwellings and a total area of 36.9 ha , at the assumed rate of 36 units/ha and $75 \%$
net developable area a net area results of 20.25 ha and a gross area of 27 ha . This is the area required to deliver the 700 dwellings in a policy compliant way and forms the basis of the modelling.
3.7 The table below illustrates the three 'number of units' scenarios. For the purpose of the CIL examination the Council believes that the second scenario, 700 units, is the most appropriate based upon current evidence.

E4.1 Knights Hill (total area is 36.9ha)

| Units | Developable Area (ha) | Density (Units/ha) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 600 | 27 | 22 |
| 700 | 27 | 26 |
| 715 | 27 | 26 |

3.8 Following on from this is a series of maps. The first map is of the site allocation and is taken from the Site Allocations and Development Management Polices plan document (SADMP), pre-submission version (2015). The SADMP is due to be adopted with modifications. The next map shows the composition of the allocation by the controlling agents. This is supported by the master plan submitted by 'Clayland' as part of their planning application, and the master plan which formed part of 'Camland's' public consultation.



E4.1 Knights Hill Land Control Composition
© Crown copyright and database rights 2015

| 0 | 0.03750 .075 | 0.15 | 0.225 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Ordnance Survey 100024314




## Conclusion

- The Borough Council has sought to clarify the assumptions used in Table 9.4, and gives an update in respect of recent evidence from current planning applications and information collected as part of the Housing Trajectory (May 2016).
- At South Wootton (Hall Lane) clarification is given of the net developable area and land owner aspirations for unit numbers (information from two parties is considered).
- We conclude that potentially higher density schemes are to be expected when planning applications are lodged. This reflects the SADMP Inspector's Main Modifications on flexibility of numbers on allocated sites. The scheme would be sharing known costs across greater numbers.
- These points are borne out by recent planning applications approved for in excess of the allocated numbers in SADMP. (The Trajectory can give details as required).
- At Knights Hill similar considerations apply.
- Developers draft proposals at Knights Hill reflect requirements for open space requirements compliant with the constraints imposed by HRA issues.
- Overall we consider realistic assumptions have been made about infrastructure requirements and resulting costs spread over realistic land areas and numbers of units.


## ITEM 4

| Modelled typologies (In respect of <br> Table 9.5 typologies 1-9) | Provide note / table (percentages and <br> numbers of dwellings) on typologies and <br> site allocations by proposed Charging <br> Zones. |
| :--- | :--- |

## Modelled Typologies 'Note’

1.1 In order to assess the relevance of the CIL 10 modelled typologies within the Borough of King's Lynn and West Norfolk we have looked at the latest published Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) 2014. The Link below is from the Borough Council website to the study's main report, site assessment tables and corresponding maps:
https://www.west-
norfolk.gov.uk/info/20185/planning policy research/379/housing and economic land a vailability assessments helaa
1.2 We have analysed the sites assessed within this study that were judged able to provided dwellings during the plan period to 2026 in comparison with the 10 modelled CIL sites, importantly this included the sites proposed for allocation at that time. These were the same as those contained within the Site Allocations and Development Management Polices (SADMP) document pre-submission version (2015).
1.3 This analysis is displayed by a series of tables that illustrate the number of sites within the HELAA study judged to be capable of providing dwellings during the plan period by the proposed CIL charging zones. Also displayed are the number of dwellings by each modelled typology and each CIL charging zone.
1.4 It is important to note that CIL modelled typologies 6, 9 and 10 do not feature as these are the smaller sites, which would not be assessed in the HELAA or sought for allocation within the local plan process, as the minimum site threshold for assessment
was 5 dwellings. These types of smaller site do however come forward within the borough and are likely come forward in the form of windfall.
1.5 For ease of reference a copy of table 9.5 from the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016, which details the 10 modelled typologies is also provided below.

| Table 9.5 Summary of Modelled Typologies |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Greenfield <br> Greenfield <br> 1 | Units | 100 | Larger urban edge, greenfield site. 36/net ha and $25 \%$ open space, 2.78 net developable ha. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 3.70 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 27 |  |
| Medium Greenfield <br> Greenfield <br> 2 | Units | 40 | Medium greenfield site. 36/net ha and $10 \%$ open space, 1.39 net developable ha. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.55 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 32 |  |
| Large Settlement Edge <br> Greenfield <br> 3 | Units | 30 | Greenfield site. 24/net ha and 10\% open space, 1.25 net developable ha. <br> Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.4 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 21 |  |
| Settlement Edge <br> Greenfield <br> 4 | Units | 12 | Greenfield site on settlement edge. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.5 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 24 |  |
| Small Greenfield <br> Greenfield <br> 5 | Units | 7 | Greenfield site on settlement edge or infill site. No open space. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.3 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 28 |  |
| Smaller Infill Infill 6 | Units | 2 | Greenfield infill on garden land. Pair of semi-detached. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 20 |  |
| Larger Urban Brownfield 7 | Units | 30 | Large brownfield site. $25 \%$ open space 36 units/ha, 0.83ha net developable ha. <br> Mix of family housing |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.11 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 27 |  |
| Urban Infill Brownfield 8 | Units | 7 | Small brownfield site. No open space. Mix of semidetached and terrace. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.3 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 23 |  |
| Small Infill Brownfield 9 | Units | 3 | Small brownfield site. No open space. Pair of semidetached and one detached. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 30 |  |
| Small Infill Greenfield$10$ | Units | 1 | Single detached house. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.05 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 20 |  |

## Number of 'sites’ / percentages

Sites
CIL Charging Zones $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$

| CIL Model | £0/2 <br> rated <br> strategic <br> sites | £10/m2 <br> Kings Lynn <br> Unparished <br> Area | £40/m2 <br> South <br> and West <br> of <br> Borough | £60/m2 <br> North <br> and East <br> of <br> Borough | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 21 |
| 2 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 13 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 23 |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 54 | 42 | 98 |
| 5 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 47 | 80 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 16 |
| 8 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 22 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 7 | 31 | 118 | 117 | 273 |

CIL Charging Zones $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$

| CIL Model | £0/2 <br> rated <br> strategic <br> sites | £10/m2 <br> Kings Lynn <br> Unparished <br> Area | £40/m2 <br> South <br> and West <br> of <br> Borough | £60/m2 <br> North <br> and East <br> of <br> Borough | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 71\% | 16\% | 4\% | 5\% | 8\% |
| 2 | 0\% | 13\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% |
| 3 | 0\% | 6\% | 8\% | 9\% | 8\% |
| 4 | 0\% | 6\% | 46\% | 36\% | 36\% |
| 5 | 0\% | 6\% | 26\% | 40\% | 29\% |
| 6 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 7 | 29\% | 26\% | 4\% | 1\% | 6\% |
| 8 | 0\% | 26\% | 8\% | 4\% | 8\% |
| 9 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 10 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

Dwellings and unit numbers breakdown and percentages

Dwellings / Units

|  | CIL Charging Zones $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL Model | £0/2 <br> rated <br> strategic <br> sites | £10/m2 <br> Kings Lynn <br> Unparished <br> Area | $£ 40 / \mathrm{m} 2$ <br> South and <br> West of Borough | £60/m2 <br> North and <br> East of Borough | Total |
| 1 | 3427 | 1210 | 560 | 1160 | 6357 |
| 2 | 0 | 185 | 147 | 260 | 592 |
| 3 | 0 | 40 | 238 | 268 | 546 |
| 4 | 0 | 31 | 735 | 571 | 1337 |
| 5 | 0 | 16 | 204 | 292 | 512 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 305 | 196 | 187 | 32 | 720 |
| 8 | 0 | 70 | 70 | 37 | 177 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3732 | 1748 | 2141 | 2620 | 10241 |


|  | CIL Charging Zones $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL Model | £0/2 <br> rated <br> strategic <br> sites | £10/m2 <br> Kings Lynn <br> Unparished <br> Area | £40/m2 <br> South and <br> West of Borough | £60/m2 <br> North and <br> East of Borough | Total |
| 1 | 92\% | 69\% | 26\% | 44\% | 62\% |
| 2 | 0\% | 11\% | 7\% | 10\% | 6\% |
| 3 | 0\% | 2\% | 11\% | 10\% | 5\% |
| 4 | 0\% | 2\% | 34\% | 22\% | 13\% |
| 5 | 0\% | 1\% | 10\% | 11\% | 5\% |
| 6 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 7 | 8\% | 11\% | 9\% | 1\% | 7\% |
| 8 | 0\% | 4\% | 3\% | 1\% | 2\% |
| 9 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 10 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |

1.6 The tables show that the modelled CIL typologies do relate to the actual sites that will come forward in the Borough.

## ITEM 5

| Table 10.3a) - Additional Profit on <br> larger sites | Corrections to table 10.3a) required as <br> result of the correct figures in Appendix 5 <br> which are not reflected in Table 10.3a). |
| :--- | :--- |

In table 10.3a the $£ /$ site column had not been updated from an earlier iteration of the report, it is presented here in amended form.

Table 10.3a Additional Profit - Larger Sites - FULL POLICY

|  |  |  | Additional Profit |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $£$ site | $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | King's Lynn | $-9,324,703$ | -491 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | King's Lynn | $-1,034,828$ | -59 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | King's Lynn | $1,890,719$ | 74 |
| 4 | Bankside | King's Lynn | $-4,192,803$ | -290 |
| 5 | West Winch | King's Lynn | $-39,918,087$ | -129 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | $7,196,899$ | 177 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | $9,639,892$ | 170 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 601,504 | 19 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | $-6,443,562$ | -144 |

## ITEM 6

| Charging Zone mapping <br> Lynn | - King's <br> unparished area of King's Lynn, in respect <br> of the $£ 10 / \mathrm{m} 2$ proposed charging zone |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Below is a more detailed map of the King's Lynn Unparished Area $£ 10 / \mathrm{m} 2$ proposed CIL charging zone. One was not provided in the in the documentation presented for consultation and before the Inspector. This map was requested by the Inspector to add a further degree of clarity.

Following on from this is an indicative map which illustrates the charging zone(s) that the strategic sites of Hall Lane and Knights Hill are located within. This is presented in order to provide clarification given the discussion about charging rates at Knights Hill.



## ITEM 7

| Table 10.4b), c) and d) - Residual | Clarify / revise tables 10.4b), c), and d) to |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Values (by proposed Charging | reconcile with actual Affordable Housing <br> Zones) | liabilities from planning policies (Policy <br> CS09). Clarify that some typologies would <br> not require affordable housing e.g. smaller <br> infill etc. Amend calculations if <br> appropriate. |
|  | (Ensure consistent approach with <br> summary figures given in Tables 10.2 b), <br> c) and d)). |  |
|  |  |  |

Tables 10.4(a to d) 10.5(a to d) 10.6(a to d) of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016 set out the results of the appraisals showing affordable housing against levels of CIL. The following tables show the appropriate affordable percentage taking into account the affordable housing policy area and the site size threshold.

It is important to note that the figures in Tables 10.4(a to d) 10.5(a to d) 10.6(a to d) of the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update January 2016 are correct, however as they are not related to the actual polices are difficult to follow.

## Conclusion

- The first column shows the corrected affordable housing \% appropriate to the location or type. Viability is then assessed on this basis in the revised table.
- When read with the response to Item 4 above (the distribution of typologies) it can be seen that the concerns that were expressed that significant amounts of development would be unviable across the CIL Charging Zones are unfounded. The majority of the 'unviable' typologies are not present in significant numbers in the areas concerned.

|  | Strategic Sites 10.4a Residual Value v Viability Threshold. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Affordable } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Alternative Use Value |  | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 15\% | 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,746,423 | -1,796,661 | -1,846,900 | -1,897,138 | -1,947,376 | -1,997,614 | -2,047,853 | -2,098,091 | -2, 148,329 | $-2,198,568$ | -2,248,806 |
| 15\% | 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 143,258 | 125,660 | 109,085 | 91,320 | 73,555 | 56,324 | 38,389 | 20,852 | 2,593 | -15,873 | -34,570 |
| 15\% | 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 407,456 | 383,565 | 359,675 | 335,784 | 311,893 | 287,339 | 262,601 | 237,862 | 213,123 | 188,384 | 163,645 |
| 15\% | 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -1,018,107 | -1,078,475 | -1,138,843 | -1,199,211 | -1,259,579 | -1,319,946 | -1,380,314 | -1,440,682 | -1,501,050 | -1,561,418 | -1,621,786 |
| 20\% | 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 221,010 | 212,493 | 203,809 | 195,101 | 186,392 | 177,683 | 168,975 | 160,266 | 151,558 | 142,849 | 134,140 |
| 20\% | 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 630,588 | 613,651 | 596,714 | 579,777 | 562,840 | 545,903 | 528,965 | 512,028 | 495,091 | 478,154 | 461,217 |
| 20\% | 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 599,572 | 583,326 | 567,079 | 550,833 | 534,587 | 518,341 | 502,095 | 485,849 | 469,603 | 453,356 | 437,110 |
| 20\% | 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 362,156 | 344,465 | 326,775 | 309,007 | 290,742 | 272,478 | 254,214 | 235,950 | 217,685 | 199,421 | 181,157 |
| 20\% | 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 134,915 | 120,763 | 106,610 | 92,115 | 77,436 | 62,757 | 48,079 | 33,716 | 19,079 | 4,242 | -11,160 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strategic Sites 10.5a CIL as \% of Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Affordable } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 15\% | 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | -2.6\% | -5.0\% | -7.3\% | -9.5\% | -11.6\% | -13.6\% | -15.5\% | -17.3\% | -19.0\% | -20.6\% |
| 15\% | 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 15.9\% | 36.7\% | 65.8\% | 108.8\% | 177.7\% | 312.8\% | 671.9\% | 6176.3\% | -1134.9\% | -579.0\% |
| 15\% | 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 7.4\% | 15.7\% | 25.2\% | 36.2\% | 49.1\% | 64.5\% | 83.1\% | 105.9\% | 134.8\% | 172.5\% |
| 15\% | 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | -5.2\% | -9.8\% | -13.9\% | -17.7\% | -21.1\% | -24.2\% | -27.1\% | -29.7\% | -32.1\% | -34.3\% |
| 20\% | 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 7.6\% | 15.9\% | 24.8\% | 34.7\% | 45.5\% | 57.4\% | 70.6\% | 85.3\% | 101.8\% | 120.4\% |
| 20\% | 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton |  |  | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.3\% | 11.3\% | 15.6\% | 20.1\% | 24.9\% | 30.0\% | 35.4\% | 41.3\% | 47.5\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton |  |  | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.4\% | 11.5\% | 15.8\% | 20.3\% | 25.2\% | 30.3\% | 35.9\% | 41.8\% | 48.2\% |
| 20\% | 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market |  |  | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 13.3\% | 21.1\% | 29.9\% | 39.9\% | 51.3\% | 64.5\% | 79.9\% | 98.2\% | 120.1\% |
| 20\% | 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech |  |  | 0.0\% | 14.6\% | 33.1\% | 57.5\% | 91.2\% | 140.6\% | 220.3\% | 366.5\% | 740.2\% | 3745.6\% | -1581.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Strategic Sites 10.6a CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Affordable } \\ \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | CLL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 15\% | 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 15\% | 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% |
| 15\% | 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% |
| 15\% | 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 20\% | 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 20\% | 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 20\% | 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% |
| 20\% | 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% |


|  | North East and East - 10.4b Residual Value v Viability Threshold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Affordable } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Value <br> Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,396,085 | 1,375,943 | 1,355,801 | 1,335,659 | 1,315,516 | 1,295,374 | 1,275,232 | 1,255,090 | 1,234,947 | 1,214,805 | 1,194,663 |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,056,589 | 1,036,721 | 1,016,853 | 996,985 | 977,117 | 957,249 | 937,381 | 917,514 | 897,646 | 877,778 | 857,910 |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,157,099 | 1,140,338 | 1,123,577 | 1,106,816 | 1,090,055 | 1,073,294 | 1,056,533 | 1,039,772 | 1,023,011 | 1,006,250 | 989,489 |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,264,267 | 1,242,430 | 1,220,593 | 1,198,756 | 1,176,919 | 1,155,082 | 1,133,245 | 1,111,408 | 1,089,571 | 1,067,734 | 1,045,897 |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,251,752 | 1,232,469 | 1,213,186 | 1,193,903 | 1,174,620 | 1,155,337 | 1,136,054 | 1,116,771 | 1,097,488 | 1,078,205 | 1,058,922 |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 490,747 | 471,438 | 452,129 | 432,821 | 413,512 | 394,203 | 374,895 | 355,586 | 336,278 | 316,969 | 297,660 |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 769,975 | 748,979 | 727,983 | 706,987 | 685,990 | 664,994 | 643,998 | 623,002 | 602,006 | 581,009 | 560,013 |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 656,411 | 636,752 | 617,093 | 597,434 | 577,774 | 558,115 | 538,456 | 518,797 | 499,137 | 479,478 | 459,819 |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 414,997 | 392,979 | 370,960 | 348,942 | 326,923 | 304,904 | 282,886 | 260,867 | 238,849 | 216,830 | 194,811 |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | 2,010,000 | 1,982,131 | 1,954,262 | 1,926,393 | 1,898,523 | 1,870,654 | 1,842,785 | 1,814,916 | 1,787,047 | 1,759,177 | 1,731,308 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North East and East - 10.5b CIL as \% of Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 3.2\% | 4.9\% | 6.7\% | 8.5\% | 10.3\% | 12.2\% | 14.2\% | 16.3\% | 18.4\% |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 4.2\% | 6.4\% | 8.6\% | 11.0\% | 13.5\% | 16.1\% | 18.8\% | 21.7\% | 24.6\% |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 3.2\% | 4.8\% | 6.5\% | 8.3\% | 10.1\% | 11.9\% | 13.9\% | 15.8\% | 17.9\% |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.7\% | 7.7\% | 9.8\% | 12.0\% | 14.3\% | 16.7\% | 19.2\% | 21.7\% |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 3.3\% | 5.0\% | 6.7\% | 8.5\% | 10.4\% | 12.4\% | 14.4\% | 16.5\% | 18.7\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 8.4\% | 13.2\% | 18.4\% | 24.1\% | 30.4\% | 37.4\% | 45.2\% | 53.9\% | 63.8\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 6.0\% | 9.3\% | 12.8\% | 16.5\% | 20.5\% | 24.7\% | 29.2\% | 34.1\% | 39.3\% |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.4\% | 9.9\% | 13.7\% | 17.7\% | 22.0\% | 26.7\% | 31.7\% | 37.1\% | 43.0\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 5.5\% | 11.7\% | 18.6\% | 26.5\% | 35.5\% | 46.0\% | 58.1\% | 72.6\% | 89.9\% | 111.2\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.8\% | 4.2\% | 5.7\% | 7.2\% | 8.8\% | 10.4\% | 12.1\% | 13.8\% | 15.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North East and East - 10.6b CIL as \% of GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.2\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.2\% |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.5\% |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.9\% | 3.2\% |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.4\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.4\% |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.9\% | 3.2\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.6\% |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | North East |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 1.0\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.0\% | 3.3\% |


|  | West and South - 10.4c Residual Value v Viability Threshold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Affordable } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 782,123 | 761,981 | 741,839 | 721,696 | 701,554 | 681,412 | 661,270 | 641,128 | 620,985 | 600,843 | 580,701 |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 906,893 | 887,025 | 867,157 | 847,289 | 827,422 | 807,554 | 787,686 | 767,818 | 747,950 | 728,082 | 708,214 |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 714,286 | 703,293 | 686,373 | 669,453 | 652,533 | 635,613 | 618,694 | 601,774 | 584,854 | 567,934 | 551,014 |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 936,877 | 914,831 | 892,786 | 870,740 | 848,694 | 826,648 | 804,602 | 782,556 | 760,510 | 738,464 | 716,418 |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 764,575 | 744,915 | 725,256 | 705,597 | 685,938 | 666,278 | 646,619 | 626,960 | 607,301 | 587,641 | 567,982 |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 108,486 | 89,177 | 69,869 | 50,560 | 31,251 | 11,943 | -7,366 | -26,675 | -45,983 | -65,292 | -84,601 |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 137,430 | 115,819 | 95,137 | 73,313 | 51,489 | 29,666 | 7,842 | -13,981 | -35,805 | -57,629 | -79,452 |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -223,221 | -243,740 | -264,260 | -284,779 | -305,299 | -325,818 | -346,338 | -366,857 | -387,377 | -407,896 | -428,416 |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -238,870 | -260,888 | -282,907 | -304,926 | -326,989 | -349,747 | -372,505 | -395,264 | -418,022 | -440,780 | -463,539 |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,081,113 | 1,053,244 | 1,025,375 | 997,505 | 969,636 | 941,767 | 913,898 | 886,029 | 858,160 | 830,290 | 802,421 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | West and South - 10.5c CIL as \% of Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 5.9\% | 9.1\% | 12.5\% | 16.1\% | 19.9\% | 24.0\% | 28.3\% | 32.9\% | 37.8\% |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.4\% | 4.9\% | 7.5\% | 10.2\% | 13.1\% | 16.1\% | 19.3\% | 22.6\% | 26.1\% | 29.8\% |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.2\% | 7.9\% | 10.9\% | 13.9\% | 17.2\% | 20.6\% | 24.2\% | 28.1\% | 32.1\% |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.1\% | 7.8\% | 10.7\% | 13.8\% | 17.0\% | 20.3\% | 23.9\% | 27.7\% | 31.7\% |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.4\% | 8.4\% | 11.5\% | 14.8\% | 18.3\% | 22.1\% | 26.0\% | 30.3\% | 34.8\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 21.3\% | 54.4\% | 112.7\% | 243.2\% | 795.5\% | -1547.7\% | -498.6\% | -330.6\% | -261.9\% | -224.6\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 46.2\% | 90.0\% | 170.8\% | 370.5\% | 1681.8\% | -1100.6\% | -491.1\% | -343.3\% | -276.7\% |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | -8.1\% | -15.0\% | -20.8\% | -25.9\% | -30.3\% | -34.2\% | -37.7\% | -40.8\% | -43.6\% | -46.1\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | -8.3\% | -15.3\% | -21.3\% | -26.5\% | -31.0\% | -34.9\% | -38.4\% | -41.5\% | -44.2\% | -46.7\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.3\% | 8.1\% | 11.1\% | 14.3\% | 17.7\% | 21.3\% | 25.2\% | 29.3\% | 33.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | West and South - 10.6c CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 20\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |
| 20\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |
| 20\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |
| 20\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.7\% |
| 20\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.8\% |
| 20\% | 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% |
| 20\% | 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% | 5.0\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | West \& South |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% |


|  |  | gs Lynn Area - 10 | 0.4d Residu | Value | Viab | ty Thre | hold |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Affordable } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 15\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 589,046 | 567,645 | 546,244 | 524,843 | 503,441 | 482,040 | 460,639 | 439,238 | 417,837 | 396,436 | 375,035 |
| 15\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 645,228 | 630,034 | 608,724 | 587,415 | 566,105 | 544,795 | 523,485 | 502,176 | 480,866 | 459,556 | 438,247 |
| 15\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 749,806 | 731,998 | 714,286 | 702,981 | 685,004 | 667,027 | 649,049 | 631,072 | 613,094 | 595,117 | 577,140 |
| 15\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 982,220 | 958,796 | 935,372 | 911,948 | 888,524 | 865,101 | 841,677 | 818,253 | 794,829 | 771,405 | 747,982 |
| 0\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 779,441 | 754,867 | 730,293 | 705,719 | 681,144 | 656,570 | 631,996 | 607,422 | 582,848 | 558,274 | 533,700 |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | 44,776 | 25,467 | 6,158 | -13,150 | -32,459 | -51,767 | -71,076 | -90,385 | -109,693 | -129,002 | -148,311 |
| 15\% | 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | 85,254 | 62,066 | 38,879 | 15,691 | -7,497 | -30,684 | -53,872 | -77,059 | -100,247 | -123,435 | -146,622 |
| 0\% | 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -145,175 | -169,992 | -194,808 | -219,624 | -245,062 | -270,712 | -296,361 | -322,011 | -347,660 | -373,309 | -398,959 |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -386,389 | -409,148 | -431,906 | -454,664 | -477,423 | -500,181 | -522,939 | -545,698 | -568,456 | -591,214 | -613,973 |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,545,557 | 1,517,687 | 1,489,818 | 1,461,949 | 1,434,080 | 1,406,211 | 1,378,341 | 1,350,472 | 1,322,603 | 1,294,734 | 1,266,865 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | gs Lynn Area - 10 | 10.5d CIL as | of Res | dual V | ue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL | 0.0\% |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 15\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 4.1\% | 8.5\% | 13.3\% | 18.5\% | 24.2\% | 30.4\% | 37.2\% | 44.6\% | 52.9\% | 62.2\% |
| 15\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.4\% | 11.5\% | 15.9\% | 20.6\% | 25.7\% | 31.3\% | 37.3\% | 44.0\% | 51.2\% |
| 15\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.3\% | 8.0\% | 11.0\% | 14.1\% | 17.4\% | 20.9\% | 24.6\% | 28.5\% | 32.6\% |
| 15\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.2\% | 7.9\% | 10.9\% | 14.0\% | 17.2\% | 20.7\% | 24.3\% | 28.2\% | 32.3\% |
| 0\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.8\% | 10.5\% | 14.5\% | 18.8\% | 23.4\% | 28.5\% | 33.9\% | 39.8\% | 46.3\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 74.6\% | 617.0\% | -433.5\% | -234.1\% | -183.5\% | -160.4\% | -147.1\% | -138.6\% | -132.6\% | -128.1\% |
| 15\% | 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 37.6\% | 120.1\% | 446.5\% | -1246.2\% | -380.6\% | -260.1\% | -212.2\% | -186.4\% | -170.3\% | -159.3\% |
| 0\% | 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | -14.5\% | -25.4\% | -33.7\% | -40.3\% | -45.6\% | -50.0\% | -53.7\% | -56.8\% | -59.5\% | -61.9\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | -5.3\% | -10.0\% | -14.3\% | -18.2\% | -21.7\% | -24.9\% | -27.8\% | -30.5\% | -33.0\% | -35.3\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.6\% | 5.5\% | 7.5\% | 9.6\% | 11.8\% | 14.0\% | 16.3\% | 18.8\% | 21.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ngs Lynn Area - | 10.6d CIL as | \% of G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | CIL as \% GD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 15\% | 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 15\% | 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 15\% | 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 15\% | 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 0\% | 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% |
| 0\% | 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% | 4.9\% |
| 15\% | 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.6\% |
| 0\% | 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% | 5.3\% |
| 0\% | 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% | 5.3\% |
| 0\% | 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn |  |  | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.6\% |

## ITEM 8

| Draft Charging Schedule | Provide definitions for types of retail <br> development in Draft Charging Schedule |
| :--- | :--- |

As set out in Chapter 12 of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study (November 2013) HDH recommend that the Charging Authority adopts the definitions set out by Geoff Salter in his report following his examination of the Wycombe DC CIL Charging Schedule (September 2012). These are:

Superstores/supermarkets are shopping destinations in their own right where weekly food shopping needs are met and which can also include non-food floorspace as part of the overall mix of the unit.

Retail warehouses are large stores specialising in the sale of household goods (such as carpets, furniture and electrical goods) DIY items and other ranges of goods catering for mainly car-borne customers.


[^0]:    All of the above information must be submitted to PINS and emailed to the representors by 20 Sep 2016.

