## Mae'r ddogfen hon ar gael yn Gymraeg / This document is also available in Welsh



5. Are there any other issues arising from the CIL Draft Charging Schedule that you would like to comment on? / Hoffech chi godi unrhyw faterion eraill ynghylch y Rhestr Ddraft Codi Tâl?

ė

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CIL DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Spatial Development Team, Regeneration & Pianning Division, Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council, Floor 3, Sardis House, Sardis Road, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU.

REPRESENTAIONS SHOULD BE RETURNED BY 5:00pm ON THE 7th AUGUST 2013

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AFTER THIS DATE WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED

DIOLCH AM EICH SYLWADAU AR Y RHESTR DDRAFFT CODI TÂL ASC

Dylech anfon ffurflenni wedi'u cwbihau at:

Carfan Datblygu Gofodol, Adran Adfywio a Chynllunio, Cyngor Bwrdeistref Rhondda Cynon Taf, Llawr 3, Tŷ Sardis, Heol Sardis, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU.

DYLA! SYLWADAU GAEL EU HANFON YN ÔL ERBYN

FYDDWN NI DDIM YN YSTYRIED UNRHYW SYLWADAU SY'N CAEL AU DERBYN AR ÔL Y 5:00pm 7fed Awst 2013 DY DDIAD HWN



For Office Use/ At ddefnydd y swyddfa yn unig

Representation Number: Contribution Number: Contributor Number:

## Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council CIL Consultation June - August 2013

Cyngor Bwrdeistref Sirol Rhondda Cynon Taf Ymgynghoriad ASC Mehefin - Awst 2013

Ffurflen Ymgynghori Rhestr Ddrafft Codi Tâl ASC CIL: Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Form

Completed forms should be returned by 5.00pm 7th August 2013 to. The Spatial Development Team, Regeneration & Planning Floor 3, Sardis House, Sardis Road, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU Division, Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council,

Dylech anfon ffurflenni wedi'u cwblhau erbyn 5:00pm 7fed Awst 2013 at: Carfan Datblygu Gofodol, Adran Adfywio a Chynllunio, Cyngor Bwrdeistref Rhondda Cynon Taf, Llawr 3, Tŷ Sardis, Heol Sardis, Pontypridd, CF37 1DU Further copies can be obtained from the Spatial Development Team, or you can photocopy this form. Gallwch gael rhagor o gopïau o Garfan Datblygu Gofodol, neu gallwch lungopïo'r ffurflen hon.

	Contact Details / Manylion Cyswilt	/SWIIt
	Personal Details / Manylion Personol	Agents Details / Manylion yr Asiant
Title / Teitll		Mr
First Name / Enw Cyntaf		Peter
Last Name / Cyfenw		Waldren
Job Title (if applicable) / Title Swydd (lle bo'n berthnasol)		Director
Organisation (if applicable) / Sefydliad (Ile bo'n berthnasol)	Talbot Green Developments Ltd	WYG
Address / Cyfeiriad	C/O Agent	5th Floor, Longcross Court 47 Newport Road Cardiff
Post Code / Côd Post		CF24 0AD
Email Address / Cyfeiriad E-bost		peter.waldren@wyg.com
Phone Number / Rhif Ffôn		02920 829 200
		RHONDDA CYNON TAF





1. Did you make any representations on this issue during the consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging

The approval of the Charg Codi Tâl gan yr Awdurdod	
The publication of the recommendations / Cyhoe	
If the Draft Charging Sch- section 212 of the Plannii chyfeirio gerbron Archwi diwygiwyd).	יוקסטק טקר סקטסו מוק טויקקי.
<ol> <li>Please tick the box if you would Tichiwch y blwch os hoffech chi</li> </ol>	□ No / Nac oes
No, I do not wish to attend	(Cyfeiriwch at yr adrannau neu'r paragraffau mae eich sylwadau yn ymwneud â nhw a nodwch fanylion eich sylwadau yn y blwch isod. Defnyddiwch ddalen ar wahân os hoffech chi).
₹	Yes / Oes (Please make sure you refer to the sections or paragraphs to which your comments relate and provide details by using the box below for your comments. If needed, please continue on a separate sheet of paper)
<ol> <li>If your representation is seeking to attend the Examination in Pt</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Do you have any comments relating to the CIL Draft Charging Schedule and its supporting evidence? / Oes sylwadau gyda chi ynghylch y Rhestr Ddrafft Codi Tâl ASC a'r dystiolaeth sy'n gen iddi?</li> </ol>
***************************************	If 'yes', please give your representation number (if known) If 'no', please briefly explain why you did not do so Os 'do', nodwch gyfeirnod y sylwadau (os yn hysbys) Os 'na', nodwch yn fyr pam na gyflwynoch chi sylwadau
	Yes/Do ☐ No/Naddo <a>T</a>
	Schedule? / A gyflwynoch chi unrhyw sylwadau yn ystod yr ymgynghoriad ar y Rhestr Ragarweiniol Ddrafft Codi Tâl?



If your representation is seeking a change to the CIL Draft Charging Schedule, do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? I Os ydy'ch sylwadau yn ceisio newid y Rhestr Ddrafft Codi Tâl ASC, ydych chi o'r fam bod angen ichi fynychu'r Archwiliad Cyhoeddus?	Yes, I wish to attend / Ydw, hoffwn i fynychu	No, I do not wish to attend / Na, dw i ddim am fynychu		
---	---	--	--	--

- like to be notified about any of the following: gael gwybodaeth ynghylch unrhyw un o'r canlynol:
- redule has been submitted to an Independent Examiner in accordance with ing Act 2008 (as amended) / Os ydy'r Rhestr Ddrafft Codi Tâl wedi cael ei iliwr Annibynnol yn unol ag adran 212 Ddeddf Cynllunio 2008 (fel y'i
- recommendations of the Examiner and the reasons behind those eddi argymhellion yr Archwilydd a'r rhesymau dros yr argymhellion hynny.
- ging Schedule by the Charging Authority (the Council) / Cymeradwyo'r Rhestr d Codi Tal (y Cyngor)



## Discretionary relief

On behalf of our client, Talbot Green Developments Limited (TGDL), these representations provide comments and precedents set in regard to the approach to discretionary relief in relation to Exceptional Circumstances (Regulation 55-58). Our client wishes to object to application of the Charging Schedule to developments which have been permitted but which require subsequent amendment, and to paragraph 6.3 of the Draft Charging Schedule (June 2013) in particular, which states that "The Council does not propose to offer discretionary relief".

Our comments seek to ensure that Rhonda Cynon Taff County Borough Council (RCTCBC) pay due regard to the need to ensure that the combined weight of obligations do not render development in the Borough unviable on the application of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). We note the apparent absence of any modelling of major developments, comparable to the scale of the Talbot Green town centre, which have very significant on-site infrastructure requirements. The viability modelling fails to account for consented schemes which become subject to 'fresh' planning applications (e.g. for revisions to layout) after the adoption of CIL, triggering the need for a payment. Such payments could result in 'double dipping' payment in the instance where an existing s106 Agreement has already secured relevant Strategic Infrastructure (or contributions towards), or could result in combined obligations. We raise concern that major developments could be rendered unviable due to the combined impact of s106 payments and CIL. In the context of economic uncertainty there is a need to have a discretionary relief policy to ensure chargeable development remains viable development.

In our opinion, the extent of previously delivered and future obligations should be considered when assessing the viability of a scheme, and in determining eligibility for Exemption Circumstance from CIL in accordance with the CIL regulations at the current time.

At the time of making these representations TGDL have received, as joint applicants with Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited (SSL), a resolution to grant full planning permission for a 10,801sqm (GEA) supermarket. TGDL have also received a separate resolution to grant an overlapping outline planning permission for a new town centre comprising c.25,000sqm of Class A1 and A3 floorspace, including the above mentioned supermarket.

The resolutions to grant were made to subject to Planning Obligations under s106 of the Act ensuring payment of (*inter alia*) £2.05M for strategic highway infrastructure, described in the committee reports as improvements to the roundabout junction of the A4119/A473. One of the transport projects included on the Councils Regulation 123 Draft Infrastructure List relates to the improvement of the A4119/A473 roundabout. The trigger point for making this payment results in the full amount being paid within 6 weeks of the full or outline development having commenced.

The stated intention set out in the applications was, and remains, to implement the supermarket as phase 1 of the wider town centre development. The development programme requires the provision, by TGDL, of significant new access infrastructure to serve the phase 1 site as well as provision of a serviced plateau for the supermarket itself. The



provision of these site preparation/access works are envisaged to take approximately 12 months, after which construction of the supermarket by SSL will commence. Accordingly, the £2.05M strategic highway s106 payment will have been made some 11 months prior to construction of the supermarket commencing.

Retailing is a particularly dynamic sector of the economy with constant data analysis refining the ultimate end product. Accordingly, schemes such as those subject to the resolutions to approve, above, are frequently refined to ensure developments are fully cognisant of the latest thinking and tenant demands. It is possible, or even likely, therefore that the precise form of development will differ from that which has been resolved to be approved, potentially necessitating a further planning submission.

In Wales, there is no scope to submit a Minor Material or Non Material Amendment and accordingly the only options to seek approval for any change would be to either (a) seek to vary a condition listing the approved plans or (b) apply for a new full or outline planning permission. Unfortunately, the conditions set out in the committee report contain no condition listing the approved plans and while we have requested one be added, it is not clear at time of writing whether such a request will be granted. In such circumstances it appears that a new application would be required for even a relatively minor and acceptable change to the approved development.

While the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2012, which came into effect on 28 November 2012, introduced a recognition that applications made under s73 of the Act might hitherto have resulted in an overpayment of CIL, there is no similar provision for new applications for full planning permission (under s57), even if such an application were materially similar to a previously approved permission and resulted in no increase in floorspace (indeed, even if they resulted in a reduction in floorspace).

The outcome of the above is that:

- Should development of the site preparation/access works commence, thus triggering payment of the £2.05 highway infrastructure payment (for works to the A4119/A473 junction, which is included on the Councils Regulation 123 list); and
- Should the permitted development need to be altered in any material way such that a new planning application is required; and
- Should such an application be determined after CIL comes into effect (as seems entirely possible given the current development programme and published timetable for introducing CIL);

Then, notwithstanding the fact that the development's share of its Regulation 123 infrastructure burden (£2.05M) will already have been paid and notwithstanding any implications for scheme viability, a further CIL payment would be required. This would be grossly unfair and would in effect constitute 'double dipping'.

Furthermore, if a significantly different form of development were envisaged for phase 2 of the town centre scheme no account would appear to be able to be taken of the fact that the project would have already contributed over £2M towards infrastructure appearing on the Regulation 123 list. Again, this would be grossly unfair, would in effect constitute 'double dipping' and would have significant implications for scheme viability.



It is also the case that another element of infrastructure on the Regulation 123 draft list is a necessary part of the phase 2 town centre development, namely the signalisation of the A473/Glamorgan Retail Park roundabout. This is currently a conditional requirement of the phase 2 town centre development and is likely to be a conditional requirement of any subsequent alteration to phase 2, should such alteration be necessary. As such, as currently drafted, the charging schedule and infrastructure list would appear to require this to be both paid for and provided.

Accordingly, our client wishes to object to the apparent potential application of the Charging Schedule to development which may already have been implemented but which require subsequent amendment.

Regulations 55 to 58 allow charging authorities to set discretionary relief for exceptional circumstances to allow the charging authority to avoid rendering sites with specific and exceptional cost burdens unviable should exceptional circumstances arise. We believe that the above scenario constitutes exceptional circumstances.

Before granting discretionary relief, the charging authority will need to be satisfied that the costs relating to the section 106 agreement (which we assume must include the section 106 agreement relating to the original permission) are greater than those related to the Community Infrastructure Levy, and that the relief would not constitute notifiable State Aid. We believe these stipulations would be met.

Accordingly, our client wishes to object to paragraph 6.3 of the Draft Charging Schedule (June 2013), which states that "The Council does not propose to offer discretionary relief".

In a similar set of circumstances to those outlined above, the London Borough of Brent and Quintain Estates and Development plc prepared and signed a Statement of Common Ground on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2012. The statement formalised areas of agreement in relation to the CIL Draft Charging Schedule between the two parties to address the circumstances prior to the adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule. As with the Talbot Green development, the s106 agreement pre-dated the Charging Schedule coming into effect and accordingly included infrastructure to both directly mitigate on site impacts, and to serve the wider needs of the area.

We request that a Statement of Common Ground or Memorandum of Understanding is also prepared and signed in advance of examination to assist the Examiner in addressing the concerns outlined above. In these similar circumstances, we wish to address our client's unease and to avoid 'double dipping' for Strategic Infrastructure and to ensure certainty for developers in assessing viability in regard to progressing their schemes.