

**Worthing Borough Council**  
**Community Infrastructure Levy Examination**

**Malcolm Rivett BA (Hons) MSC MRTPI - Examiner**  
**Linda Amos – Programme Officer**

Ian Moody  
Principal Planning Officer  
Adur and Worthing Councils  
Civic Centre  
Ham Road  
Shoreham-by-Sea  
West Sussex  
BN43 6PR

3 July 2014

Dear Mr Moody

**Worthing Community Infrastructure Levy Examination**

I have commenced the Examination reading and considering the evidence you have submitted and the representations which were received in response to the consultation on the draft schedule. At this stage I have a number of initial questions to which I would be grateful for the Council's response.

1. I note that the October 2013 NCS Viability Assessment assumes a 50% share to the landowner of the uplift in land value whereas the December 2012 Assessment assumed a 60% share – the 60% share explained (in para 3.23 of the 2012 Assessment) to be necessary "in order for sites to be released". What is the evidence supporting this change in approach and, in broad terms, what effect has the change had on the levels of CIL shown to be viable?
2. I note that the December 2012 NCS Viability Assessment included "residential – residential" appraisals. Why were these not repeated in the October 2013 Assessment? Is it likely, as is contended by some representations, that a significant proportion of new residential development will involve the redevelopment of existing residential land?
3. Para 8.22 of the October 2013 Assessment indicates that the majority of development in the Borough is likely to take place on brownfield sites and I note that the brownfield appraisals assume the land to be currently industrial. Given Policy 4 of the Core Strategy (which seeks to resist loss of land used/last used for employment purposes) is it realistic that the majority of brownfield residential development will be on industrial land?

4. Para 8.18 of the NCS Assessment (October 2013) quotes the 2013 CIL Guidance. However, it appears that the quotation comes from the 2010 Guidance and, as far as I am aware, the last two sentences of the quote did not appear in subsequent versions of the guidance. I'd be grateful for the Council's comment on the General Conclusions section of the Assessment (paras 8.16 – 8.24) in the light of this.
5. Para 8.24 of the NCS Assessment (October 2013) acknowledges that a £100 CIL rate could potentially threaten the viability of some residential development in the low value areas but argues that because 75-80% of new residential development is envisaged to take place in the medium and high value areas of the Borough the CIL rate would be unlikely to threaten the delivery of residential development as a whole over the plan period. Is there evidence to support the 75-80% figure? Moreover, does this approach accord with the 2014 CIL Guidance (now incorporated in DCLG's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)) that charging authorities should set a rate which does not threaten the ability to develop viably the sites and scales of development identified in the relevant plan?
6. CD03/4 helpfully sets out the funding collected through planning obligations although it appears not to include affordable housing. Are you able to provide information on the total number of affordable homes secured through planning obligations in recent years (I don't necessarily need site-by-site information) and a broad indication of how this figure compares with the adopted affordable housing percentage requirements.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

*Malcolm Rivett*

EXAMINER