

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY SCHEDULE EXAMINATION

DRAFT HEARINGS PROGRAMME

Examiner – Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

Hearings commencing at 10:00 on Thursday 25 November
2021

To be held virtually using Teams

This programme should be read in conjunction with
the Examiner’s Briefing Note

**Ian Kemp
Programme Officer**

Tel: 07723 009 166

e-mail: jdkemp@icloud.com

IMPORTANT NOTES

The primary purpose of the CIL Schedule is to set down the basis for charging in relation to relevant planning applications. However, the details of particular schemes before or recently considered by the London Borough of Barnet are not a matter for the examination.

Representations received and any further written statements have been read by the Examiner prior to the hearing. They are available to everyone through the examination website. Therefore, it is not necessary for participants to repeat things from their statement; it is however helpful for participants to highlight their main points.

The hearing sessions will be held virtually using 'Teams'. 'This is an online video conferencing system that allows virtual meetings to be held.

The day will be split into three approximate 1.5-hour sessions (an additional 4th session will be added if required). There will be a lunch break and short breaks of approximately 20 minutes between the sessions. A draft programme indicating the matters to be discussed is set out below.

AGENDA

10:00 – Examiner's Opening Statement

10:10 – Council's Opening Statement

In their opening statement the Council will be asked to confirm that the Community Infrastructure Levy Schedule has been prepared in accordance with:

- The statutory procedures?
- The Council's Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan?
- The consultation requirements set out in the Regulations?
- Is it supported by a viability appraisal?
- If there are any fundamental procedural shortcomings?

Preliminary Matter – Infrastructure Funding Gap

- a. What is the overall amount of Infrastructure Funding required to deliver the quantum of development identified within the various adopted and emerging planning policies for the London Borough of Barnet?

- b. What level of funding has been secured from s106 and the existing CIL regime in the London Borough of Barnet since it has been introduced?
- c. Can the Council provide a projection of the level of funding that will be secured from the CIL and taking this into account what would be the overall Infrastructure Funding Gap in Barnet?

The Proposed CIL Rates

Part One

Residential including C2, C3 and C4 use classes and sui generis HMOs and other sui generis residential uses - £300sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £300sqm for Residential including C2, C3 and C4 use classes and sui generis HMOs and other sui generis residential uses justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for the London Borough of Barnet?
- b. Does the local levy rate of £300sqm ensure an adequate viability buffer (it is helpful to clarify this in percentage terms) when measured against the minimum and maximum viable CIL rates for Residential including C2, C3 and C4 use classes and sui generis HMOs and other sui generis residential uses?
- c. Overall, does the rate of £300sqm for Residential including C2, C3 and C4 use classes and sui generis HMOs and other sui generis residential uses strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability?

Invited Participants: TBC, plus Council

Part Two

Hotels (C1) - £202sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £202sqm for Hotels (C1) justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for Barnet?

- b. Does the local levy rate of £202sqm ensure an adequate viability buffer (it is helpful to clarify this in percentage terms) when measured against the minimum and maximum viable CIL rates for Hotels (C1)?
- c. Overall, does the rate of £202sqm for Hotels (C1) strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability?

Part Three

Retail (including former A1-A5 uses) - £202sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £202sqm for Retail (including former A1-A5 uses) justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for Barnet?
- b. Does the local levy rate of £202sqm ensure an adequate viability buffer (it is helpful to clarify this in percentage terms) when measured against the minimum and maximum viable CIL rates for Retail (including former A1-A5 uses)?
- c. Overall, does the rate of £202sqm for Retail (including former A1-A5 uses) strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability?

Invited Participants: TBC, plus Council

Part Four

Leisure (including former D2 uses and sui generis leisure uses) - £20sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £20sqm for Leisure (including former D2 uses and sui generis leisure uses) justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for Barnet?
- b. Does the local levy rate of £20sqm ensure an adequate viability buffer (it is helpful to clarify this in percentage terms) when measured against the minimum and maximum viable CIL rates for Leisure (including former D2 uses and sui generis leisure uses)?

- c. Overall, does the rate of £20sqm for Leisure (including former D2 uses and sui generis leisure uses) strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability?

Invited Participants: TBC, plus Council

Part Five

Employment (including former B use classes and/or B2 and B8 uses) - £20sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £20sqm for Employment (including former B use classes and/or B2 and B8 uses) justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for Barnet?
- b. Does the local levy rate of £20sqm ensure an adequate viability buffer (it is helpful to clarify this in percentage terms) when measured against the minimum and maximum viable CIL rates for Employment (including former B use classes and/or B2 and B8 uses)?
- c. Overall, does the rate of £20sqm for Employment (including former B use classes and/or B2 and B8 uses) strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability?

Invited Participants: TBC, plus Council

Part Six

All other uses - £0sqm

- a. Is the local levy rate of £0sqm for All other uses justified by appropriate available evidence, having regard to national guidance, local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the various adopted and emerging planning policies for East Devon?
- b. Overall, does the local levy rate of £0sqm for All other uses strike an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential effects on economic viability (viability buffer)?

Invited Participants: TBC, plus Council