

Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation 2023

QUESTION SUMMARIES

DATA TRENDS

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

All Pages –

Respondent #45 –

“

”

COMPLETE

Started: Sunday, March 26, 2023 3:45:24 PM

Last Modified: Sunday, March 26, 2023 3:55:52 PM

Time Spent: 00:10:28

IP Address:

[REDACTED]

Page 1: Survey Information

Q1

Do you confirm that you have read and understood the privacy notice? You must select 'Yes' in order to take the survey.

Yes

Page 2: Register for consultation

Q2

Your name:

Robert Powell

Contact details:

Address

[REDACTED]

Address 2

[REDACTED]

City/town

[REDACTED]

Post code

[REDACTED]

Email address

[REDACTED]

Q4

Do you wish to notified of future updates to CIL by the council? If yes we will use contact details provided above

Yes

Q5

Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination? If yes we will use contact details provided above

Yes

Page 3: Your response

Q6

1a. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study informed the production of the proposed rates in the draft CIL Charging Schedule. Do you have any comments on the content of the CIL Viability Study?

Respondent skipped this question

Q8

2a. Do the proposed levy rates set out in the draft CIL Charging Schedule appropriately reflect the conclusions of the CIL Viability Study?

Respondent skipped this question

Q10

3a. Do the proposed levy rates set out in the draft CIL Charging Schedule provide an appropriate balance between securing infrastructure investment and supporting the financial viability of new development in the area?

Respondent skipped this question

Q12

4a. CIL rates should not be set at a level which could render new development financially unviable. To ensure the financial viability of new development in the area, and to take into account variations in land prices and development costs throughout the authority's area, the draft CIL Charging Schedule proposes variable rates for different kinds of development. Do you have any comments on the proposed CIL rates?

Respondent skipped this question

Q14

5a. Should any types of development be charged a different CIL rate, and if so, why? Where alternative rates are proposed, please provide evidence to demonstrate why a proposed rate should be changed.

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Your response

Q16

6a. To support the financial viability of new development in the area, the draft CIL Charging Schedule includes an Instalments Policy which allows specified levels of levy charges to be paid in instalments over a set period of time. Do you have any comments on the draft Instalments Policy?

Respondent skipped this question

Q18

7a. Part 6 of the CIL Regulations (as amended) allows the Council to give discretionary relief for certain types of development from paying the levy. The Council has not identified any types of development which may require this beyond the compulsory relief and exemptions outlined in the Regulations. Is there a need to provide discretionary relief from the levy to any types of

development, and if so, why?

Yes, but in rare and carefully considered circumstances only.

Q20

8a. Do you have any other comments on the draft CIL Charging Schedule?

Respondent skipped this question

Q22

9a. Do you have any other comments on the CIL evidence base?

The current CIL consultation provides the Council with the opportunity to a) deal with certain planning policy inconsistencies and b) to include CIL as an important tool in addressing the city's gaps in cultural provision and infrastructure. Please see attached PDF file in 9.b.

Powered by  SurveyMonkey

Check out our [sample surveys](#) and [create your own now!](#)

'Regarding Cultural Provision as a Vital Part of part of CIL'

The current CIL consultation provides the Council with the opportunity to a) deal with certain planning policy inconsistencies and b) to include CIL as an important tool in addressing the city's gaps in cultural provision and infrastructure.

Cultural wellbeing is identified as one of the twelve core planning principles underpinning both plan-making and decision-making in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Infrastructure Funding Gap Assessment (December 2022) furthermore references Paragraph 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) - 'Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for: (a) housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development; (b) infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat); (c) **community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure)**; and (d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation'

Yet in section 3 of 'Infrastructure Funding Requirements' there is **no reference to any funding requirements for cultural infrastructure**. The statement accompanying table 1 'indicates the full level of funding required for infrastructure within the authority, other funding streams may also contribute. The table simply shows items to which CIL could contribute and where there is as yet no other confirmed funding to fully cover their costs.'

This would suggest that the Local Authority believes that there is **no funding gap for cultural infrastructure** within the City of York or that the City of York Council **does not believe that CIL payments should applied to culture**, which is at odds with NPPF guidance as quoted by the council themselves.

Yet, as **York's Culture Strategy** ('York's Creative Future 2020-25') makes clear, this is emphatically not the case, as one of its key outcomes is to **'secure new funding to support culture' to fill the current gap**.

Furthermore, **Local Plan Policy D3 - Cultural Provision** makes it clear that 'development proposals will be supported where they are designed to sustain, enhance, and add value to the special qualities and significance of **York's cultural character, assets, capacity, activities, and opportunities for access**'. It goes on to state: 'Development should deliver a multi-functional public realm comprising streets and spaces that can accommodate a range of appropriate arts and cultural uses and activities both now and in the future, providing animation, vitality and inclusion. Major development schemes and significant schemes at whatever scale should also enable the delivery of permanent and temporary public arts, promoting a multi-disciplinary approach to commissioning artists in the design process itself as part of design and masterplanning teams. **Facilities and resources, including funding, for arts and cultural activity both within and beyond the development period...will also be supported**.'

The current CIL consultation provides the Council with the opportunity to deal with these policy inconsistencies and address the city's gaps in cultural provision and infrastructure.

Given the recognised importance of diverse and accessible cultural infrastructure to York's future, I strongly recommend that the Council include within the CIL Evidence Base and Infrastructure Funding Gap an assessment of the needs of the city's Cultural Infrastructure alongside the other forms of infrastructure that is covered.