

Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Committee

Date:	7 November 2017
Title:	Draft Pre-Publication Local Plan / CIL Viability Assessment methodology consultation
Contact Officer:	Graeme Markland, Neighbourhood Plan Continuity Officer

Purpose of Report

1. To provide a summary of the representations made by Thame Town Council to the District's consultation on the methodology used in its draft Local Plan/CIL Viability Assessment.

Background

2. The National Planning Policy Framework notes that planning policies should not prevent the delivery of development schemes. This document aims to test the impact on typical developments of emerging policies from the Publication Local Plan. These are not tested in isolation, but cumulatively.

It is disappointing to note that the consultation on the methodology SODC are adopting for this critical piece of evidence was very late in the day, and was only available for two weeks. Consultation started on the 15 September 2017 and ended on 29 September 2017. This was presumably to ensure the final Local Plan / CIL impact assessment was published in time for the launch of the Publication Local Plan, on 11 October 2017.

Thame Town Council Recommended Additions and Alterations

3. Comments made were limited. The methodology used emerged from best practice from the Home Builders Federation, the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, certain examined CIL documents and advice from the Homes and Communities Agency. This was reviewed by the District's consultant, Aspinall Verdi, in order to establish the soundest methodology to use when devising base land values and the uplift in land values that is associated with development.

Sections 5 – 10 of the Pre-Publication Draft Viability Assessment are missing from the consultation document that the consultation web page and e-mail links to. Within each section is the sentence "This section will be completed following consultation". It was assumed that the debate sought was therefore wholly on the methodology used, like the SHELAA document, and not on any baseline figures or data that underlay it.

Having attempted to fill out the electronic version of the consultation form supplied, for each section 5 – 10 there were significant further reports available. However, these were only available from the electronic form; were not available elsewhere; were not incorporated into the key report; and anyone aiming to respond via e-mail, a method recommended by SODC, would have not been made aware of their existence.

This extra evidence was not therefore reviewed. It must be questioned if other consultees similarly did not recognise this extra information – the key information – was available. This would have been especially true of those responding via e-mail.

Action Required

4. To **note** the report.