

Runnymede Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Technical Background Document

(December 2019)

Contents

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Estimated Level of Development 4
- 3. Infrastructure Funding Gap..... 9
- 4. CIL & Section 106 Contributions.....19
- 5. Setting CIL Rates21
- 6. Estimated CIL Receipts43
- 7. Implementation & Governance45

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the Council's approach and evidence for implementing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule. CIL was introduced by Government in 2010 and is a mechanism to raise monies from development to enable necessary infrastructure. CIL is charged on the net amount of floorspace coming forward within a development on a £s per square metre (sqm) basis and is non-negotiable. However, certain types of development are exempt from paying CIL such as affordable housing, development less than 100sqm and residential extensions/annexes.
- 1.2 Section 216 of The Planning Act 2008 (as amended) sets out the types of infrastructure for which CIL can be charged and includes roads, transport, flood defences, education, medical facilities, sports, recreation and open space facilities but does not include affordable housing. Section 216 also sets out that CIL can be spent on the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure.
- 1.3 For the purposes of CIL, Runnymede Borough Council will be the charging authority which sets CIL rates, charges development and collects CIL receipts. However, Runnymede can also collect CIL for infrastructure provided by Surrey County Council such as highways, transport and education, although ultimately it is the decision of the Borough Council on which infrastructure projects it will spend CIL funds.
- 1.4 CIL also has a neighbourhood element where a percentage of any CIL collected must be spent in the neighbourhood in which that development occurred. In areas such as Runnymede which has no parish or town councils the Borough Council retains 15% of CIL receipts (25% in areas with a Neighbourhood Plan or Development Order), but must engage with the local community where that development has taken place on how best to spend those CIL receipts.
- 1.5 In order to charge CIL the Council must demonstrate that it has an infrastructure funding gap, when taking account of all sources of infrastructure funding. The Council must set out what it intends to charge development through the Levy, in a CIL Charging Schedule.
- 1.6 A CIL charge can be set at a single rate which covers all types of development across the whole of the Borough or it can be set at different rates for different areas, different types of development and/or different scales taking account of viability evidence.

- 1.7 When drawing up a Charging Schedule the Council must show and explain how any proposed rates will contribute towards the implementation of the Local Plan and support development across the Borough striking an appropriate balance between additional investment and the potential effect on development viability. Guidance on the setting of a CIL charge can be found in the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) note on CIL¹, last updated September 2019.
- 1.8 Runnymede has undertaken a screening assessment to determine whether a CIL charging schedule requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The screening assessment concludes that neither SEA nor HRA is required. The Council also considers that a CIL charging schedule is not required to undergo Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as it is not a local development document.

Runnymede 2030 Local Plan

- 1.9 The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan sets out the spatial strategy for development over the period 2015-2030 and includes the quantum of development expected to come forward for residential, employment, retail and other types of floorspace.
- 1.10 In order to identify the impact development will have across the Borough over the Plan period the Council published an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Infrastructure Schedules².
- 1.11 The IDP identifies deficits in infrastructure capacity for a number of infrastructure types and the schedules set out a series of infrastructure projects aimed at addressing that capacity. The schedules set out a range of projects for different infrastructure types and when these are anticipated to come forward, their cost and current funding gap.
- 1.12 The Council has identified the infrastructure which is 'critical' to delivering the 2030 Local Plan. This includes the A320 & M25 Junction 11 mitigation scheme and the provision of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) to avoid impact to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Council intends to secure critical infrastructure through the use of Section 106 agreements rather than through a CIL charge.

¹ Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

² Documents CD_007M, N & O, available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/16139/Runnymede-2030-Submission-Local-Plan>

1.13 Other infrastructure types or projects will be secured through a combination of Section 106 agreements and/or CIL. The Council has drafted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) setting out this approach.

2. Estimated Level of Development

- 2.1 In order to calculate an appropriate CIL charge, it is necessary to consider the level of development planned to come forward over the Local Plan period. The Local Plan makes provision for almost 8,000 net additional dwellings which includes 1,700 dwellings at a new garden village at Longcross as well as 80,000sqm of net additional employment floorspace and 7,500sqm of retailing within the Borough's main Town Centres.
- 2.2 As the Local Plan start date is 1st April 2015, a certain amount of development has already been delivered or has permission and CIL could not be charged. As such the estimated level of development is based on the remaining requirement only. The level of development already completed or with permission is set out in Table 2-1 and the estimated level of development which could be subject to CIL is set out in Table 2-4.

Table 2-1: Completions/Permissions from 1st April 2015 – 31st March 2019

Development Type	Local Plan Requirement	Floorspace or Number Completed/with Permission	Residual Local Plan Requirement
Residential (C3)	7,920	3,013 units	4,907 units
Residential (C2 units) ¹	428 units	408 units	20 units
Residential (C2 bedspaces)	193 bedspaces	227	0
Residential (Student)	3,513 bedspaces	3,513 bedspaces	0
Employment (All B Classes)	80,630sqm	37,139sqm	43,491sqm
Town Centre Retail (A1)	5,940sqm	4,227sqm	1,713sqm

¹ Based on information set out in Council's response to Matter 5 of Local Plan EiP (RBCLP_20) available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/16273/Runnymede-2030-Local-Plan-Examination->

- 2.3 As CIL is charged on a £s per square meter basis on net additional floorspace and excludes floorspace from affordable housing, the estimate of residential development needs converting from unit numbers to floorspace. This will be used to estimate the level of CIL receipts in the following sections of this document.
- 2.4 It should be noted that the residual 4,907 unit figure for residential in Table 2-1 does not correlate with the expected number of units to come forward over the remaining plan period. This is because the 7,920 plan target applies a discount rate to some sites and therefore the actual delivery may be greater. Adding the number of dwellings in Appendix B available for CIL and subtracting completions/pipeline gives a residual of 5,112 dwellings.

2.5 Of the 1,635 completions between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2019, 460 were affordable units. This equates to 28% of all housing delivery and is close to the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan target of 30% of dwellings as affordable set out in Policy SL20.

Residential Development

2.6 The residual dwellings requirement to come forward over the rest of the plan period is 5,112 and will be made up from the supply identified in Appendix B. For windfalls, an estimate of floorspace is made based on the mix of dwelling units advocated by Policy SL19 of the 2030 Local Plan. In each case an assumption has been made that 2 bed units are split evenly between flats and houses. The floor area in sqm of units is the same as tested through the CIL Viability Report.

2.7 Existing floorspace of a site has been estimated from the site’s planning history, Council’s GIS and aerial photography. The estimate of existing floorspace from windfalls has been made based on an average gross to net ratio. As windfalls will constitute small sites a gross to net ratio has been calculated based on urban brownfield sites of less than 10 net dwellings or 0.5ha or less in area.

2.8 The gross to net ratio is based on how much existing floorspace is typically found on a site compared with how much is proposed for development and has been calculated from the sites completed or with permission since 2015 as set out in Appendix A and summarised in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2: Gross to Net Ratios for Residential Development

Type	Existing Floorspace	Proposed Floorspace	Gross to Net Ratio
Small Urban PDL	6,818sqm	13,558sqm	35:65

2.9 Table 2-2 shows that typically small urban brownfield sites have a 35:65 gross to net ratio and this has been applied to estimated windfalls.

2.10 The estimated level of residential development to come forward over the remaining plan period is around 240,528sqm (Appendix B). A number of planning applications are under consideration for sites allocated in the Plan and therefore a certain amount of the 240,528sqm floorspace could be permitted prior to implementation of CIL. These sites and their floorspace are set out in Table 2-3 and amount to some 23,505sqm. This could reduce CIL liable residential floorspace to 217,023sqm and reduces the residual number of units to 4,540.

Table 2-3: Appendix B Sites Submitted and Pending Decision

Site	Development	App Ref	Existing Floorspace	Net Floorspace ¹
SL3 – Hanworth Lane	52 residential dwellings (part of site only)	RU.18/0443	0sqm	2,980sqm
SL8 – Thorpe Lea Rd West	220 residential dwellings (part of site only)	RU.19/0204	1,572sqm	9,003sqm
SL17 – Chertsey Bittams D	200 residential dwellings	RU.17/1749	0sqm	7,458sqm
Egham Gateway West	100 residential dwellings	RU.19/0437	2,477sqm	4,064sqm (C3)
Total				23,505sqm

¹ Based on schedule of units in planning application

Employment Development

2.11 The residual net level of employment development to come forward over the Local Plan period is 43,461sqm. Part of this will comprise 20,000sqm on the employment allocation at Byfleet Road with the other 23,461sqm to come forward within the existing Strategic Employment Areas. It is assumed that the remaining 23,461sqm will come forward as B1a offices.

Retail, Hotel & Leisure

2.12 Local Plan Policy SD2 identifies an additional net 5,940sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period in the Borough's three main town centres. To date some 4,227sqm of retail floorspace has either been completed since 2015 or is in the pipeline leaving a residual 1,713sqm. The majority of retail development has occurred in Addlestone and a further 500sqm is identified in the Addlestone West allocation (policy IE8). As such, along with Policy IE8, and requirements from the other town centres of Chertsey and Egham there is still a requirement for a further 2,293sqm.

2.13 In terms of leisure development there are no targets in the Local Plan. The Town & Local Centres Study 2015³ identifies a need for around 6 cinema screens, 718sqm-958sqm of gross A3-A5 use and potential for additional gym facilities. The Surrey Hotel Futures Study 2015⁴ identifies potential for new hotel opportunities in Runnymede including boutique, budget and apart hotels.

2.14 Since 2015, a number of developments have come forward including a 101 room budget hotel, 6 screen cinema and gym facilities in the Addlestone One development

³ Town & Local Centres Study (2015) Carter Jonas. Available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/15564/Runnymede-Town-and-Local-Centres-Study-2015>

⁴ Surrey Hotel Futures Study (2015) Hotel Solutions . Available at: <https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/land-planning-and-development/development/economic-development/surrey-hotel-futures-study-2015>

as well as further leisure facilities at the redeveloped Egham Leisure Centre. The Addlestone One development has so far included around 500sqm of A3-A5 uses and further opportunities are likely to come forward in the allocations at Addlestone West (Policy IE8), Egham Gateway East (Policy IE9) as well as Chertsey Broad Location (Policy IE11). Any further A3-A5 floorspace is only likely to be small in scale to make up a shortfall of 218sqm-458sqm

- 2.15 Planning application RU.19/0437 also proposes additional leisure uses at the Egham Gateway West allocation (Policy IE10) in the form of a cinema of 1,247sqm and could add to the leisure pipeline. Given that there is no target for hotel or leisure uses in the Local Plan, no estimate of future floorspace has been made, although this does not preclude further development of this type coming forward over the plan period which, if viable, could raise some further CIL funds.

Other

- 2.16 Other development set out in the Local Plan includes accommodation for the elderly and students as well as Traveller/Travelling snowperson pitches/plots, although Traveller pitches or Showperson plots are not considered floorspace, would not be subject to CIL and in any event are likely to be considered as affordable pitches/plots.
- 2.17 In terms of student accommodation, there are already 3,513 bedspaces completed or in the planning pipeline which equals the need for 3,513 bedspaces, although this does not discount further development of this type coming forward.
- 2.18 For elderly (Use Class C2) accommodation the Local Plan requires 428 C2 units of extra care/sheltered accommodation to be brought forward of which 408 have already been completed or have permission. This leaves a residual 20 units to come forward over the plan period which at an average of 57sqm per unit is some 1,140sqm. A further 60 C2 units are allocated at Longcross Garden Village giving a potential surplus of 2,280sqm and as such no further requirement.
- 2.19 In terms of C2 bedspaces for nursing/residential care there is no residual need given that already delivered since the start of the Plan period, this does not preclude further development coming forward in the future as windfall.

Table 2-4: Estimated Residual Floorspace to End of Plan Period (2030)

Development Type	Estimated Floorspace (net)
Residential (C3)	217,023sqm
Residential (C2 Units)	0sqm
Residential (C2 Bedspaces)	0sqm
Residential (Student)	0sqm
Employment (B Class Uses)	43,461sqm
Retail (A1)	2,293sqm
Total	262,777sqm

3. Infrastructure Funding Gap

- 3.1 Taking a straightforward approach the infrastructure funding gap can be calculated by taking the costs set out in the IDP project schedules over the plan period and subtracting developer contributions and other funding sources secured so far.
- 3.2 Some projects are generic and refer simply to an infrastructure type where a gap in infrastructure provision has been identified in the IDP and some projects are more specific or relate to specific sites.
- 3.3 One such site is the strategic allocation at Longcross Garden Village. The Council intends for infrastructure to come forward on this site (and where necessary off-site) through the use of Section 106 agreements rather than through a CIL charge and therefore the costs of infrastructure at this site do not form part of the funding gap.
- 3.4 The overall infrastructure costs identified in the IDP and schedules which support the 2030 Local Plan are set out in Table 3-2 by infrastructure type. The infrastructure costs at Longcross Garden Village have been subtracted from the 'Rest of Plan Area' cost.

Table 3-2: Table of Longcross and Rest of Borough Infrastructure Costs

Infrastructure Type	LGV Cost	Rest of Plan Area Cost 2015-2030
Education		
Early Years	£0.48m	£3.93m
Primary & Secondary	£14.9m	£22m
Adult	£0	£5.62m
Health		
Primary	£0.92m	£2.8m
Acute	£0	£21.4m
Mental	£0	£7.4m
C2 Accommodation	£3.6m ¹	£3.2m
Community		
Libraries	£0	£0
Community Facilities	£0.71m	£0.76m
Recreation		
Outdoor Sports	£1.08m	£6.13m
Indoor Sports	£0	£0
Playspace	£3.3m	£7.88m
Green Infrastructure		
SANG	£3m	£11.05m
Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspace	£0	£0
Parks & Gardens	£0.62m	£1.97m
Amenity Greenspace	£0.23m	£0.75m
Allotments	£0.17m	£0.58m
Cemeteries	£0	£0
Transport		

Highways	£19.5m ²	£88.5m
Bus & Rail ³	£10.88m	£23.1m
Active	£0.25m	£10.25m
Flood Defence		
Flood Alleviation	£0	£11m ⁴
Emergency Services		
Ambulance	£0	£0
Police	TBD	£0.49m
Fire	£0	£0
Total	£60m	£229m

¹ To be delivered on-site

² Excludes costs for A320 improvements

³ Excludes Heathrow Southern Rail Access

⁴ Excludes costs of River Thames Scheme

3.5 The above table identifies an initial funding gap (excluding Longcross) of £229m. Not all infrastructure types will be funded through a CIL, but are likely to come forward through private sector funding/provision which will reduce the funding gap further and is discussed below. The Council may also have access to other funding resources as well as contributions already raised to reduce the infrastructure funding gap further and this is also discussed below for each infrastructure type. Appendix C sets out the developer contributions which have already been secured during the Local Plan period and which are referred to below.

Education

3.6 Adult education initial funding gap is £5.62m. Services are typically provided by the private sector and have their own funding resource and where subsidised, this is through national funding. The funding gap for adult education is therefore zero.

3.7 Early Years initial funding gap is £3.93m for places run through the County Council (50% of places). Since 2015, £0.4m has been received in developer contributions reducing the funding gap to £3.53m over the plan period.

3.8 Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to ensure there are sufficient school places in the county to meet primary and secondary demand and offer a school place to any Surrey resident who requires one. Community schools, foundation schools, voluntary-aided schools or voluntary-controlled schools are funded by the County Council. Academies are normally managed by an academy trust which acts outside of County Council control. Academies and free schools are funded through central government. However, the County Council remains responsible for ensuring there are sufficient school places available to serve local communities including the needs associated with new development.

- 3.9 Surrey County Council receives government funding for new school places known as 'Basic Need Funding' but this does not cover the full cost of provision nor is it a substitute for developer contributions as recent government guidance confirms⁵. The funding is received three years in advance to allow time for the County Council to strategically plan its spending and achieve the best value for money.
- 3.10 Between 2015 and 2019 Surrey was allocated £183m of Basic Need Funding⁶ to cover the cost of additional school places across the whole of Surrey between 2017/18 and 2020/21.
- 3.11 During the period 2015/16 to 2018/19 Surrey County Council commissioned the permanent expansion of three primary phase schools and one secondary school in Runnymede, which provided an additional 434 permanent primary places and an additional 250 permanent secondary places at a cost of £10m. In addition, a new secondary free school, funded by central government, was opened, providing an additional 900 secondary places.
- 3.12 With demand from the birth rate now beginning to peter off, the majority of the demand for school places in Runnymede is now being generated by new development. Based on Runnymede's current housing trajectories for the planned period it is anticipated that there will be an underlying additional form of primary entry (210 places) required over the next 5 years, alongside a potential additional two to three form of entry (300-450 places) required in the secondary sector. Based on the Department for Education's cost multiplier per place of £13,728 for primary and £20,685 for secondary, this is anticipated to be a potential cost of around £12m.
- 3.13 Surrey County Council historically forward fund the school places in advance of receiving any developer contributions and the basic need funding. It has yet to receive any Basic Need Funding towards the potential deficit of places detailed above and it is not guaranteed that the County Council will receive funding at the level required. Also the level of funding allocated in the future is likely to reflect future contributions that should have been secured from new development and as a result such funding cannot be relied upon to fill the funding gap in future years. The funding gap for primary and secondary education is therefore estimated at £12m.

⁵ Securing Developer contributions for Education (MHCLG) 2019. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-schools-to-support-housing-growth>

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/basic-need-allocations>

Total Education Infrastructure Funding Gap - £15.5m

Health

- 3.14 Health services are provided by Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), hospital foundation trusts and the private sector. The CCGs and hospital trusts are responsible for ensuring sufficient health infrastructure capacity is planned for and delivered in their catchment areas to respond to population growth and health needs. The IDP identified that several GP practices in the North West Surrey CCG area are over capacity.
- 3.15 The initial primary healthcare funding gap is £2.8m. The Council and North West Surrey CCG has identified opportunities to provide new primary healthcare facilities in Ottershaw and Addlestone. Both of these opportunities would either result in developers providing facilities or land for facilities and the CCG funding or part funding provision. The exact amount of funding which may be available from the CCG is unknown. Since 2015, £5,700 has been raised for primary healthcare through developer contributions. The primary healthcare funding gap is therefore £2.74m over the plan period.
- 3.16 Acute healthcare facilities are provided by Ashford & St Peter's Hospital NHS Foundation Trust and Surrey & Borders NHS Foundation Trust. Funding for secondary healthcare facilities such as hospital and mental healthcare facilities are typically secured from trust capital investment plans/central government funding and as such the funding gap for acute and mental health infrastructure is considered to be zero.
- 3.17 The IDP identifies a need for £3.29m for elderly care over the plan period. As can be seen from Table 2-2, the requirement for bed spaces has already been met. As such the funding gap for elderly care facilities is considered to be zero.

Total Health Infrastructure Funding Gap - £2.74m

Community

- 3.18 The IDP identifies a need for additional community space. The initial funding gap is £0.76m. Since 2015 some £0.11m has been secured from developer contributions towards community facilities which reduces the plan period funding gap to £0.65m.

3.19 The Borough Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2018/19 – 2021/22⁷ does not identify any committed spending or include in its capital programme funding towards physical community infrastructure. The community infrastructure funding gap therefore remains at £0.65m over the plan period.

Total Community Infrastructure Funding Gap - £0.65m

Recreation

3.20 The initial funding gap for outdoor sports is £6.13m. Since 2015 the Council has not raised any developer contributions towards outdoor sports facilities and the MTFS does not identify any capital spend. The funding gap remains at £6.13m over the plan period.

3.21 The initial funding gap for playspace is £7.88m over the plan period. Since 2015 £0.29m has been secured from developer contributions towards playspace facilities reducing the funding gap to £7.59m. The Council's MTFS identifies four projects in its Capital Programme, two of which are not budgeted through developer contributions (Marshall Place and Runnymede Pleasure Grounds), the capital spend for which is listed as £4.9m. This reduces the funding gap to £2.69m

3.22 The IDP did not identify any additional requirements for indoor sports facilities and the funding gap for this is considered to be zero.

Total Recreation Infrastructure Funding Gap - £8.82m

Green Infrastructure

3.23 The initial funding gap for SANG is £11.05m. The Council will continue to collect contributions towards its strategic SANG solution or agree the provision of bespoke SANG for larger sites through Section 106 agreements not CIL. This cost has been taken into account in the CIL Viability Report. As such the funding gap for CIL purposes is considered to be zero.

3.24 The initial funding gap for parks and gardens space is £1.97m. Since 2015 no contributions have been received towards parks & gardens infrastructure and no capital projects are identified in the Council's MTFS for physical improvements. As such the funding gap remains at £1.97m.

⁷ Runnymede MTFS 2018/19. Available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/14622/Strategies-and-plans>

- 3.25 In terms of amenity green space this is likely to be provided on-site by developers and includes incidental areas such as grass strips/verges, landscaped areas and/or areas for biodiversity gain. Whilst this is a cost to the developer this is more for the design element of a site rather than an infrastructure cost and as such the funding gap is considered to be zero.
- 3.26 The initial funding gap for allotment plots is £0.58m. Since 2015 the Council has not collected any developer contributions towards allotment provision and neither does the Council's MTFS identify any capital spend on allotment projects. As such the funding gap remains £0.58m.
- 3.27 The IDP did not identify a need for additional natural/semi-natural green space or cemeteries and as such the funding gaps for these green infrastructure types is zero.

Total Green Infrastructure Funding Gap - £2.55m

Highways & Transport

- 3.28 The initial funding gap for highways is £88.5m. The A320 & M25 Junction 11 mitigation scheme is a series of highway junction and link improvements along the A320 corridor from Ottershaw to Chertsey and M25 Junction 11. The A320 & M25 Junction 11 mitigation scheme is critical to delivery of the Local Plan at a cost of £44m.
- 3.29 Surrey County Council submitted a Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid in September 2017 for £44m to cover the cost and forward fund the A320 mitigation with the Council identifying 25% clawback of HIF funding from developer contributions (£11m). The Council is awaiting a response from government about the success of the bid.
- 3.30 Even should the HIF bid be unsuccessful, The A320 has been designated as part of the Major Roads Network (MRN) and Surrey County Council through Transport for South East has submitted a bid for MRN funding in May 2019 for the cost of £44m with potential match-funding of 15% from developer contributions (£6.6m).
- 3.31 As a critical infrastructure project the Council will be securing any clawback or match-funding through Section 106 contributions from A320 dependent sites (as identified in the 2030 Local Plan) and not CIL. The implications for this cost are set out in further sections. As such the funding gap for CIL purposes is considered to be zero.
- 3.32 A number of other projects have been identified in the IDP schedules with an initial funding gap of £44.5m. Since 2015, the Council has received £0.51m towards

highways infrastructure from developer contributions with £0.12m already committed to the Runnymede Roundabout project. As such contributions to date are £0.39m.

- 3.33 The Council's other main source of funding is through the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3 LEP). LEP funding has previously been secured to deliver the Runnymede Roundabout improvements and Egham Sustainable Transport Package 1, match funded with developer contributions. However, at the time of writing no further bids have been made to the LEP for additional funding.
- 3.34 The Surrey County Council Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) shows capital funding for Local Transport Schemes of £400,000 per annum distributed to projects around the 11 Borough's and Districts. Even if this were extrapolated over the lifetime of the Local Plan and averaged among the 11 Borough's and Districts (which is unlikely as this depends on the projects identified) this would amount to around £363,000 for Runnymede Borough.
- 3.35 As such, total funding gap for highway infrastructure projects is a minimum of £43.75m.
- 3.36 The initial funding gap for active transport projects is £10.25m. Since 2015, £0.4m has been raised through developer contributions towards active transport projects although £0.12m of this was secured against the Egham Sustainable Transport Package 1 as match funding. As such, the actual contributions to reduce the funding gap are £0.28m.
- 3.37 As for highway projects there are currently no funds available for active transport projects from the LEP and neither does the Council's MTFS identify any capital funding towards the active transport projects set out in the IDP schedules. As such the funding gap for active transport projects is £9.97m.
- 3.38 Bus and rail schemes have an initial funding gap of £23.1m. Since 2015, the Council has received developer contributions of £2.67m along with funding received from the LEP for the Wider Staines Transport Package worth £4.3m. This reduces the funding gap to £16.1m with no other funding sources identified at this time.

Total Highways & Transport Infrastructure Funding Gap - £69.8m

Flood Defence

- 3.39 The initial funding gap for flood defence/drainage projects is £11m. Since 2015 the council has secured £5.8m towards flood alleviation schemes from the Environment Agency (EA). The Surrey County Council Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP)

highlights £500,000 per annum towards highway flood resilience schemes over the period 2018-2021 which if extrapolated over the lifetime of the Plan and averaged to the 11 Borough's and Districts (which is unlikely as funds will be made to specific projects) gives potential funding of around £455,000. No further funding from the EA or SCC has been identified. The minimum funding gap is therefore £4.75m

- 3.40 The IDP schedules include the River Thames Scheme (RTS), a strategic infrastructure project required to provide flood relief to the lower Thames from Datchet through to Teddington and involves cooperation between a number of partners including local authorities, Thames Water and the Environment Agency. The cost of the RTS is not included in the infrastructure funding gap as this will not be funded through CIL from Runnymede.

Total Flood Defence/Drainage Infrastructure Funding Gap - £4.75m

Emergency Services

- 3.41 No additional physical capacity for emergency services has been identified in the IDP.
- 3.42 Surrey Police have provided details of infrastructure projects which could be funded through developer contributions at a cost of £0.9m. Whilst the Council does not agree that all of the projects listed are 'infrastructure' it does agree that there is a current funding gap for capital projects.
- 3.43 For the purposes of this paper the gap is considered to be £0.49m based on the need for expanded premises and fixed ANPR. Since 2015, the Council has collected £0.16m for crime and disorder and therefore the funding gap is £0.33m.

Total Emergency Services Infrastructure Funding Gap - £0.33m

Utilities

- 3.44 There are no strategic utility infrastructure projects identified for the Borough. Utilities infrastructure is provided by private companies who use their own funding for utilities infrastructure and therefore the funding gap is zero.
- 3.45 Developers do have to pay for new connections to utilities networks or may have to pay or part pay for reinforcement works, however this is not something that the Council would seek through developer contributions being a matter directly between the developer and utility provider.

Other Sources of Funding

- 3.46 The Joint Runnymede Local Area Committee has funding available from Surrey County Council with a joint spending power of £30,000 per annum. To date none of the projects listed in the IDP have been funded through this resource and at £30,000 per annum this would realise around £300,000 by the end of the plan period.
- 3.47 There is also a Local Committee Highway Fund of £4.5m 2019-2021 administered by Surrey County Council, however the fund is in place to carry out minor projects such as sign cleaning, ditch clearing and would not be applicable to the projects listed in the IDP. As such this source of funding will not reduce the overall funding gap.
- 3.48 There are numerous grants available to fund play space, green space and biodiversity initiatives however the majority of these are only available to voluntary and community organisations. Whilst this could be a potential source of capital for green/play space and biodiversity projects which the Council could seek to match fund, grant funding is not guaranteed and would depend on a voluntary or community group taking ownership of the project and possibly the asset. It is not possible to quantify how much grant funding could be secured but it is unlikely to significantly close the funding gap for playspace, parks & gardens and allotments.
- 3.49 The Borough Council has access to borrowing through the Public Works Loans Board (PWLb). However, any funds borrowed will have to be repaid with interest and as such the Council would need to satisfy itself that sufficient income can be generated to ensure the repayment of any loans.
- 3.50 The Council has not, at present, identified any infrastructure schemes in its Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) that seek or would attract loans through the PWLB and other sources of income such as Council Tax, Business Rates and New Homes Bonus have already been allocated to other expenditure streams.
- 3.51 Given that no other sources of funding have been identified that would significantly reduce the overall funding gap, the gap is estimated at £105m over the plan period and this is shown in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: Infrastructure Funding Gap for Local Plan Period Excluding Longcross

Infrastructure Type	Cost 2015-2030	Potential or Secured Funding	Funding Gap (£)
Education	£31.55	£16m	£15.5m
Health	£35m	£32.3m	£2.7m
Community Facilities	£0.76m	£0.11m	£0.65m
Recreation	£14m	£5.2m	£8.8m
Green Infrastructure	£14.4m	£11.8m	£2.6m
Highways & Transport	£122m	£52m	£70m
Flood Defence/Drainage	£11m	£6.25m	£4.75m
Emergency Services	£0.49m	£0.16m	£0.33m
Utilities	£0	£0	£0
Total	£229.2m	£123.8m	£105.4m

4. CIL & Section 106 Contributions

- 4.1 Section 216 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) sets out the types of infrastructure to which CIL can be applied including its improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance. This includes roads and transport facilities, flood defences, schools, medical facilities, sporting and recreational facilities and open spaces.
- 4.2 Typically the Council has sought to gain developer contributions for these types of infrastructure through Section 106 planning obligations. Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Paragraph 54 of the NPPF set out three legal tests which Section 106 obligations must meet as follows:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - Directly related to the development; and
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 4.3 As such, there are restrictions on when and how the Council can apply planning obligations, which makes it difficult to ensure that sufficient funds can be secured for large infrastructure projects which are required to mitigate more than one development. S106 obligations can also only be sought on developments of 10 or more dwellings and are therefore not applicable to smaller developments likely to have a cumulative impact.
- 4.4 CIL is not constrained by these restrictions and provided it is spent in line with Section 216 of the 2008 Planning Act, can be spent on any project in any part of the Borough and is applicable to all development to which a charge applies.
- 4.5 The two contribution regimes can operate in tandem and as such there is potential for infrastructure projects to be funded through S106 and CIL. Operating in tandem also allows opportunities to physically deliver infrastructure through S106 and mitigate the cumulative level of development through CIL.
- 4.6 The PPG note on CIL¹ sets out in paragraph 169 that authorities should be clear what developers will be expected to pay and through which route. Paragraph 170 states that authorities can use funding from CIL and Section 106 to pay for the same infrastructure and should set out in an Infrastructure Funding Statement which infrastructure they intend to fund and detail the different sources of funding.
- 4.7 The Council will set out which infrastructure projects and/or types will be funded through CIL and S106 in its annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS), the first of

which will be published in December 2020. In the meantime the Council has prepared a draft Infrastructure Delivery & Prioritisation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which seeks to guide the content of the IFS.

5. Setting CIL Rates

- 5.1 A CIL Charging Schedule sets out the CIL rates that a Charging Authority intends to charge development on a £s per sqm basis. CIL rates can be a simple single charge to cover the whole borough and for all types of development or can be set for different areas of the Borough, different types and/or different scales of development. In doing so, the charging authority setting CIL rates must base rates on evidence of viability.
- 5.2 The Council commissioned consultants AGA Ltd to undertake a viability assessment to test whether a CIL charge could be levied on a range of different development types including residential development (Class C2 & C3), student accommodation, retail, office, industrial and a number of other uses.

Residential Development

- 5.3 The CIL Viability Report tests the viability of notional 1ha sites across different areas of the Borough, the 2030 Local Plan allocation sites and small sites less than 10 units (on a per unit basis). The viability assessment takes account of 2030 Local Plan policies SL19 on housing mix, SL20 on affordable housing, sustainable design standards in Policies SD7 & SD8 and the cost of SANG & SAMM as avoidance for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as well as residual S106/S278 highways contributions⁸.
- 5.4 The 2030 Local Plan allocation sites were also tested with the costs of physical infrastructure provision secured through S106 as required by the allocation policies including SANG/SAMM but not A320 & M25 Junction 11 mitigation. As such residual values (RVs) in the viability assessment reflect policy compliant development with any surplus over benchmark land values (BLV) being the theoretical value left for CIL.
- 5.5 The governments study into the value of CIL⁹ found that when setting CIL rates a typical viability buffer of around 30% has been applied by charging authorities to allow for changing market conditions.
- 5.6 Research from Savills¹⁰ forecasts house price rises in the region of 9.3% 2019-2023 in the South East with annual inflation flat for 2019 and then between 2% to 2.5% 2020-

⁸ Based £1,500 per dwelling or £150 per sqm for commercial.

⁹ The value, impact and delivery of the Community Infrastructure Levy (2017) CLG. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-infrastructure-levy-review-report-to-government>

¹⁰ Savills Forecasts for UK Residential Market in the Next 5 Years (Nov 2018) Savills. Available at: <https://www.savills.co.uk/insight-and-opinion/savills-news/170245-1/savills-forecasts-uk-residential-market-in-the-next-5-years>

2023. Similarly research by Knight Frank¹¹ forecasts house price inflation in the South East between 2018 and 2023 at 9.2% with a fall in prices in 2019, growth between 1% and 2.5% 2020-2022 but picking up to 5% in 2023. Other forecasts include the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR)¹² which shows price rises of 0.8% in 2019, 1.3% in 2020 and around 4% 2021-2023.

- 5.7 Therefore, given the uncertainty surrounding house prices in the shorter term and possibly over the life of a Charging Schedule (3 years) and the high level nature of the CIL Viability Report, a 50% buffer has been applied to allow for changing market conditions and that this is the Borough's first charging schedule.

1ha Notional Sites

- 5.8 For notional 1ha sites (at 30dph) RVs are compared to two potential BLVs, a commercial land value at £2m per ha and the other a 'worst case' BLV based on Table 6.2 of the CIL Viability Report. Tables 5-1 and 5-2 show the results of this comparison with a 50% viability buffer.

Table 5-1: Difference between RLV & Commercial BLV for notional 1ha site at 30dph

Location	RLV (£m)	BLV (£m)	Difference	Sqm*	£ per sqm	Buffer of 50%
Wentworth	£16,180,000	£2,000,000	£14,180,000	2,776	£5,108	£2,554
Virginia Water	£6,870,000	£2,000,000	£4,870,000	2,776	£1,754	£877
Englefield Green	£4,820,000	£2,000,000	£2,820,000	2,776	£1,016	£508
Ottershaw	£4,270,000	£2,000,000	£2,270,000	2,776	£818	£409
Woodham	£4,240,000	£2,000,000	£2,240,000	2,776	£807	£403
Chertsey	£3,580,000	£2,000,000	£1,580,000	2,776	£569	£285
Egham	£3,310,000	£2,000,000	£1,310,000	2,776	£472	£236
Addlestone	£2,630,000	£2,000,000	£630,000	2,776	£227	£113
Staines Border & North	£2,500,000	£2,000,000	£500,000	2,776	£180	£90

*Based on mix of market units required by Local Plan Policy SL19

¹¹ UK Residential Market Forecast (2018) Knight Frank. Available at: <https://content.knightfrank.com/research/367/documents/en/uk-housing-market-forecast-november-2018-6011.pdf>.

¹² <https://obr.uk/forecasts-in-depth/the-economy-forecast/housing-market/>

Table 5-2: Difference between RLV & ‘Worst Case’ BLV for notional 1ha site at 30dph

Location	RLV (£m)*	BLV (£m)*	Difference	Sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer at 50%
Wentworth	£16,180,000	£8,106,918	£8,073,082	2,776	£2,908	£1,454
Virginia Water	£6,870,000	£4,320,755	£2,549,245	2,776	£918	£459
Englefield Green	£4,820,000	£3,490,566	£1,329,434	2,776	£479	£239
Ottershaw	£4,270,000	£3,264,151	£1,005,849	2,776	£362	£181
Woodham	£4,240,000	£3,000,000	£1,240,000	2,776	£447	£223
Chertsey	£3,580,000	£2,893,082	£686,918	2,776	£247	£124
Egham	£3,310,000	£2,886,792	£423,208	2,776	£152	£76
Addlestone	£2,630,000	£2,616,352	£13,648	2,776	£5	£2
Staines Border & North	£2,500,000	£2,572,327	-£72,327	2,776	-£26	-£13

- 5.9 Table 5-1 shows that all areas of the Borough have sufficient viability to levy a CIL charge. Ranging from £90 in Staines Border & North to over £2,500 per sqm at Wentworth. Given this range in scope for CIL, this shows that the Council could set differential rates based on location.
- 5.10 Table 5-2 shows the scope for CIL in a ‘worst case’ BLV scenario, which is likely to reflect brownfield land in an existing residential use. In all locations scope for CIL is markedly reduced. Appendix B shows that of the remaining 4,067 dwellings to come forward over the plan period and liable for CIL, only 49 would be through the redevelopment of sites in an existing residential use and of these 15 would come from small sites (less than 10 units). As such, only 34 units out of 4,167 (less than 1%) could be placed at risk with higher CIL rates. However, all of the 34 units have no net floorspace given their Green Belt status and may not be liable for CIL.
- 5.11 Therefore no sites would be placed at risk and it is considered that higher CIL rates than those based on a worst case BLV can be set. This will however need to be considered alongside the results of the Local Plan allocation and small sites testing.

Local Plan Allocation Sites

- 5.12 Sites allocated in the Local Plan which have not yet been permitted could be liable for CIL. The sites are a mix of brownfield and greenfield locations predominantly formed from areas of land released from the Green Belt for development either in an existing agricultural/horticultural use sometimes with a limited number of residential units or a

commercial use. The CIL Viability Report identifies sites in agricultural use as having an EUV of £20,000 per ha with BLV likely to be x20 i.e. £400,000 per ha.

- 5.13 The comparison for all sites is based on a commercial BLV of £2m per ha as set out in Table 6-4 of the CIL Viability Report which is summarised below in Table 5-3 along with a 50% buffer. In the case of Longcross, BLV is based on the extensive viability work carried out in the A320 and Longcross Viability Report summarised in the CIL Viability Report.
- 5.14 It should be noted that using a commercial BLV for sites which are in existing agricultural/horticultural use would see existing use value (EUV) at around £20,000 per ha uplifted 100 fold. The PPG note on Viability states that BLV should be based on EUV plus an uplift to incentivise the land owner to sell or 'EUV+'. It should be noted that the Borough Council does not consider an uplift of 100 fold to be a reasonable figure for 'EUV+' and therefore in reality some sites will have more scope to pay CIL than is indicated in Table 5-3. These sites are indicated with a (G) in Table 5.3 to indicate their predominantly greenfield status.

Table 5-3: Difference between RV & BLV for Local Plan Allocation Sites

Allocation Sites	Site Size (ha)	RV (£m)	BLV (£m)	Difference	Gross Sqm*	£ per sqm	Buffer of 50%
Addlestone West	0.3	£3,798,967	£600,000	£3,198,967	4,620	£692	£346
Ottershaw East (G)	6.2	£25,650,650	£12,400,000	£13,250,650	16,735	£792	£396
Chertsey Bittams A (G)	4.6	£17,451,600	£9,200,000	£8,251,600	14,670	£562	£281
Chertsey Bittams B (G)	3.4	£11,818,500	£6,800,000	£5,018,500	10,062	£499	£249
Chertsey Bittams C (G)	1	£528,000	£2,000,000	-£1,472,000	867	-£1,698	-£849
Chertsey Bittams D (G)	2.8	£13,861,500	£5,600,000	£8,261,500	10,443	£791	£396
Chertsey Bittams E (G)	3.1	£7,914,300	£6,200,000	£1,714,300	7,405	£232	£116
Vet Labs (G)	3.7	£8,279,600	£7,400,000	£879,600	12,606	£70	£35
Thorpe Lea Rd North	1.9	£9,113,420	£3,800,000	£5,313,420	5,669	£937	£469
Thorpe Lea Rd West	6.6	£25,376,375	£13,200,000	£12,176,375	15,781	£772	£386
Virginia Water North (G)	8.5	£27,175,800	£17,000,000	£10,175,800	13,321	£764	£382

Virginia Water South (G)	5.3	£31,790,600	£10,600,000	£21,190,600	12,805	£1,655	£827
Pycroft Road (G)	6.8	£27,181,100	£13,600,000	£13,581,100	23,148	£587	£293
Blays House	2.9	£15,202,150	£5,800,000	£9,402,150	8,424	£1,116	£558
Longcross Garden Village		£138,173,000	£60,680,000	£77,493,000	130,251	£595	£297

*Based on mix of market units required by Local Plan Policy SL19

5.15 Table 5-3 shows a range of values across the Borough ranging from the lowest value of -£849 per sqm at Chertsey Bittams C and the highest at Virginia Water South at £827 per sqm.

5.16 The site at Chertsey Bittams C is proposed in the Local Plan to deliver 11 affordable Traveller pitches and only 9 market units for housing which severely reduces its RV and why it returns a much lower potential for CIL. This site is 100% greenfield and unlikely to attract a BLV of £2m per ha. If a greenfield BLV of £400,000 per ha is taken, scope for CIL improves to £74 per ha.

5.17 The lowest values are seen at the Vet Labs Site and Chertsey Bittams E, however, these again are either 100% greenfield with no or limited previous development. If greenfield BLV is used for these sites instead the scope for CIL with a 50% buffer increases to £267 and £451 respectively.

Small Scale Sites (Less than 10)

5.18 Sites of less than 10 net dwellings will make up a small proportion of the Council's housing land supply. Appendix B shows that of the 4,067 dwellings remaining to be delivered around 165 will be from small sites including windfalls. Whilst small site supply does not make up the bulk of supply, it is considered that the Council should not be placing these at risk given the opportunities they afford to SME house builders and developers.

5.19 In line with NPPF paragraph 63 the Local Plan does not apply affordable housing targets to sites of less than 10 net units. Neither do S106 obligations apply, although small sites still need to avoid impact to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The lack of affordable and infrastructure requirements is likely to be reflected in higher RVs proportionally and Table 5-4 shows this. Therefore small sites have the advantage of not being subject to affordable housing, section 106 contributions and have the benefit

of a 50% buffer applied to CIL. This gives a high degree of flexibility should smaller sites encounter abnormals or higher costs.

5.20 BLVs are based on commercial however Table 5-5 compares RVs against 'worst case' BLVs based on Table 6.2 of the CIL Viability Report.

Table 5-4: Difference between RLV and BLV for single dwellings

Location	RLV (£)	BLV (£)	Difference	Sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer at 50%
Wentworth	£721,533	£66,667	£654,866	95 ¹³	£6,893	£3,447
Virginia Water	£307,500	£66,667	£240,833	95	£2,535	£1,268
Englefield Green	£215,967	£66,667	£149,300	95	£1,572	£764
Ottershaw	£191,767	£66,667	£125,100	95	£1,316	£658
Woodham	£162,233	£66,667	£95,566	95	£1,006	£503
Chertsey	£150,933	£66,667	£84,266	95	£887	£444
Egham	£150,133	£66,667	£83,466	95	£879	£440
Addlestone	£120,600	£66,667	£53,933	95	£568	£284
Staines Border & North	£115,333	£66,667	£48,666	95	£512	£256

Table 5-5: Difference between RLV and BLV for small sites (Worst Case)

Location	RLV (£)	BLV (£)	Difference	Sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer at 50%
Wentworth	£721,533	£270,231	£451,302	95	£4,751	£2,376
Virginia Water	£307,500	£144,025	£163,475	95	£1,721	£861
Englefield Green	£215,967	£116,352	£99,615	95	£1,049	£525
Ottershaw	£191,767	£108,805	£82,962	95	£873	£437
Woodham	£162,233	£100,000	£62,233	95	£655	£328
Chertsey	£150,933	£96,436	£54,497	95	£574	£287
Egham	£150,133	£96,226	£53,907	95	£567	£284
Addlestone	£120,600	£87,218	£33,382	95	£351	£176
Staines Border & North	£115,333	£85,744	£29,589	95	£311	£156

5.21 The results in tables 5-4 to 5-5 again show similarities in terms of the ability to fund CIL depending on location. Again the areas of Wentworth and Virginia Water produce the highest values and Addlestone and Staines North & Border the lowest.

¹³ Average size of 3 bed market dwelling.

Setting Rates for Residential Development (Use Class C3)

5.22 Table 5-6 brings together the results from the high level, Local Plan allocation and small sites testing so that a comparison can be made across locations and across development scales.

Table 5-6: Comparison of Site Testing

Location	High Level Testing	Allocation Sites	Small Sites
Wentworth	£2,554	N/A	£2,376 - £3,447
Virginia Water	£877	£382-£827	£861 - £1,268
Englefield Green	£508	£588	£525 - £764
Ottershaw	£409	£396	£437 - £658
Woodham	£403	N/A	£328 - £503
Chertsey ¹	£285	£116-£396	£287 - £444
Egham	£236	N/A	£284 - £440
Addlestone	£113	£35-£346	£176 - £284
Staines Border & North (Egham Hythe & Thorpe)	£90	£386-£469	£156 - £256
Longcross	N/A	£297	N/A

¹ Excludes Chertsey Bittams C

5.23 Looking across different residential development scales and locations it would appear that there is scope to differentiate CIL rates on a locational basis. The scope for CIL from small sites appears to be relatively similar to that expected from notional 1ha sites and some of the much larger allocations and therefore it is not recommended that differentiating CIL rates by scale should be pursued unless a site is placed at risk of delivery.

5.24 The highest value areas are consistently Wentworth and Virginia Water where in the majority of circumstances CIL rates above £800 per sqm could theoretically be achieved. The exception is the Virginia Water North allocation (Local Plan Policy SL9) where CIL rates would need to be lower at around £380 per sqm. This allocation is indicated to come forward in the period 2020-2025 and therefore could come forward in the lifetime of the first CIL Charging Schedule which is likely to run until the end of 2023.

5.25 The Council could give a differential rate to the Virginia Water North allocation but this is considered to add an unnecessary level of complexity when a lower rate across the area would not place any other development at risk. In terms of setting rates the Council would not wish to place one of its housing allocation sites at risk and therefore a rate for Virginia Water & Wentworth of £380 per sqm is feasible and viable.

- 5.26 There are 15 smaller sites which although falling within the Virginia Water area, are more likely to reflect values seen in the Egham area (as shown on the map on p11 of the CIL Viability Report). The small site values for Egham show scope for CIL somewhere between £284 and £410 per sqm and £380 per sqm sits just within this range. Whilst this may place some development at risk, it is not considered to be significant being at the most 15 units and in any event the 15 units sit within the Green Belt where development is restricted and may not realise any net additional floorspace.
- 5.27 Englefield Green also displays high values ranging from £508 - £764 per sqm. There is one allocation site in Englefield Green (Local Plan Policy SL5) which the Council would not wish to place at risk. The viability report suggests a surplus at this site of £588 per sqm. Appendix B of this document shows a further 24 units to come from smaller sites in Englefield Green which would have less scope for CIL at around £508 - £525 per sqm.
- 5.28 Englefield Green is however relatively contiguous with Wentworth/Virginia Water and therefore could form part of a larger charging zone, although this would need to adopt the CIL rate of £380. Whilst some infrastructure funding may be lost by setting lower rates in this area, there is in reality only a low level of net additional floorspace to come forward in Englefield Green and any value lost is unlikely to be significant.
- 5.29 The Ottershaw area also exhibits relatively high values for all types of site ranging from £396 to £658 per sqm. The Ottershaw area contains the allocation Ottershaw East which has a potential for CIL at £396 per sqm. However, the Ottershaw East site would also be expected to make a contribution toward the A320 mitigation scheme at £61 per sqm. Subtracting this leaves a potential for CIL of £335 per sqm.
- 5.30 However, it is considered that the Ottershaw East site could support a charge in excess of £335 given the site is predominantly greenfield and the generous 50% buffer already applied to CIL potential as well as the fact that CIL potential has been based on gross not net sqm and therefore total CIL liability is likely to be lower on a per sqm basis. A greenfield BLV for the site would see a potential for CIL (gross floorspace), with A320 mitigation and a 50% buffer at £631 per sqm.
- 5.31 The area also contains the settlement of Lyne up to Virginia Water and is contiguous with a possible Englefield Green/Wentworth/Virginia Water charging zone. Appendix B shows a further 26 units to come forward in this area, one of which a smaller site could support a CIL charge of £437 per sqm. Given the relative closeness in value and

proximity to Virginia Water it is logical based on the viability evidence to include Ottershaw within the Englefield Green/Wentworth/Virginia Water zone at £380.

- 5.32 The Longcross Garden Village site would lie within the same value area as Ottershaw, however, this is considered separately below, given the strategic nature of this site and its infrastructure delivery route.
- 5.33 The next highest range of values is found for Woodham with potential ranging from £328 - £503. There are no Local Plan allocation sites in Woodham and neither does the list of sites in Appendix B show any in the Woodham or New Haw area. The Woodham area is relatively contiguous with Ottershaw to the north and west but more so with Addlestone to the north. As such Woodham/New Haw should sit with Addlestone given that the lowest value sits below Englefield Green/Ottershaw/Virginia Water/Wentworth and that £380 per sqm is recommended for that area.
- 5.34 Chertsey and Egham (west of the M25) show a similar range of values for 1ha notional and small sites between £236 and £444 per sqm. Seven of the Local Plan allocation sites lie within the Chertsey value area with 5 dependent on A320 mitigation (Policies SL6, SL14-SL18) with values ranging from £55 to £335. However, as set out in paragraph 5.16, the Bittams E site is predominantly greenfield which gives a potential for CIL, taking account of A320 mitigation, at £390 per sqm, although Bittams B would fall to £188 per sqm.
- 5.35 There are also 225 units anticipated from smaller sites within the Chertsey and Egham area including the Chertsey and Egham Opportunity areas and 9 units to come from small sites which the Council would not wish to place at risk. Without placing any development at risk it is considered, based on the viability evidence that CIL rates for Chertsey and Egham would need to be less than £188 and £236 per sqm respectively and therefore a rate of £185 and £235 per sqm is recommended.
- 5.36 If Chertsey and Egham formed part of a larger charging zone with Englefield Green, Ottershaw, Virginia Water and Wentworth, the rate for that zone would have to reflect the lower value of £185. This could reduce the level of potential CIL coming forward and given the size of the infrastructure funding gap this is not a level of CIL the Council is willing to lose in order to have less complexity in its charging schedule. As such, it is recommended that Chertsey and Egham have separate charging zones at a rate of £185 and £235 per sqm respectively.
- 5.37 The Local Plan allocation Chertsey Bittams C (Policy SL16) lies within the potential Chertsey charging zone. This site only generates very small scope for CIL at around

£74 per sqm with a greenfield BLV and even less once £61 per sqm for the A320 is subtracted.

- 5.38 The site is allocated to deliver 9 units of market housing and 11 Traveller pitches and therefore will make a substantial contribution to Traveller needs in the Borough. Given the importance this site has in helping to meet a specified need, the Council would not wish to place this site at risk. Therefore, it is recommended that Biitams C is zero rated for CIL. A differential rate of CIL could be imposed based on the scale of development, although this could see exemptions for smaller sites which are viable and is not recommended.
- 5.39 In Addlestone values range from £35 to £346 per sqm, which reflects the two allocations comprising 223 dwellings. A further 28 units from smaller sites are anticipated with potential between £113 and £284 per sqm. If the greenfield BLV for the Vet Labs Site (Policy SL11) is taken into account potential for CIL, with A320 mitigation, rises to £206 per sqm. In this respect the site allocation values sit within the notional 1ha and small site values.
- 5.40 The Addlestone West site is allocated to replace and possibly expand existing health/community uses along with retail and residential. This is likely to reduce the potential for CIL from £346 per sqm. This leaves 150 units to come forward on the Vet Labs allocation with potential for £206 per sqm. Given that smaller sites exhibit scope for CIL at £113 and not wishing to place any development at risk, a CIL rate of £110 per sqm for Addlestone is recommended. This should give sufficient flexibility should the Vet Labs Site attract a BLV higher than greenfield.
- 5.41 The lowest value area is Staines Border & North comprising Egham (east of the M25) and Thorpe. Within the Staines Border & North area values range from £90 to £469, with the highest values reflecting the allocation sites. There are two allocations in Staines Border & North (Policies SL7 & SL8) comprising some 340 dwellings. There are also a further 44 units from smaller sites anticipated (all in Thorpe) with potential for CIL ranging from £90 - £256 per sqm.
- 5.42 Not placing any development at risk the maximum CIL value in Staines Border & North area would be around £90 per sqm, which is some way below the values seen for the two allocation sites. However, a planning application for the Thorpe Lea Road West site (Policy SL8) is already under consideration and could be determined prior to a CIL charging schedule coming into effect. This would only leave 90 units remaining at Thorpe Lea Road North, part of which may not come forward within the period of the

first charging schedule. As such, it is not considered reasonable or pragmatic to include the site as a separate charging zone and add further complexity, when a lower rate will not risk the development coming forward. A CIL rate of £90 per sqm is therefore recommended for Staines Border & North.

- 5.43 However, the village of Thorpe is a distinct settlement in its own right within the Staines Border & North area and there may be a differential between the values seen across the wider Staines Border and North area (predominantly Egham Hythe and the part of Staines on Thames in Runnymede) and the area designated for the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan. Evidence of sold house prices in the Thorpe Neighbourhood Plan area is set out in Appendix E as given by the Land Registry for 2018-2019. Whilst the data of sold prices is not extensive, it is considered there is sufficient data to pick out any potential variations in house prices.
- 5.44 In comparing values for Thorpe to other areas tested there is some variation depending on dwelling type and size. Only one dwelling type/size falls below the price average for Staines Border & North (2 bed terraced) with one other (4 bed terraced) closely correlating to Staines Border & North. All other types/sizes show higher values and on this basis there is scope for higher CIL rates.
- 5.45 One type/size is closely correlated to Addlestone (4 bed semi-detached), 3 with Egham (2 & 3 bed semi-detached and 3 bed terraced), 1 with Woodham (3 bed detached) and 2 with Ottershaw (4 & 5 bed detached), although both show lower values than Ottershaw. As such it is considered that CIL rates based on Ottershaw i.e. £380 per sqm would not be appropriate for Thorpe and would place development at risk.
- 5.46 The Runnymede Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) shows the greatest need for 2 & 3 bed units in the market sector with 4 beds to a lesser extent. The majority of 2 & 3 bed dwellings in Thorpe show values with a closer affinity to Egham (west of M25) but still at a lower level. Whilst some 4 bed types/sizes show a variance from this (both above and below Egham), it is considered that setting a CIL rate just below Egham is appropriate and would be viable in the majority of circumstances. This would reflect the CIL rate proposed for Chertsey at £185 per sqm and which should ensure 2 & 3 bed dwellings remain viable. Whilst certain types of 4 bed units do not show viability at this CIL rate, sold values for Thorpe are based on the second hand market with any new build likely to achieve a premium, improving viability further.
- 5.47 Viability for the Longcross Garden Village site has been dealt with in some detail in the A320 Impact and Longcross Garden Village Viability Update Study (summarised in the

CIL Viability Report) which was prepared as evidence to support the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. The A320 & Longcross Viability Update considered two scenarios for the Longcross site, a static approach to viability and a phased approach.

- 5.48 In the static approach the viability update found that RLVs for the Longcross site would be around £130m taking account of affordable housing, infrastructure and sustainable design expectations. This compared to a BLV of around £60m, thus a potential surplus or some £70m, equating to potential for CIL of £300 per sqm with a 50% viability buffer.
- 5.49 However, the update report also highlights that if yields for the existing uses on site were better than the 12% assumed, BLV would be higher, although yields less than 10% are unlikely. A yield of 10% would give a BLV of around £80m and therefore the surplus for CIL could be £50m rather than £70m which would leave a potential CIL of around £197 per sqm.
- 5.50 The viability update also considered the site on a phased basis in three scenarios where house prices and build cost assumptions were altered to account for changing market conditions over time. Two of the scenarios (where house price inflation was higher than build cost inflation) gave large surpluses. The 'Historic' scenario reflects longer term house price inflation at 7% and build cost inflation at 5% per annum and gives large surpluses. The pessimistic scenario in the viability update has house price inflation at only 2% and gives an RLV of around £88.4m for the Longcross site. Given the market commentary earlier, the historic and optimistic scenarios appear to be unlikely with RLV more likely to fit with the pessimistic scenario in the short term and possibly over the lifetime of a charging schedule.
- 5.51 The pessimistic scenario gives a surplus of between £8m and £28m and potential for CIL with a 50% viability buffer of between £32-£109 per sqm (on the basis of BLV at £60m and £80m). Coupled with these scenarios the viability did not assume any infrastructure costs towards the A320 mitigation scheme.
- 5.52 Given that the Longcross site is a key strategic site underpinning delivery of the Local Plan and its spatial strategy, the Council would not wish to place the delivery of this site at risk. As such, it is recommended the Longcross site is given its own charging zone with CIL rates for residential development set at £0.

Specialist C3 Residential Accommodation

- 5.53 Also of note when considering C3 residential development is the potential for specialist retirement/sheltered accommodation which falls within Class C3 development. The CIL

Viability Report has tested this type of development and considers it to be viable. The Viability Report found that with commercial BLVs C3 retirement/sheltered schemes could command surpluses for CIL of some £2,500 per sqm, which is certainly within the bounds of all of the CIL rates for C3 development recommended even if an allowance for affordable provision is made.

5.54 If delivered on existing residential land the surpluses for CIL could be reduced. The RV shown for C3 retirement/sheltered accommodation in the CIL Viability report is around £16m per ha. This sits comfortably above the residential BLVs shown in Table 6.2 of the CIL Viability Report and therefore schemes coming forward on sites in existing residential use should be able to accommodate the CIL charges recommended even with a 50% buffer.

Sense Check

5.55 In order to sense check the CIL rates recommended above, there has been a general rule of thumb with first charging schedules that CIL rates should not represent more than around 5% of Gross Development Value (GDV). However, the CIL rates considered above have all been based on the gross level of development coming forward.

5.56 In reality, the calculation of CIL will need to take account of any existing floorspace as it is net floorspace that counts towards CIL not gross and this is likely to lower the total CIL liability on a per sqm basis. Further, for sites of 10 or more units, the affordable housing exemption may be applied which would reduce total CIL liability further. Table 5-7 sets out CIL as a percentage of GDV for each of the allocation sites on a gross and net floorspace basis having taken into account an exemption for affordable housing.

Table 5-7: CIL as % of GDV for Local Plan Allocation Sites

Allocation Sites	CIL Rate	GDV	Gross Floorspace	Net Floorspace	Gross %	Net %
Ottershaw East	£380	£76,681,650	16,735	11,141	8.3%	5.5%
Chertsey Bittams A	£185	£59,960,600	14,670	10,384	4.5%	3.2%
Chertsey Bittams B	£185	£41,120,500	10,062	6,659	4.5%	3.0%
Chertsey Bittams D	£185	£42,437,500	10,443	7,458	4.6%	3.3%
Chertsey Bittams E	£185	£25,923,300	7,405	4,562	5.3%	3.3%
Vet Labs	£110	£43,613,600	12,606	8,970	3.2%	2.3%
Thorpe Lea Rs North	£90	£34,377,420	5,669	4,509	1.5%	1.2%
Thorpe Lea Rd West	£90	£96,627,375	15,781	9,238	1.5%	0.9%

Virginia Water North	£380	£66,761,800	13,321	4,509	7.6%	2.6%
Virginia Water South	£380	£78,092,600	12,805	8,000	6.2%	3.9%
Pycroft Road	£185	£106,637,100	23,148	14,089	4.0%	2.4%
Blay's House	£380	£45,586,150	8,424	404	7.0%	0.3%

5.57 As can be seen in Table 5-7, there is only one site where CIL as a percentage of GDV on a net floorspace basis sits above 5%, which is the Local Plan site allocation at Ottershaw East (Policy SL12). In order to achieve CIL as percentage of GDV at 5% the CIL rate at Ottershaw East would need to drop to around £345 per sqm which is £35 below the rate recommended for Ottershaw. However, given the potential for CIL if greenfield BLV is applied, it is considered £380 per sqm remains an appropriate rate for Ottershaw.

5.58 Whilst some sites, particularly in Englefield Green and Staines Border & North exhibit particularly low CIL as a percentage of GDV, the 1ha and small sites tested showed lower potential for CIL and as such raising CIL rates at these sites could place further development at risk.

Recommended C3 Residential Charging Zones

5.59 From the above there is potential for seven separate charging zones for residential development as follows: -

- A) Englefield Green/Ottershaw/Virginia Water & Wentworth (£380)
- B) Egham (£235)
- C) Chertsey & Thorpe (£185)
- D) Addlestone, Woodham & New Haw (£110)
- E) Egham Hythe/Staines upon Thames (£90)
- F) Chertsey Bittams C (£0)
- G) Longcross Garden Village (£0)

5.60 The map on p11 of the CIL Viability Report shows the value areas as described above as postcode areas with the edges of each not clearly defined in terms of settlements or distinct areas. As such, when forming the charging zones (as set out above) more distinctive zone boundaries will be applied.

C2 Housing

- 5.61 The CIL Viability Report tested C2 nursing homes and other residential institutions. This was tested for a generic 200 room scheme on a borough wide basis given that location within the Borough is not a factor determining the value of the development or commercial land benchmarks but is more a reflection on the business model in the care sector.
- 5.62 The Viability Report found no potential for CIL with negative values returned when comparing RLV with BLV. Given the viability results, C2 housing will be given a zero CIL rate across the whole of the Borough.

Student Accommodation

- 5.63 The CIL Viability Report tested student accommodation for self-catering units at 20sqm per room. Rental values were based on rates seen in accommodation provided for Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) which is based in Englefield Green. Using out of London yields, the CIL Viability tested a 1ha site with 5 storey accommodation and found surpluses for CIL at £2,000 per sqm which is far in excess of any of the C3 CIL rates recommended.
- 5.64 The majority of student accommodation will occur in the Englefield Green and Egham (west of M25) areas of the Borough, although it could also come forward in other areas of the Borough. There is no reason to suggest that the viability of student accommodation in the Borough is dependent on location and as such a single rate could be set across the whole Borough. Even with a 50% buffer a rate of £1,000 per sqm could theoretically be set. The analysis by Cushman & Wakefield¹⁴ referred to in the Viability Report does show yields for outer London areas at 4.25% - 4.75% but also in secondary regional at 5.75% - 6%. If the higher yield percentage of 6% is taken as a worst case scenario than potential for CIL drops to £496 with a 50% buffer. As such a rate of £495 per sqm is recommended to allow greater flexibility should the Runnymede market be more aligned to secondary regional than outer London.

¹⁴ UK Student Accommodation 2019/20, Cushman Wakefield. Available at: <http://www.cushmanwakefield.co.uk/en-gb/research-and-insight/2019/uk-student-accommodation-report-2019>

Commercial Development

Convenience Retail

- 5.65 Convenience retailing was tested in the CIL Viability Report at £200 per sqm rental value and yields of 5.5%. The viability testing showed that at these values negative potential for CIL was realised. As such, it is recommended that a zero CIL rate for convenience retailing is set across the Borough.
- 5.66 The Viability Report also set out that retail warehousing will likely show lower rental values than convenience retailing with less potential for CIL than convenience retail. As such, a zero CIL rate is also recommended for retail warehousing.

Comparison Retail

- 5.67 The CIL Viability Report considered 'High Street' retail as A1 comparison retail. It found that for a 3,000sqm scheme on a 1ha site, potential CIL surpluses could be achieved in the region of £1,200 per sqm. With a 50% buffer this equates to £600 per sqm.
- 5.68 The Viability Report tested rents at £350 per sqm, although it does explain that in Addlestone and Chertsey rents are likely to sit closer to £260-£280 per sqm, which at a yield of 6.5% as tested in the viability study would give negative or limited scope for CIL of around £65 per sqm with a 50% buffer. Given that both Addlestone and Chertsey are proposing retail development led schemes (Policy IE8 & IE11), the Council would not wish to place these developments at risk. Given that there may be a scenario which would see marginal viability and negative values for CIL, it is recommended a zero rate for A1 comparison retail is set for Addlestone & Chertsey.
- 5.69 In terms of Egham, the viability study shows stronger rental performance at around £400 per sqm, which is £50 higher than tested in the viability report. This would see CIL surpluses around £1,000 per sqm with a 50% buffer. However, this would equate to a CIL charge as a percentage of GDV of 16% on gross floorspace. Given the limited data on retail builds in the Borough it is not possible to equate this figure to a net percentage. The Local Plan also proposes an allocation and opportunity area within Egham Town Centre, Egham Gateway East (Policy IE9) and High Street North (Policy IE11).
- 5.70 The Chase & Partners Spring Retail Report 2019¹⁵ identifies yields for shop property in secondary high street or secondary shopping centre locations at 10% or more. The

¹⁵ Chase & Partners Spring Retail Report 2019. Available at: <http://www.chaseandpartners.co.uk/>

Knight Frank Investment Yield Guide January 2019¹⁶ also shows yields for good secondary at 6.5%, but 10% or more in secondary/tertiary high streets and shopping centres. Savills¹⁷ also show yields for secondary high street at 11% in Q1 2019. At these yields, positive scope for CIL only occurs when rental value is around £420 which is above rental values in Egham and therefore a zero rate should be set.

A2-A5 Retail

5.71 The Viability report tested A2, A3, A4 and A5 uses. For all of these uses the viability report found large deficits and as such there is no potential for CIL and a zero rate will be set across the whole Borough. Again, location within the Borough does not appear to be a factor in determining the viability of A2-A5 uses given that Runnymede's centres are similar in scale and function to one another in performing a more secondary retail role.

B1a Office Use

5.72 The viability report tested a generic 4,000sqm B1a office on a 1ha site and tested a rental value of £250 per sqm and yield of 5%. The assumptions tested returned a surplus for CIL of some £669 per sqm when comparing RLV with BLV or £335 per sqm with a 50% viability buffer.

5.73 However, simply changing the yield tested from 5% to 5.5% reduces the potential for CIL from £335 per sqm to £85 per sqm with a 50% buffer which is the same should yields stay at 5% but rental values fall to £225 per sqm. Yields at 6% and £250 per sqm rent would produce negative values as would reducing rent to £200 and keeping yields at 5%. Table 5-9 sets out the potential for CIL in changing yield and rent scenarios.

Table 5-9: Potential for CIL with Changes to Office Rents/Yields

	CIL Potential with 50% Buffer		
	Yield 5%	Yield 5.5%	Yield 6%
Rent £200	-£166	-£366	-£506
Rent £225	£85	-£141	-£298
Rent £250	£335	£85	-£91

5.74 Research by Savills¹⁸ shows that yields for M25 offices remained the same at 5% through 2017 & 2018. Colliers forecast annualised yields for offices in the South East at

¹⁶ Investment Yield Guide (2019) Knight Frank. Available at: <https://www.knightfrank.co.uk/research/investment-yield-guide-january-2019-6068.aspx>

¹⁷ UK Retail Investment Market (2019) Savills. Available at: https://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/282365-0

¹⁸ Commercial Forecast: Back to Basics (Jan 2019) Savills. Available at: https://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/273247-0

5.9% 2018-2022. Lambert Smith Hampton's Office Market Report 2019 for Thames Valley & South East¹⁹ shows yields at 5% for the Staines area. Even at a rental value of £250 per sqm, at yield 6% this returns a negative potential for CIL, although market commentary appears to suggest yields closer to 5%. Given the range of yields expressed, but the emphasis closer to 5% than 6% it does appear that there is scope to charge CIL for B1a Office floorspace.

5.75 As such, it is considered that a charge of £50 is set for B1a office floorspace. This level of CIL should allow sufficient flexibility should yields or rents weaken over the lifetime of the CIL charging Schedule.

The provision of some B1a office space has already been considered in the viability testing for Longcross Garden Village. Given the overall viability results as set out above, it is recommended that a zero CIL rate be set for B1a offices in a Longcross Garden Village charging zone. The £50 CIL rate would be in all other residential zones covering the rest of the Borough except for Chertsey Bittams C which is allocated for residential only.

B1c/B2 Industrial Use

5.76 The Viability Report tested a generic industrial use at 4,000sqm on a 1ha site and tested rental value at £150 per sqm and yield 6%. The viability report found no potential for CIL with results showing a deficit when RLV is compared to BLV.

5.77 In order to return a potential for CIL, rents would need to be at least £180 per sqm at a yield of 6%. The Cushman & Wakefield²⁰ Logistics and Industrial Rent & Yield Map for Q3 2019 shows rents in the region of £11.50 per sq ft (£124 per sqm) in Weybridge, £10.50 (£113) in Guildford and £13.50 (£145) in Slough with yields at 4.75%.

At a yield of 4.75% and the highest rental value of £145 per sqm seen in Slough, negative potential for CIL is still returned. As such, a zero rate for industrial will be set across the whole Borough.

B8 Warehousing

5.78 The Viability Report tested B8 warehousing and found a small surplus and potential for CIL when RLV is compared to BLV. The potential for CIL is £32 per sqm with a 50% buffer.

¹⁹ Office Market Report for Thames Valley & South East (2019) Lambert Smith Hampton. Available at: <https://www.thamesvalley.co.uk/download/thames-valley-south-east-office-report-2019/>

²⁰ National Logistics & Industrial Rent & Yield Map (Q3 2019) Cushman & Wakefield. Available at:

- 5.79 The viability report also tested the Local Plan allocation at Byfleet Road for 20,000sqm of B8 floorspace. The viability report found negative potential when RLV is compared to a commercial BLV. However, the site is 100% greenfield with no previous development and commercial BLV is unlikely. Potential for CIL with a greenfield BLV is around £38 per sqm with a 50% buffer.
- 5.80 However, the Byfleet Road site is affected by flood risk and some form of flood mitigation will be required to bring the site forward. The cost of this has not been included in the viability testing as this is unknown at this time. Whilst the site generates a small surplus for CIL with a greenfield BLV, given the unknown cost of flood mitigation and that the Council would not wish to place this site at risk, it is considered that the site should be zero rated.
- 5.81 Whilst B8 in other locations could be viable for CIL at around £30 per sqm, the Council could form a charging zone for the Byfleet Road site with a zero rate with the rest of the Borough attracting a low CIL charge. However, there are no other Local Plan allocations for B8 use and no other sites identified where this use may come forward. As such, to avoid complexity it is considered that B8 warehousing should have a zero rate. Further, given the market commentary on industrial and logistics from Cushman & Wakefield as highlighted above, it is considered that rents and yields are unlikely to reach a level which could support a potential for CIL.

Hotels

- 5.82 The CIL Viability Report considered the viability of 350 bed hotel development on a 1ha site. The viability report shows a potential for CIL of £359 per sqm when RLV is compared to commercial BLV or £180 per sqm with a 50% viability buffer. This is based on a rental value per room per night of £120 and yield of 5%.
- 5.83 Market commentary from Savills²¹ shows prime regional hotel yields at 4.75%, intimating that yields are better than tested in the viability report. Market commentary from PWC²² sees RevPAR (Revenue per available room) at £55 possibly rising to £55.50 in 2020, with Knight Frank²³ seeing regional daily room rates somewhere between £57 and £87 which is still some way below the value per room of £120 tested in the CIL Viability Report.

²¹ Market Commentary in Minutes (May 2019) Savills. Available at

²² UK Hotels Forecast (2019) PWC. Available at

²³ UK Hotel Trading Performance (2018) Knight Frank

As such, whilst yields tested in the viability report appear to be more conservative than market commentary suggests, the value per room is probably on the high side. This is also evidenced through the Surrey Hotels Future study undertaken by Surrey County Council in 2015²⁴ showing annual room rates in Surrey under £120 aside from luxury destination hotels. Table 24 on p109 of the Hotel Futures Study shows interest for budget, boutique and apart hotels in Runnymede but not luxury or 3/4 star hotels. Therefore, it is considered that hotel uses should not attract a CIL charge and be zero rated.

D2 Leisure Uses

5.84 The CIL Viability Report considered a gym development and when RLV was compared to BLV there was negative potential for CIL.

5.85 Typically D2 type uses tend to come forward as part of mixed use schemes such as town centre developments which can include uses such as gyms, cinema's and/or bowling alleys and bingo halls.

5.86 A gym and cinema has recently been completed in the new Addlestone One development in Addlestone Town Centre and permission has been granted for a new cinema in the Egham Gateway West development in Egham Town Centre. Further, Egham Leisure Centre has recently been redeveloped to include swimming lanes and new gym facilities.

5.87 As such, given recent completions and permissions for D2 uses in the Borough, it is considered unlikely that further D2 uses would be forthcoming over the lifetime of a CIL charging schedule and no such allocations or targets for such are set out in the Local Plan. Given the negative potential for CIL and that further D2 uses are unlikely to come forward given recent completions/permissions, it is considered that such uses should attract a zero CIL charge.

Other Uses

5.88 A number of different development types are likely to arise over the period of a CIL charging schedule and this document and the CIL Viability Report have considered those uses which are likely to form the bulk of development coming forward to deliver the Local Plan vision and objectives.

²⁴ Surrey Hotels Futures Study (2015)

5.89 The question now is how to use this analysis to help set a charge for development of peripheral uses that are not central to the delivery of the Local Plan. These peripheral uses may be as diverse as scrapyards, laundrettes, equestrian development and so on. Individual viability testing of this range of uses has not been undertaken for the following reasons:

- (i) These are not critical to the delivery of the Local Plan and historical evidence suggests that they have not been particularly important in the past;
- (ii) Because limited amounts of net new floorspace will be delivered in these categories, it is likely that only small amounts of CIL would be raised;
- (iii) These uses will mostly move into second-hand rather than new build premises so they would not be liable for CIL anyway;
- (iv) A robust viability assessment of these uses would be complex, partly because there are many possible combinations of type of development (building) and type of use and these combinations are impossible to predict. This kind of assessment would need specialist valuation involving disproportionate cost and effort and the results would be inconclusive;
- (v) Some sui generis uses will be similar in nature to industrial uses which have already been determined as not being viable.

5.90 Community and other facilities (e.g. education, community halls, libraries, medical facilities and emergency services etc...) may be delivered in Runnymede over the plan period and could potentially occupy net additional floorspace liable for CIL. However, it is not proposed to levy CIL on these types of uses for the following reasons: -

- (i) These are uses likely to require public subsidy to support development and raising CIL against these would in effect only create a circular funding stream which requires the return of CIL funds to support these uses.
- (ii) Completed developments of these types are not commercial in nature and do not have a commercial value in themselves and as such do not create a residual land value. In other words from a commercial perspective, such developments are not viable.
- (iii) Non-state education projects such as private schools generally have charitable status and will therefore be exempt from CIL.

5.91 Therefore given the above analysis of peripheral and community uses and that industrial/warehousing has been determined as not viable for CIL, it is considered that a standard rate of CIL set at £0 should be implemented.

6. Estimated CIL Receipts

- 6.1 The previous section set out recommendations for the level of CIL rates which could be set in a CIL Charging Schedule. These are based on seven different zones for C3 and student units and five for B1a office development. All other types of development are to be zero rated.
- 6.2 To estimate CIL receipts an estimate of net additional floorspace is required by charging zone to establish how much revenue CIL charges could bring and how much of the infrastructure funding gap could be reduced.
- 6.3 Table 6-1 sets out the estimated level of net additional floorspace which would attract a CIL charge by area of the borough and estimated CIL receipts including the top-slicing for the neighbourhood funding element. Estimated floorspace from windfalls has been allocated pro rata based on the level of residential development coming forward in each area in accordance with the Runnymede 2030 Spatial Strategy (excluding Longcross).

Table 6-1: Estimated CIL Receipts by Borough Area

Allocation Sites	Net Floorspace	Estimated CIL Receipts	Neighbourhood Top Slice	Total CIL Receipts
Addlestone (inc Rowtown) (Resi)	13,450	£1,479,500	£221,925	£1,257,575
Chertsey (inc Bittams) (Resi)	45,485	£8,414,725	£1,262,209	£7,152,516
Egham (Resi)	11,122	£1,699,010	£254,852	£1,444,159
Englefield Green (Resi)	2,209	£839,420	£209,855	£629,565
Longcross (Resi)	94,599	£0	£0	£0
Lyne (Resi)	151	£57,380	£8,607	£48,773
Ottershaw (Resi)	11,897	£4,520,860	£678,129	£3,842,731
Thorpe (Resi)	1,320	£244,200	£61,050	£183,150
Virginia Water (Resi)	13,668	£5,193,840	£1,298,460	£3,895,380
Woodham & New Haw (Resi)	303	£33,330	£5,000	£28,331
Office	23,461	£1,173,050	£175,958	£997,093
Total	217,665	£23,655,315	£4,176,043	£19,479,272

¹ Neighbourhood top slice based on 25% where Neighbourhood Plans are under preparation. 15% in all other locations.

- 6.4 Table 6-1 shows estimated CIL receipts at £19.5m once the neighbourhood funding element has been subtracted from CIL receipts. The Council is also able to redeem a percentage of CIL receipts towards the cost of administering CIL at 5% of CIL receipts. If this is applied after the top slicing of neighbourhood funds, the amount of CIL available for infrastructure is around £18.5m.

- 6.5 Table 3-3 in Section 3 showed a funding gap of around £105m and as such CIL receipts could reduce this funding gap to around £86.5m over the plan period after the neighbourhood funding element and administration costs have been taken into account.
- 6.6 The neighbourhood funding element could reduce the funding gap by a further £4.2m if a neighbourhood's infrastructure priorities are the same as the Council's and combined with its CIL receipts. This could reduce the gap to £81.3m.
- 6.7 The 2030 Local Plan allocation site policies also require the physical provision of infrastructure on site rather than through a financial contribution. This predominantly relates to recreation and green infrastructure and amounts to some £5.75m. As such the final infrastructure funding gap is estimated at £75.5m.
- 6.8 Even with CIL and Section 106 contributions it is evident from the size of the funding gap that the Council will need to find other sources of funding throughout the Local Plan period. As such the Council will need to take full advantage and be proactive in bidding for other sources of funding available whether at local or national level.

7. Implementation & Governance

- 7.1 The procedures for calculating and collecting CIL are set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). This also includes procedures for the monitoring of CIL monies, both those collected and those spent. The Regulations also set out the procedures for CIL relief including whether or not the Borough Council will allow relief in exceptional circumstances.
- 7.2 Runnymede Borough Council is a lower tier authority and as such may collect CIL on behalf of Surrey County Council or other organisations which provide infrastructure, although ultimately it is the Borough Council who determines on what infrastructure projects CIL receipts are spent.
- 7.3 The Regulations also include provision for the Borough Council to retain a percentage of CIL receipts for a neighbourhood funding element in unparished areas as explained in previous sections.

Exemptions & Relief

- 7.4 The CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) contain provisions for certain exemptions and relief from CIL. The list of exemptions is included in paragraph 005 of the PPG note on CIL¹ and includes:
- Development less than 100sqm (unless it consists of one or more dwellings);
 - Buildings into which people do not normally go;
 - Buildings into which people go only intermittently;
 - Structures which are not buildings;
 - Development which is zero rated in CIL charging schedules
- 7.5 Some types of relief set out in the CIL Regulations are mandatory and include relief for residential extensions and annexes, social housing, self-build housing and some forms of charitable development.
- 7.6 The Borough Council may also grant discretionary relief where the whole or greater part of development will be held as a charitable investment, social housing where the sold price is no more than 80% of market value or in exceptional circumstances. Discretionary reliefs are only available if the Borough Council makes them so.

- 7.7 The Borough Council has decided not to grant discretionary reliefs for its first charging schedule. The Council considers that the charges proposed will not place development at risk within the Borough and therefore discretionary reliefs are not required. This will however be reviewed upon the first review of the Charging Schedule.

Implementation

- 7.8 The CIL Regulations (as amended) allow a charging authority to implement an instalment policy (Regulation 69B). The policy must be published on the Council's website. Where no instalment policy has been implemented CIL is payable in full within 60 days of the intended commencement date as stated in the commencement notice submitted to the Borough Council (Regulation 70). The instalment policy is not subject to examination and can be amended at any time.
- 7.9 The Borough Council has drafted an Instalments Policy which has been published alongside the draft Charging Schedule for information.

Governance

- 7.10 It will be the Borough Council who controls the CIL fund and has ultimate responsibility in determining the infrastructure projects on which CIL will be spent. This will be undertaken in consultation with other infrastructure providers such as the County Council and/or other organisations who may be responsible for infrastructure delivery in the Borough. This would not include infrastructure provided by the private sector.
- 7.11 In terms of the funds to be retained for neighbourhoods, guidance sets out how charging authorities should engage with their communities to agree how a neighbourhood funding element should be spent. The Borough Council will undertake appropriate engagement with its communities in line with Government guidance and set aside the neighbourhood funding element for local infrastructure provision.

Appendix A

Gross to Net Data for Residential Sites less than 10 Units or 0.5ha,
Employment Sites in SEAs & Average Student or C2 Units/Bedspaces
per Square Metre

Residential Completions or Extant Permissions for Sites less than 10 units or 0.5ha

Site	Type	Plan Ref	Site Size	Net Dwellings	Existing Floorspace	Proposed Floorspace	Net Floorspace	Density (dph)
37A Armstrong Road, Englefield Green (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.10/102	0.03ha	1	74	250	176sqm	33
Bridge House, Trumps Green Road, VW (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.13/0950	0.25ha	1	368	826	458sqm	40
30 Crossways, Egham (Urban)	Infill	RU.13/0913	0.02ha	1	0	80	80sqm	50
52 Station Road, Egham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.14/487	0.02	5	172	277	105sqm	250
1 The Crescent, Egham (Urban)	Infill	RU.13/1118	0.01ha	1	0	122	122sqm	100
19 Crown Street, Egham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.14/0382	0.05ha	1	175	300	125sqm	20
Land adj 563-565 Stroude Rd, Virginia Water (Urban)	Infill	RU.14/1034	0.05ha	1	0	90	90sqm	20
78 Brox Road, Ottershaw (Urban)	C of U	RU.14/1732	0.016ha	1	177	167	-10sqm	63
8 Woodham Lane, New Haw (Urban)	Infill	RU.15/0805	0.02ha	1	0	115	115sqm	50
18 High Street, Addlestone (Urban)	Conversion	RU.10/0286	0.016ha	2	129	129	0sqm	125
4 Orchard Way, Addlestone (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.12/0103	0.015ha	1	206	267	61sqm	67
Land r/o 8, 9, 10, 11 Hatch Close (Urban)	Backland	RU.12/1026	0.06ha	1	0	97	97sqm	17
27 High Street, Addlestone (Urban)	C of U & extension	RU.13/0432	0.024ha	6	120	398	278sqm	250
Land adj 2 Meadway Drive, New Haw (Urban)	Infill	RU.13/0661	0.04ha	1	0	90	90sqm	25
87 & 89 Spinney Hill, Addlestone (Urban)	Backland	RU.14/0599	0.28ha	3	0	751	751sqm	11
End House, Prairie Road, Addlestone (Urban)	Conversion & extension	RU.14/0982	0.04ha	1	125	173	48sqm	25
Land adj 85 Spinney Hill, Addlestone (Urban)	Infill	RU.14/1429	0.02ha	1	0	99	99sqm	50

Land r/o 54 & 56 Bourneside Road (Urban)	Infill	RU.14/1091	0.014ha	1	23	94	71sqm	71
Cambridge House, 8 Chapel Grove, Addlestone (Urban)	Extension to create new dwellings	RU.15/0324	0.05ha	2	0	122	122sqm	40
Addlestone Lodge & Charton, Ongar Hill (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.14/1695	0.21ha	6	684	987	303sqm	29
Land r/o 61 & 63 Grange Rd, Woodham (Urban)	Infill	RU.15/0129	0.037ha	2	0	183	183sqm	54
12 Willow Close, Woodham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU15/0775	0.07ha	1	180	320	140sqm	14
35 Burleigh Road, Addlestone (Urban)	Infill	RU.15/1491	0.06ha	1	36	116	80sqm	17
100-106 Church Rd, Addlestone (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.16/0039	0.18ha	7 + A1	340	984	644sqm	39
Arden, Brox Road, Ottershaw (Urban)	Conversion	RU.12/0711	0.03ha	1	78	78	0sqm	33
24 Guilford Rd, Chertsey (Urban)	Conversion & extension	RU.13/1374	0.02ha	1	84	157	73sqm	50
53 Rusham Road, Egham (Urban)	Infill	RU.12/1246	0.022ha	1	34	104	70sqm	45
54 Station Road, Egham (Urban)	Extension to create new dwelling	RU.15/0484	0.012ha	1	110	165	55sqm	83
Former Mushroom Farm, Thorpe (Green Belt)	Redevelop	RU.15/0213	0.44ha	5	1,184	1,700	516sqm	11
67-69 Woodham Lane, Woodham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.13/0893	0.06ha	7	206	351	145sqm	117
10A Woodham Lane, Woodham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.14/0391	0.08ha	5	286	373	87sqm	63
Stamford Lodge, 58 Amis Avenue, Woodham (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.15/1306	0.14ha	3	231	430	199sqm	21
The Bungalow, Willow Walk, Chertsey (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.15/1079	0.077ha	1	177	320	143sqm	13
35 Liberty Rise, Addlestone (Urban)	Infill	RU.15/1539	0.02ha	1	0	123	123sqm	50

1 Liberty Rise, Addlestone (Urban)	Conversion & extension	RU.16/0204	0.09ha	1	155	266	111sqm	11
The Black Horse, New Haw Rd (Urban)	Redevelop	RU.16/0094	0.1ha	9	315	640	325sqm	90
70A Wheatash Rd, Chertsey (Urban)	Redevelop & Backland	RU.16/0811	0.06ha	2	450	247	-203sqm	33
52 Simplemarsh Rd, Addlestone (Urban)	Backland	RU.16/0749	0.14ha	4	15	400	385sqm	29
Thelma, Rosemary Lane, Thorpe (Green Belt)	Redevelop	RU.16/0395	0.11ha	4	40	524	484sqm	36
Barrsbrook Cattery, Guildford Rd, Chertsey (Green Belt)	Redevelop	RU.17/	0.48ha	5	644	643	-1sqm	10
Total				109	6,818sqm	13,558	6,740sqm	

Appendix B

Estimated Levels of Development in Remaining Plan Period

Estimated Development

Site and (Net Dwellings Required or sqm)	Estimated Existing Floorspace	Estimated Proposed Floorspace ¹	Net Floorspace ² (discounted for affordable and existing floorspace)
C3 Residential Completions 01/04/2015-31/03/2019 (1,635)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pipeline C3 Residential Development (1,378 with Permission as at 31/10/2019)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sites Likely to be Unavailable for CIL³			
SL8 – Thorpe Lea Road West (220)	6,376sqm	18,467sqm	9,003sqm
SL17 Bittams D (200)	0sqm	10,443sqm	7,458sqm
IE10 – Egham Gateway West (100)	1,242sqm	5,840sqm	4,064sqm
SL3 – Hanworth Lane (52 remaining)	0sqm	3,500sqm	2,980sqm
Sites Available for CIL			
SD10 – LGV North (240)	0sqm	14,400sqm	9,570sqm
SD10 – LGV South (1,532)	9,980sqm	130,251sqm	85,029sqm
SL5 – Blays House (92 remaining)	5,450sqm	8,424sqm	404sqm
SL6 – Pyrcroft Road (275)	3,470sqm	23,148sqm	14,089sqm
SL7 – Thorpe Lea Road North (90)	2,950sqm	5,669sqm	2,719sqm
SL8 – Thorpe Lea Rd West (55)	1,249sqm	4,552sqm	2,379sqm
SL9 – Virginia Water North (120)	4,947sqm	13,321sqm	4,509sqm
SL10 – Virginia Water South (140)	854sqm	12,805sqm	8,000sqm
SL11 – Vet Labs (150)	0sqm	12,606sqm	8,970sqm
SL12 – Ottershaw E (200)	1,270sqm	16,735sqm	11,141sqm
SL14 Bittams A (175)	235sqm	14,670sqm	10,384sqm
SL15 Bittams B (120)	800sqm	10,062sqm	6,659sqm
SL16 Bittams C (9)	0sqm	867sqm	867sqm
SL18 Bittams E (105)	0sqm	7,405sqm	4,562sqm
IE1 – Byfleet Road (20,000sqm B8)	0sqm	20,000sqm	20,000sqm
IE8 – Addlestone West (73)	3,240sqm	4,200sqm	1,305sqm
IE8 – Addlestone West (500sqm comparison Retail)		500sqm	156sqm
IE9 – Egham Gateway East (45)	1,215sqm	1,790sqm	526sqm
IE11 - Chertsey Opportunity Area (142)	4,570sqm	8,395sqm	3,655sqm
IE11- Chertsey Opportunity Area (294sqm comparison retail)		294sqm	294sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (50)	2,690sqm	2,955sqm	1,197sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (814sqm convenience retail)		814sqm	814sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (685sqm comparison retail)		685sqm	685sqm
IE11 - Egham Library (40)	712sqm	1,863sqm	1,398sqm
CABI, Bakeham Lane (25)	3,744sqm	3,744sqm	0sqm
Coltscroft, Rosemary Lane (24)	532sqm	1,542sqm	1,169sqm
Thorpe Park Farm (20)	2,870sqm	2,870sqm	0sqm
Hurst Lane (10)	850sqm	850sqm	0sqm

Ongar Hill Brickworks, Ledger Drive (12)	947sqm	923sqm	0sqm
Alwyn House, Windsor Street, Chertsey (35)	1,870sqm	1,870sqm	0sqm
Land at Howards Lane (6)	612sqm	612sqm	0sqm
Woburn Hill, Addlestone (10)	2,182sqm	2,182sqm	0sqm
Units 1 & 1a Downside, Chertsey (30)	820sqm	1,775sqm	538sqm
Pantiles Nursery, Almnors Lane (20)	5,537sqm	1,588sqm	0sqm
Trys Hill Farm (6)	1,690sqm	568sqm	0sqm
Villa Santa Maria (9)	1,327sqm	1,327sqm	0sqm
Sandhills & Lyne Lane (11)	1,527sqm	1,527sqm	0sqm
Garage Site, Trumps Green Rd (5)	256sqm	356sqm	100sqm
Webbs, The Green (14)	1,132sqm	1,132sqm	0sqm
Two Bridges, Guildford St (13)	850sqm	850sqm	0sqm
9-11 Victoria Street, EG (10)	487sqm	779sqm	292sqm
Padd Farm, Hurst Lane (5)			0sqm
33 Station Road (15)	717sqm	1,200sqm	483sqm
Windfalls (245)	9,310sqm	23,275sqm	15,129sqm
Estates Regeneration ¹ (170)	All affordable so net floorspace = 0sqm		
Prior Approvals (192)	No net floorspace so = 0sqm		
Total Net Floorspace			240,528sqm
Total Net Floorspace Available for CIL			217,023sqm

¹ Based on SHMA Mix of units or planning application as submitted.

² Based on CIL Regulation 40 & 50.

³ Outstanding applications which may be permitted prior to CIL implementation and not included in estimated CIL receipts.

Appendix C

Section 106 Contributions Secured 2015-2019

Developer Contributions Secured from 01.04.2015

Site	App No	Contributions Secured	Contribution per dwelling
Land at 22 Ferndale Avenue, Chertsey (12 net dwellings)	RU.12/0904	Playspace - £180,000 Libraries - £2,932 Crime & Disorder - £7,968 Yellow Bus - £15,935 SANG - £24,000 SAMM - £7,560	£18,338
Tamchester, Pretoria Rd, Chertsey (57 net dwellings)	RU.13/0023	Highways - £58,132 Yellow Bus - £21,805 Crime & Disorder - £10,902 Libraries - £4,012 SANG - £114,000 SAMM - £35,910	£4,294
72-82 Holbrook Court, Pooley Green Rd, Egham* (26 net dwellings)	RU.13/0401	Highways - £44,164 Playspace - £21,093 Libraries - £3,369 Crime & Disorder - £10,000 Yellow Bus - £18,310	£3,728
Aviator Park, Addlestone	RU.13/0770	CCTV - £20,000 Yellow Bus - £97,860 SANG - £400,000 SAMM - £126,000	£3,219
Former DERA site, Longcross	RU.13/0856	Traffic Calming Works - £165,000 Bus Service - £880,000 Rail Service - £700,000 Rail Station - £754,641 Travel Initiative - £150,000	

		Primary Education - £669,103 Secondary Education - £763,070 SANG - £272,852 Off-site Highway Works	
Land at Dashwood Lang Rd, Addlestone	RU.13/1311	Transport (Bus & Rail) - £250,000 Yellow Bus - £15,000 Crime & Disorder - £32,000	N/A
Royal Holloway University of London, Englefield Green	RU.14/0099	Transport - £100,000 Crime & Disorder - £25,000	N/A
Land at Station Rd, Addlestone (188 net dwellings)	RU.14/0435	Travel Initiative - £123,660 Primary Education - £169,129 Secondary Education - £172,513 SANG - £376,000 SAMM - £118,440	£4,506
Land at Wick Road, Englefield Green (89 net dwellings)	RU.14/1208	Highways - £38,500 Primary Education - £277,855 Secondary Education - £337,993 Playspace - £14,000 Yellow Bus - £76,000 SANG - £178,000 SAMM - £56,070	£10,993
Tamesis 1, The Causeway, Egham	RU.14/1699	Highways - £123,000* Crime & Disorder - £20,000	N/A
Land at Hanworth Lane (North), Chertsey (130 net dwellings)	RU.15/0855	Primary Education - £273,462	£7,687

		Secondary Education - £299,933 Cycle - £4,000 Play Space - £80,000 SANG - £260,000 SAMM - £81,900	
Land Fronting the Glanty, The Causeway, Egham	RU.15/1933	Highways - £123,000*	N/A
Land at Coombelands Lane, Addlestone (43 net dwellings)	RU.16/0845	Early Years - £28,941 Primary Education - £111,746 Secondary Education - £123,076 SANG - £86,000 SAMM - £27,090	£8,764
31 The Causeway, Egham	RU.16/0926	Cycling/Walking - £300,000	N/A
Former Brunel University Campus (59 net dwellings)	RU.17/1649	Community Support - £400,000 Minor Projects - £85,253 Cycle Lane Link - £100,000 RT Bus Info - £15,000 Yellow Bus - £80,000 Highway Works – On-site delivery	£11,530
St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey (386 net dwellings)	RU.17/1815	Highways Contribution - £1,194,160 Bus Service - £70,000 Community Centre - £90,870 Early Years - £189,801 Primary Education - £847,017 Secondary Education - £ Police - £30,307	£8,905

		SANG - £772,000 SAMM - £243,180	
Land at Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw (40 net dwellings)	RU.17/1940	Early Years - £26,922 Primary Education - £122,454 Secondary Education - £134,659 SANG - £80,000 SAMM - £25,200	£9,731
159-175 Station Rd, Addlestone (65 net dwellings)	RU.18/0743	Early Years - £46,440 Secondary Education - £92,669 Health - £56,925 SANG - £130,000 SAMM - £40,950	£5,646
Land at Hanworth Lane (South), Chertsey (158 net dwellings)	RU.18/1280	Early Years Education - £106,342 Primary Education - £389,052 Secondary Education - £391,360 Community Facilities - £23,800 Highways (A320) - £827,604 SANG - £316,000 SAMM - £99,540	£13,631
Average			£8,536

*Contribution towards Runnymede Roundabout and/or Egham Sustainable Transport Package 1

Appendix D
A320 Corridor Tariff Calculations

The figures in Table D-1 have been calculated using total estimated net sqm of all development as would be calculated under CIL to gain an idea of net floorspace.

The total contributions required for each scenario minus the contributions already agreed through S106 for Hanworth Lane and St Peter's Hospital give a residual amount of funding available whether through HIF or MRN for each site when based on a £ per sqm basis. This gives the following scenarios:

HIF - £11m - £2.02m = £8.98m/149,159sqm = £61 per sqm

MRN - £6.6m - £2.02m = £4.58m/149,159sqm = £31 per sqm

Table D-1: Estimated Net Additional Floorspace from Residential Development

Site	Estimated Existing Floorspace	Estimated Proposed Floorspace ¹	Net Floorspace ² (discounted for affordable and non-residential)
SD10 – LGV South	9,980sqm	130,251sqm	85,029sqm
SL6 – Pyrcroft Road	3,470sqm	23,148sqm	14,089sqm
SL11 – Vet Labs	0sqm	12,606sqm	8,970sqm
SL12 – Ottershaw E	1,270sqm	16,735sqm	11,141sqm
SL14-18 Bittams A-E	1,035sqm	43,447sqm	29,930sqm
SL16 Bittams C Only	0sqm	867sqm	867sqm
Total	15,755sqm	226,187sqm	149,159sqm

¹Based on housing mix in Policy SL19 and affordable housing in Policy SL20. Dwelling size assumptions as in A320 Viability Study

Table D-2: Estimated A320 Contributions per allocation site

Site	Net Floorspace ² with discount for affordable units (sqm)	Site A320 Cost	
		MRN @ £31 per sqm	HIF @ £61 per sqm
SD10 – LGV South	85,029	£2,295,783	£4,846,653
SL6 – Pyrcroft Road	14,089	£380,403	£803,073
SL11 – Vet Labs	8,970	£242,190	£511,290
SL12 – Ottershaw E	11,141	£300,807	£635,037
SL14 Bittams A	10,384	£280,368	£591,888
SL15 Bittams B	6,659	£179,793	£379,563
SL16 Bittams C	867	£23,409	£49,419
SL17 Bittams D	7,458	£201,366	£425,106
SL18 Bittams E	4,562	£123,174	£260,034
Total			

Appendix E

Sold House Prices in Thorpe 2018-2019

Thorpe NP Area Average Sold House Prices by Dwelling Type 2018-2019. Number in brackets indicates number of sales for that dwelling type in the 2018-2019 data.

Type	Beds				
	1	2	3	4	5
Flats	No Data	No Data	N/A	N/A	N/A
Terraced	No Data	£322,500 (6)	£422,500 (6)	£449,500 (1)	N/A
Semi-Detached	No Data	£390,000 (1)	£455,000 (3)	£505,000 (6)	No Data
Detached	No Data	No Data	£538,500 (4)	£865,000 (7)	£815,000 (2)

2 bed Terraced

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Staines Border	£355,000	£322,500	Staines Border
Chertsey	£400,000		
Egham (W of M25)	£399,000		

2 bed Semi-Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Addlestone	£364,000	£390,000	Egham
Chertsey	£402,000		
Egham (W of M25)	£401,000		

3 bed Terraced

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Addlestone	£395,000	£422,500	Egham
Chertsey	£437,000		
Egham (W of M25)	£436,000		

3 bed Semi-Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Addlestone	£428,000	£455,000	Egham
Chertsey	£473,000		
Egham (W of M25)	£472,000		

3 bed Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Chertsey	£500,000	£517,000	Woodham
Woodham	£520,000		
Ottershaw	£565,000		

4 bed Terraced

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Staines Border	£446,000	£449,500	Staines Border
Addlestone	£454,000		
Chertsey	£503,000		

4 bed Semi-Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Addlestone	£492,000	£505,000	Addlestone
Egham (W of M25)	£542,000		
Chertsey	£543,000		

4 bed Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Chertsey	£626,000	£700,000	Ottershaw
Woodham	£649,000		
Ottershaw	£706,000		

5 bed Detached

		Thorpe NP Area Value	Nearest Value Area
Chertsey	£735,000	£815,500	Ottershaw