

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Policy](#)
Subject: Runnymede CIL and infrastructure consultation
Date: 09 April 2020 15:10:32

Re the Runnymede CIL and infrastructure delivery and prioritisation consultation

Dear Sir or Madam,

First, the [REDACTED] wishes to apologise. In the general muddle and disorientation generated by the coronavirus crisis, the consultation deadline on these matters - the Runnymede community infrastructure levy and infrastructure delivery and prioritisation supplementary planning documents - was forgotten and missed by us. We hope that this brief response can nonetheless be considered as part of the consultation. If not, no worries; we shall write to the council's chief executive officer and put the same points to him.

The CIL consultation document tells us that in parts of the borough with neighbourhood plans in place 25pc of the revenue generated by the levy in the area will be secured for infrastructure in that area, but that the percentage drops to 15pc in other areas without neighbourhood plans in place. We gather that this was a decision by the Government and not by Runnymede Council, but we would be grateful if you could make this fully clear. Either way, could you cast some light on the rationale behind the decision? Why should parts of the borough without a neighbourhood plan - such as Egham - be disadvantaged in this way?

Secondly, why is it proposed that much of the Egham Town ward be put in CIL residential charging zone B - where the second highest charges in the borough would be levied for most classes of residential accommodation? And why is it proposed that for student accommodation the same (£ per sqm) CIL charge be levied in Egham, where a big expansion of student accommodation has caused much controversy in recent years, as in other parts of the borough where there is no university?

Thirdly, regarding the prioritisation of infrastructure spending: Since the current crisis broke, it has become commonplace to hear comments such as "nothing will ever be the same again" and "we shall have to change our ways and travel less". Isn't there a danger that in these new and radically changed circumstances, the Draft Local Plan is already looking outdated? Should highways improvements designed "to enable growth" remain the top, "critical", priority?

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]