Action Note from CIL Steering Group– 5th September 2017

16:00 Windsor House

Attendees: Anna Hart **(AH),** Julian Ware **(JW),** Peter Heath **(PH),** Richard Jones **(RJ)**, Ryan Gerrish **(RG)**, Alice Bennett **(AB)**

1. **MCIL2 PDCS Consultation**

Boundaries	**OPDC** Discussion re: the two 'enclosed' Hammersmith and Fulham sites to the east of OPDC. Consensus amongst group members that these two sites should remain in Hammersmith & Fulham (Band 1) and not become part of OPDC (Band 2). Discussion emerged re: banding of OPDC, Hammersmith & Fulham and Kensington & Chelsea. RJ noted in OPDCs response they don't agree with their placing in band 2, RJ argued based on our viability evidence but also the boroughs own, this is the correct band. JW agreed OPDC is correctly placed, further noting that in Kensington & Chelsea response they refer to viability differences between North and South of the borough (specifically Kensal Canalside Opportunity Area) and feel MCIL should take this into consideration. JW noted OPDC's placing as Band 2 reflects viability of the area as a whole. **Agreed Response/Action:** Based on JLL viability evidence, we will continue to follow the allocated boundary and banding of OPDC, Hammersmith & Fulham and Kensington & Chelsea. In many cases, boroughs' own viability evidence and BCIL rates reflect/support our boundaries/banding. **Action: RJ/RG to review house value between Kensal Green and Willesden Green (12/09).**
	Paddington Discussion re: Extension of CIL Central London Charging Area over borough boundary by ½ km to the West of Paddington (between Bayswater and Notting Hill). RJ noted that many boundary changes had been made to better reflect road layouts and this may have been the reasoning behind this change. JW suggested considering adapting CIL boundary to reflect the borough boundary as newly enclosed area is most likely residential and not commercial. Discussion re: viability evidence relating to proposed MCIL2 rates on commercial development, as raised by City of Westminster. We consider that current S106 charges are built into the developers' viability calculations so proposed MCIL 2 rates will not shock the development market in Westminster. **Agreed Response/Action:** We will change the Proposed CIL Central London Charging Area to the West of Paddington (between Bayswater and Notting Hill) to reflect the borough boundary.
	Camden Discussion re: Camden's response stating that CAZ is out of date. JW highlighted that this response was unclear and it would be beneficial to meet with Jeremy Howell and discuss. JW considered whether we are planning to change CAZ boundaries in new London Plan (PH to look into – see action). **Agreed Response/Action:** PH, another GLA colleague and TfL NL/AB to meet with Jeremy Howell and discuss Camden's response. **Action: PH to find out if new London Plan will amend CAZ (12/09).**
	City Fringe Discussion re: Tower Hamlets CIL Charging Area, in response TH notes the boundary being extended into Whitechapel. JW highlighted this is untrue and Whitechapel has been in the charging area since the introduction of the Crossrail S106 charge. Proposed charging boundary does extend beyond Whitechapel, so if TH consider this being a viability issue, they should raise it during the DCS consultation. Discussion re: Bishopsgate response on MCIL rates being too high. Similar to the point on Whitechapel, BGY are already within the CAZ boundary and subject to current Crossrail s106 rates Agreed Response/Action: Argument from Tower Hamlets is weak but offer meeting to discuss. Inform Bishopsgate Goods Yard that CAZ is a set rate and all CAZ is included.

	Elephant and Castle Discussion re: Southwark response citing concerns relating to CAZ being extended to include Elephant and Castle. RJ expressed sympathy for Southwark's argument given a lack of commercial development in the area. The question is whether TfL/Mayor should stick to the natural CAZ boundaries or carve out E&C. JW highlighted that regardless of whether E&C is or is not included, there will be no change to proposed residential charges and limited impact on affordable housing. Agreed Response/Action: RJ/RG to undertake further work (see actions). Enter DCS with an open approach; want to stick to current boundary but aware and understanding of borough's viability argument. **Action: RJ/RG to look into proposals for the new shopping centre in E&C (12/09).**
	Lambeth Discussion re: Waterloo inclusion in the CAZ. JW said that we took CAZ Waterloo out the first time because inspector wanted us to but the level of development in Southbank and value based evidence are strong arguments for Waterloo being included. Similar reasons to above as to why Vauxhall should be included. Discussion re: We Are Waterloo response on Elizabeth House being excluded from the charges. The scheme is mostly residential and therefore resi dictates development viability. RJ, response noted public realm improvements being needed in the area – surely this should be paid for through BCIL, not an argument for MCIL Central London boundary change. Agreed Response/Action: Sticking to proposed CAZ boundary based on viability evidence.
	Wandsworth Discussion re: Wandsworth response arguing that the proposed inclusion into Central London charging zone is unjustified. Our response: there is substantial evidence of viability change in the area between 2010 and now (BPS development, NLE, benefit from the Crossrail 1 scheme). Borough's own CIL puts VNEB into high charging zones 1 and 2 – some of the highest BCIL rates in London. Agreed Response/Action: Stick to proposed CAZ boundary. Share a better map of the proposed MCIL charging area with LBW. **Action: RJ to e-mail Stephen Gardiner to check if BPS' point re: being subject to MCIL2 liability if amend scheme under S73 is valid (12/09).**
	Isle of Dogs Discussion re: Tower Hamlets response. JW, in response they seem to be suggesting the Isle of Dogs charging zone being extended in the South and reduced in the North. Group agreed discussion with Tower Hamlets would be beneficial. Discussion re: Canary Wharf Group response of having no benefit from CR2, believe they should be placed in Band 2. RJ, our viability evidence says otherwise (see action note). Agreed Response/Action: RG and TfL representatives to hold discussion with Tower Hamlets – PH to organise (see action note). Respond to Canary Wharf Group highlighting although no direct benefit to them from CR2, they will reap wider benefits. **Action: PH to organise meeting for RG and TfL with Tower Hamlets.** **Action: RJ/RG to review viability argument for funding of CR2 by all Authorities (12/09).**
Use of money if not CR2/R123	*(Note: The two topics have been combined due to their similarity/relevance)* JW, negotiations are continuing. PH, Mayor has a clear priority and this is reflected in draft statement and supporting documents. Agreed Response/Action: State in our response that 123 List is not a relevant factor for the MCIL EiP. The decision needs to be left to the Mayor as to what he will spend the MCIL 2 proceeds on, should CR2 not go ahead in mid-2020s. Include a statement on Crossrail 2 progress in DCS documents and indication of what the R123 List will say.
Instalments	All signed off by Mayor.

Schedule…

Date	Topics to cover
30/08	2, 3 – DONE
05/09	1, 4, 11, 12 - DONE
12/09	5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

Action: NL to have exceptional circumstances document ready for next meeting (12/09).
Action: AB to produce grid detailing consultee responses against discussion topics (12/09).

2. Station Zones Report

AH update re: discussions with CR2 team on Station Zones Report – currently agreeing a date for a meeting.

Next CIL Steering Group Meeting: **Tuesday 12th September, 4-6pm, Room 13R2M1, Windsor House**