

# Action Note from CIL Steering Group– 12<sup>th</sup> September 2017

16:00 Windsor House

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

## 1. MCIL2 PDCS Consultation

Group ran through actions from previous meeting.

**Action: RJ/RG to add paragraph in DCS documents explaining that responses/boundary issues have been considered and reviewed in finalising proposed boundaries.**

**Action: RG to confirm with PH and AH availability for Isle of Dogs meeting.**

<b>Exceptional Circumstances/ Charitable Relief</b>	<p><b>Exceptional Circumstances</b> Discussion re: NL handout 'Consideration of introducing an Exceptional Circumstances Policy'. NL highlighted only two Boroughs (Lambeth and Newham) alongside a number of large developers, suggest an Exceptional Circumstance Policy. NL, Mayor's position on Exceptional Circumstances is fresh and clear as he has been kept updated in the biannual review.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> It is not necessary to introduce an Exceptional Circumstances Policy but the Mayor will continue to keep it under review.</p>
	<p><b>Charitable Relief</b> Discussion re: Dolphin House response on charitable relief for housing charities. Group questioned how charitable these housing charities are. JW, we are supportive of charities and give charitable relief where appropriate. Group agreed not a very strong argument from Dolphin Housing. RJ questioned Churches falling under 'charities' and receiving charitable relief, brief discussion.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> TfL/GLA will keep this under review.</p>
<b>Issues for Boroughs changing bands</b>	<p><b>Waltham Forest</b> Discussion re: WF response disagreeing with change from Charging Band 3 to Band 2 and suggestion of introducing a 4<sup>th</sup> Charging Band. RJ, disagree with their comments on change in Charging Band as house prices (our indication) have moved up significantly. JW, we would oppose a 4<sup>th</sup> Charging Band as this would be too complicated and create too many problems.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> Meet with Waltham Forest, discuss reasons for their change in Charging Band and our objection to a 4<sup>th</sup> Band being introduced.</p> <p><b>Action: TfL/GLA to meet with Waltham Forest and discuss their response.</b></p>
	<p><b>Enfield</b> Discussion re: Enfield response disagreeing with change from Charging Band 3 to 2. JW, much more of a marginal decision. Enfield average house price (£395,044) currently sits just above Hounslow (£389,458), if we downgrade Enfield we would need to consider doing the same for Hounslow. Group worked through the 5 points in Enfield's response and considered a response to each...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Due warning has been given, Enfield can take time to mitigate between now and April 2019.</li><li>2. Current cut off point is correct, doesn't need to be a 'round' number.</li><li>3. If there was a serious downturn in house prices and housing development, then the Mayor would take serious action.</li><li>4. Charging rate is a flat rate for the whole borough, meaning OA areas are not exempt.</li><li>5. Reject Brexit point, not valid/relevant.</li></ol> <p>AH noted that RL and AH met with Enfield, don't feel they need to be met again. Group felt Enfield would not take much risk as number of Crossrail2 stations are anticipated to fall within Enfield.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> As detailed above. No need to meet Enfield.</p> <p><b>Action: RJ/RG to produce paragraph for PDCS on Boroughs moving Charging Bands (26/09).</b></p>

<b>OA</b>	<p>Discussion re: boroughs with OA's. JW, OA's are very varied and would be extremely difficult to create an OA approach – don't feel we should flex.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> Sticking to flat rate across Boroughs, OA will not be treated differently.</p> <p><b>Action: RJ/RG to review current CIL guidance/regulations on complexity wording (26/09).</b></p>
<b>Richmond</b>	<p>Discussion re: Richmond response citing MCIL2 could hinder certain types of development in the Borough. RJ, how can you hinder development when it is not currently taking place?</p> <p>Discussion re: Richmond feeling they do not benefit from CR1 or CR2. RJ, they reap wider benefits of both.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action: None.</b></p>
<b>Hotels</b>	<p>Discussion re: Whitbread response arguing that hotel space is being penalised and will result in reduced hotel bedrooms in central. JW, don't think their comparison is right - always at a higher rate in London, the increased charge for Hotels is because of the removal of S106.</p> <p>Discussion re: Islington response citing concerns over losing employment space to Hotels. Perhaps the mixed reaction indicates that the rate is right?</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> In DCS, clearly set out why the set approach to hotels was taken.</p> <p><b>Action: RJ/RG to produce appraisal for Hotels in central London (26/09).</b></p>
<b>Link with London Plan</b>	<p>Discussion re: PH circulated email. PH, viability evidence/impact of New London Plan + MCIL2 using worst case scenarios is expected in 6-8 weeks - not anticipated to affect viability.</p> <p><b>Agreed Response/Action:</b> The viability of the policies being developed for the review of the London Plan is being assessed by independent external consultants. This work has incorporated the proposed MCIL 2 rates. This viability evidence will be published as part of the London Plan evidence base and is currently not available for publication (from PH email).</p>
	<p><b>Action: JW, RL and NL to meet Westminster.</b></p> <p><b>Action: RJ to re-read Westminster response and decide whether to attend Westminster meeting.</b></p> <p><b>Action: RJ/RG to revise PDCS to reflect changes agreed over CIL Steering Group meetings (26/09).</b></p>

## 2. AOB

Group progress, PH explained that we are currently in week 1 of 3 week 'buffer' period. PH has started creating draft document highlighting that is going to be tweaked.

AB presented A3 spreadsheet. RJ noted high level of responses making reference to concerns re: the top-down viability approach, suggested JLL should review (see action).

NL questioned how much MCIL2 material should/can be distributed at CIL Collection Group on 19/09. JW suggested sharing something along the lines of AB grid to show that review of responses is underway. Explain that in future meetings CIL Collection Group members will be able to be given more information.

**Action: AB to cancel next weeks meeting on 19/09 (completed 13/09).**

**Action: AB to create list of meetings with consultees agreed within CIL SG meetings and capture any other consultees requesting meetings in responses (completed and circulated 13/09).**

**Action: AB to complete A3 spreadsheet (26/09).**

**Action: RJ/RG to review rationale for top-down methodology approach (26/09).**

Next CIL Steering Group Meeting: Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> September, 4-5pm, Room 13R2M1, Windsor House