



Pauline Butcher,  
Lambeth CIL Programme Officer,  
By E Mail [ldfprogrammeofficer@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:ldfprogrammeofficer@tiscali.co.uk)

Dear Ms Butcher,

### **LAMBETH CIL EXAMINATION**

I refer to Lambeth's CIL Examination (held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2014) which Quod did not attend as it was considered that the open public forum of the CIL Examination was inappropriate for discussing detailed and site specific viability issues which are commercially sensitive particularly in view of the current planning status of the Shell Centre site which as explained in the Council's addendum is the subject of SoS call in. In response to the Council's addendum we considered it may be helpful to provide clarification of concerns associated with the implementation of CIL at the rates proposed for the Waterloo area.

As set out in the response to the Topic Papers (dated 14 February 2014) the figures contained in the Topic Paper are inaccurate and the resulting conclusion therefore (that the addition of CIL would not prevent the scheme coming forward) is based on incorrect figures and is misleading. The Applicants of the Shell Centre redevelopment strongly disagree with the conclusions and assert that the introduction of CIL at the proposed rate for the Waterloo area would have a material impact on the overall scheme viability to the extent where the proposed s106 package would not be able to be viable in addition to CIL.

In implementing CIL at the level proposed for the Waterloo area the Council risk frustrating delivery of a key development site which is critical to meeting Lambeth's housing target as well as providing jobs. The site is unarguably critical to realising the Council's overall vision for the regeneration of Waterloo. The risk that CIL presents to realising the far reaching benefits of the scheme is significant and the conclusions of BNPPs testing of the impact of CIL are misleading. The Applicant maintains that a nil CIL rate should be applied consistent with the development proposals that have been independently assessed to secure the maximum reasonable s106 package. If CIL is implemented at the proposed rate before the planning permission is granted the s106 package, including the proposed affordable housing, would require renegotiation which would be detrimental to overall housing delivery and the regeneration of the Opportunity Area.

Page 2

As noted by the Inspector at the Examination whilst a decision by the SoS is expected in June 2014 (ie. in advance of CIL being implemented) there is no certainty of this and in any case there are likely to be other administrative requirements to complete such as the engrossment of the Section 106 agreement. The expectation that the scheme will have secured planning permission prior to implementation of CIL should not be a reason for accepting a level of CIL which is evidenced to be unviable given that the maximum reasonable contribution to s106 and affordable housing has already been independently evidenced to have been secured through the planning process.

Yours faithfully,

Director