

LONDON BOROUGH OF LAMBETH CIL Examination

Hearing Agenda: 20 February

Tuesday 25 February, commencing at 1.00pm

1. Student Accommodation

Participants

011 – King’s College London	King’s College London Deloitte LLP Herbert Smith Freehills LLP
015 – Downing	Downing Rolfe Judd Planning Ltd
023 – UNITE Group PLC	
Lambeth Council	

Examiner’s Questions

Building Costs

- i) I wish to explore the quoted building costs. The same figures are used in August 2012 and April 2013, but for November 2013 all building costs are lower by circa 22%. Other evidence suggests a levelling of costs over this period whilst I have heard it said in the house building industry that costs are rising at circa 6% pa. How is the Council’s figure arrived at?
- ii) The figures given by Deloitte at page 3, section 6 – 2 bullet points, quote recent build costs of £315 and £191 per sq ft – I would like some clarification.

Borough Wide Rental Profile

- iii) I would like further comment on the implications of CgMs page 3 and Appendix 1 assumptions and to query contingency, Mayor CIL and s106 figure and maximum CIL figure.

Differential/Preferential Rates – comparison with alternative sectors

- iv) I would like comment/discussion on CgMs reference to s106 (paragraph 2, page4).
- v) I wish to explore the ‘lack of flexibility’ in viability considerations due to lack of s106 affordable housing requirements on student accommodation.
- vi) What are the implications for a ‘differential rate to deal with geographical viability’ (CgMs page 4 ii)?
- vii) I would like to explore further the ‘Dispersal/Affordability’ Agenda (CgMs page 4 iii).
- viii) I would like to explore further the EUV + Premium in the purchase of student accommodation sites (Rolfe Judd pages 4 and 5).

Student Housing at Submarket Levels

- ix) The Council appears to accept the argument but suggests charitable relief or exceptional circumstances: I would like to explore this and the alternative of an 'exclusion clause'.

'Buffer' Percentage

- x) I am not clear how the buffer percentage has been set generally in the Viability Study and, in particular, in relation to student accommodation development.

Purchasers' Costs

- xi) I wish to have discussion about the relevance of purchasers' costs.
xii) Any other matter to raise re student accommodation?

2. Retail Development

Participants

Lambeth Council	
-----------------	--

Examiner's Questions

- xiii) The representations mainly contain assertions rather than factual evidence. In the circumstances I wish to run through the issues raised by Morrisons.

3. Hotel Development

Participants

008 – Travelodge Hotel Ltd	Travelodge Turley Associates
Lambeth Council	

Examiner's Questions

- xiv) What is the significance in terms of viability assessment of the floor area figures 'per bedroom' given by Turley Associates?

Any Other Matter to Raise?

Lambeth Council Representatives:

David Joyce, Assistant Director Planning and Development
Anthony Lee, BNP Paribas Real Estate
Clive Fraser, Team Leader Regeneration Strategy and Policy
Adam Mills, Principle Regeneration and Strategy Officer
Andrea Churchill, Senior Administrative Support Officer
Peter Flockhart and Susan Boucher, Legal

Wednesday 26 February, commencing at 10.00am

4. Waterloo and Vauxhall

Participants

12 – Waterloo Community Development Group?	
021 - Kennington Assn Planning Forum	
024 - Braeburn Estates Limited Partnership	Quod – representatives TBC
Lambeth Council	

Examiner's Questions

Offices

- i) Should office development in Waterloo and Vauxhall be 'encouraged' by reducing CIL: competition with neighbouring areas – office rates higher than in Southwark, Wandsworth and City of London? Policy should not be the driver of CIL rates?

Housing and Jobs

- ii) Quod makes the point that delivery of development at Waterloo is central to Lambeth's and Mayor's targets for housing and jobs and states that viability of key sites has not been tested, whilst "appropriate available evidence" is available from, eg, the Shell Centre application. I wish to discuss this and the other points made in Quod's letter of 14 February.

General Viability Matters

- iii) Concern is expressed (GL Hearn/BT) at level of non-viability as shown in Tables 6.14.1 and 6.14.2 of April 13 Viability Study. I wish to examine the arguments in the light of the comment "if not viable, will not happen anyway". I cannot see a cogent counter-argument - ?

5. Affordable Housing delivery/Section 106 Obligation contributions

Participants

Lambeth Council	
-----------------	--

Examiner's Questions

Affordable Housing and S106 Delivery – Topic Paper 6

- iv) The impact of CIL - is enough left for S106 ambitions? I am not clear what are the implications of Topic Paper 6. There is no indication of what infrastructure might be included which either would or would not be captured by CIL. Also, the figures in Table 3 need questioning.

Topic Paper 4 – "Market" Affordable Housing

- v) This appears to revolve around the making of the CIL (Amendment) Regulations 2014. In the circumstances it appears not to be a matter for me.

6. Other Matters

- vi) Mapped boundary questions raised by the Kennington Association
- vii) Police stations and facilities – a NIL charge?
- viii) Is it necessary or helpful to identify that 'Retail' is all Class A Uses (Southbank Centre, et al)?
- ix) I do not believe that the draft S123 list is a matter for me.