

Runnymede Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Technical Background Document

Addendum

(July 2020)

Contents

- 1. Introduction 2
- 2. Estimated Level of Development..... 3
- 3. Infrastructure Funding Gap..... 6
- 4. Setting CIL Rates 8
- 5. Estimated CIL Receipts.....24

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document is an addendum to the Runnymede CIL Technical Background Document (TBD) dated December 2019 and updates the Council's approach for implementing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule where evidence has changed since consultation of the draft Charging Schedule in Feb-April 2020. As such, this Addendum updates the estimated level of development in light of recent permissions and completions, infrastructure funding gap in light of recent S106 contributions and the approach to CIL rates in light of a review of CIL viability in the face of the Covid-19 pandemic and representations received.
- 1.2 Runnymede has undertaken a screening assessment to determine whether a CIL charging schedule requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and/or a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The screening assessment concludes that neither SEA nor HRA is required and this is confirmed by the three statutory bodies (Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England). The Council also considers that a CIL charging schedule is not required to undergo Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as it is not a local development document.

Runnymede 2030 Local Plan

- 1.3 The Runnymede 2030 Local Plan sets out the spatial strategy for development over the period 2015-2030 and includes the quantum of development expected to come forward for residential, employment, retail and other types of floorspace. The 2030 Local Plan was adopted by the Borough Council on the 16 July 2020.
- 1.4 The 2030 Local Plan identifies the infrastructure which is 'critical' to delivery of growth in the Borough. This includes the A320 & M25 Junction 11 mitigation scheme and the provision of Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANG) to avoid impact to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Council will continue to secure critical infrastructure through the use of Section 106 agreements rather than through a CIL charge. Since the time of writing the TBD in December 2019, the Council has received confirmation of a successful Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid from Homes England for £41.8m for the A320 and M25 J11 improvements, which is in the form of a grant.
- 1.5 Other infrastructure types or projects will be secured through a combination of Section 106 agreements and/or CIL. The Council has updated its draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) setting out this approach.

2. Estimated Level of Development

- 2.1 In order to calculate an appropriate CIL charge, it is necessary to consider the level of development planned to come forward over the Local Plan period. The 2030 Local Plan makes provision for almost 8,000 net additional dwellings which includes 1,700 dwellings at a new garden village at Longcross as well as 80,000sqm of net additional employment floorspace and 7,500sqm of retailing within the Borough's main Town Centres.
- 2.2 As the Local Plan start date is 1st April 2015, a certain amount of development has already been delivered or has permission and CIL could not be charged. As such the estimated level of development is based on the remaining requirement only. The level of development already completed or with permission is set out in Table 2-1 and is updated to include permissions and completions to 31 March 2020. On this basis the updated estimate of development which could be subject to CIL is set out in Table 2-2.

Table 2-1: Completions/Permissions from 1st April 2015 – 31st March 2020

Development Type	Local Plan Requirement	Floorspace or Number Completed/with Permission	Residual Local Plan Requirement
Residential (C3)	7,920	2,033 completions 1,646 with permission	4,241 units
Residential (C2 units) ¹	428 units	408 units	20 units
Residential (C2 bedspaces)	193 bedspaces	208	0
Residential (Student)	3,513 bedspaces ²	3,513 bedspaces	0
Employment (All B Classes)	80,630sqm	-11,530sqm completions 22,972sqm with permission	69,188sqm
Town Centre Retail (A1)	5,940sqm	4,300sqm	1,640sqm

¹ Based on information set out in Council's response to Matter 5 of Local Plan EiP (RBCLP_20) available at: <https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/16273/Runnymede-2030-Local-Plan-Examination->

² Number of student bedspaces is not a target/requirement but the level of need identified in the Runnymede Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

- 2.3 It should be noted that the residual 4,241 unit figure for residential in Table 2-1 does not correlate with the expected number of units to come forward over the remaining plan period. This is because the 7,920 plan target applies a discount rate to some sites and therefore the actual delivery may be greater. Adding the number of dwellings in Appendix A available for CIL gives a residual of 4,304 dwellings.
- 2.4 Of the 2,033 completions between 1st April 2015 and 31st March 2020, 510 were affordable units. This equates to 25% of all housing delivery and is 5% below the

Runnymede 2030 Local Plan target of 30% of dwellings as affordable set out in Policy SL20. However, these completions were at a time prior to adoption of the Local Plan.

Residential Development

- 2.5 The residual dwellings requirement to come forward over the rest of the plan period is 4,304 and will be made up from the supply identified in Appendix B. This gives a total estimated net residential floorspace available for CIL of 189,360sqm.

Employment Development

- 2.6 The residual net level of employment development to come forward over the Local Plan period is 69,188sqm. Part of this will comprise 20,000sqm on the employment allocation at Byfleet Road with the other 49,188sqm to come forward within the existing Strategic Employment Areas. It is assumed that the remaining 49,188sqm will come forward as B1a offices.

Retail, Hotel & Leisure

- 2.7 Local Plan Policy SD1 identifies an additional net 5,940sqm of retail floorspace over the plan period in the Borough's three main town centres. To date some 4,300sqm of retail floorspace has either been completed since 2015 or is in the pipeline leaving a residual of 1,640sqm. However, Appendix A identifies 1,949sqm for retail and as such the floorspace which may be available for CIL is 1,949sqm.
- 2.8 In terms of leisure development there are no targets in the Local Plan and aside from Egham Gateway gaining permission and adding to the pipeline, the position in the 2019 TBD remains the same.

Other

- 2.9 Other development set out in the Local Plan includes accommodation for the elderly, students and Traveller/Travelling snowperson pitches/plots. The position with regards to 'other' development remains the same as set out in the 2019 TBD.

Table 2-2: Estimated Residual Floorspace to End of Plan Period (2030)

Development Type	Estimated Floorspace (net)
Residential (C3)	189,360sqm
Residential (C2 Units)	0sqm
Residential (C2 Bedspaces)	0sqm
Residential (Student)	0sqm

Employment (B Class Uses)	69,188sqm
Retail (A1)	1,949sqm
Total	260,497sqm

3. Infrastructure Funding Gap

3.1 The overall infrastructure costs identified in the IDP and schedules which support the 2030 Local Plan are set out in Table 3-1 by infrastructure type and these figures have not changed from the 2019 TBD.

Table 3-1: Table of Longcross and Rest of Borough Infrastructure Costs

Infrastructure Type	LGV Cost	Rest of Plan Area Cost 2015-2030
Education		
Early Years	£0.48m	£3.93m
Primary & Secondary	£14.9m	£22m
Adult	£0	£5.62m
Health		
Primary	£0.92m	£2.8m
Acute	£0	£21.4m
Mental	£0	£7.4m
C2 Accommodation	£3.6m ¹	£3.2m
Community		
Libraries	£0	£0
Community Facilities	£0.71m	£0.76m
Recreation		
Outdoor Sports	£1.08m	£6.13m
Indoor Sports	£0	£0
Playspace	£3.3m	£7.88m
Green Infrastructure		
SANG	£3m	£11.05m
Natural & Semi-Natural Greenspace	£0	£0
Parks & Gardens	£0.62m	£1.97m
Amenity Greenspace	£0.23m	£0.75m
Allotments	£0.17m	£0.58m
Cemeteries	£0	£0
Transport		
Highways	£19.5m ²	£88.5m
Bus & Rail ³	£10.88m	£23.1m
Active	£0.25m	£10.25m
Flood Defence		
Flood Alleviation	£0	£11m ⁴
Emergency Services		
Ambulance	£0	£0
Police	TBD	£0.49m
Fire	£0	£0
Total	£60m	£229m

¹ To be delivered on-site

² Excludes costs for A320 improvements

³ Excludes Heathrow Southern Rail Access

⁴ Excludes costs of River Thames Scheme

3.2 The above table identifies an initial funding gap (excluding Longcross) of £229m. Since the 2019 TBD, the Council has received confirmation of a HIF bid grant for £41.8m for improvement to the A320 & J11 of the M25. Whilst A320 improvements are costed at £44m, due to physical provision of junction improvements at St Peter's Hospital the rest of the A320 improvements are £41.8m. As such the funding gap for this project remains zero.

Appendix B of this Addendum updates S106 contributions to March 2020 in order to update the infrastructure funding gap set out in Table 3-2. No other sources of funding have been identified or confirmed since the 2019 TBD and therefore the total funding gap is £105m.

Table 3-2: Infrastructure Funding Gap for Local Plan Period Excluding Longcross

Infrastructure Type	Cost 2015-2030	Potential or Secured Funding	Funding Gap (£)
Education	£31.55	£16.22m	£15.33m
Health	£35m	£32.3m	£2.7m
Community Facilities	£0.76m	£0.11m	£0.65m
Recreation	£14m	£5.24m	£8.76m
Green Infrastructure	£14.4m	£11.81m	£2.59m
Highways & Transport	£122m	£52m	£70m
Flood Defence/Drainage	£11m	£6.25m	£4.75m
Emergency Services	£0.49m	£0.16m	£0.33m
Utilities	£0	£0	£0
Total	£229.2m	£124.1m	£105.1m

4. Setting CIL Rates

- 4.1 The Council's draft Charging Schedule consulted on in February-April 2020 set out a number of CIL rates covering residential development, student accommodation and office development in light of evidence set out in the CIL Viability Assessment 2019 carried out on behalf of the Council by AGA Ltd.
- 4.2 In light of the Covid-19 pandemic and representations received to the draft Charging Schedule at Regulation 16 stage, the Council requested AGA Ltd to review the 2019 CIL Viability Assessment and undertake sensitivity testing of the rates proposed. This Addendum TBD sets out the findings of the AGA Ltd Representation Responses Paper (RRP) and what this means for the proposed CIL rates across the Borough and for different development types.

Residential Development

- 4.3 The CIL Viability reviews the notional 1ha sites across different areas of the Borough with sensitivity testing around a number of different economic scenarios including a fall in residential values and increase in build costs. The review still takes account of 2030 Local Plan policies SL19 on housing mix, SL20 on affordable housing, sustainable design standards in Policies SD7 & SD8 and the cost of SANG & SAMM as avoidance for the Thames Basin Heaths SPA as well as residual S106/S278 highways contributions¹.
- 4.4 The scenarios tested are used to explore the difference in site surpluses (i.e. how much revenue is left within a development after land value and other costs) from the 2019 Viability Assessment. The results of the scenario testing can then be extrapolated to the 2030 Local Plan allocation sites and small site scenarios, assuming the same infrastructure and affordable housing costs as in the 2019 Viability Assessment. The Council has also taken this opportunity to revise or add viability for two of its allocation sites. The first is Ottershaw East where SANG costs have been increased and Brox End Nurseries where viability was undertaken in the Local Plan Viability Assessment but not CIL (as outline consent for this site has been granted but an amended application is now under consideration).
- 4.5 The CIL Review suggests that a 5% fall in house prices is likely in the short term with potential for recovery during 2021. The Review also suggests that build costs could increase due to labour shortages, however the change in build costs whether up or

¹ Based on £1,500 per dwelling or £150 per sqm for commercial.

down is uncertain. Taking a precautionary approach, the Council has considered the impact on its CIL rates from the review scenario where house prices fall by 5% and costs increase by 5%. This scenario will inevitably lead to lower surpluses then set out in the 2019 CIL Viability, the question is by how much and how this affects proposed rates.

4.6 The governments study into the value of CIL² found that when setting CIL rates a typical viability buffer of around 30% has been applied by charging authorities to allow for changing market conditions. Runnymede initially applied a 50% buffer to potential CIL rates to allow for changing market conditions, the high-level nature of CIL Viability and because this is the Borough's first charging schedule. This was reflected in CIL rates in the draft Charging Schedule consulted Feb-April 2020.

4.7 However, the 50% buffer was applied to potential rates during a 'normal' market. If 50% were applied in a market depressed from what appears to be short-term Covid-19 impacts this will inevitably lead to a larger buffer than 50% when the market returns to 'normal'. As such, applying a 50% buffer again will build in a larger buffer once the market returns to normal which could be as early as 2021. Therefore a 50% buffer has not been applied to a scenario of 5% falls in house prices and 5% increase in build costs as this could lead to artificially low rates once the market has returned to 'normal'. However, it is considered that some level of buffer should be maintained in a 5% price fall/5% cost increase scenario should the market not return to 'normal' as soon as expected and/or if build costs increase by 5% over the lifetime of the Charging Schedule. In this respect a 30% buffer has been applied as a reasonable response and in line with the government study.

1ha Notional Sites

4.8 The Review scenario for prices down 5%/costs up 5% show reduced residual value (RV) for notional 1ha sites (at 30dph) when compared to the 2019 Viability Assessment. The difference in values before a land value benchmark and CIL costs are taken into account are shown in Table 5-1.

² The value, impact and delivery of the Community Infrastructure Levy (2017) CLG. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/community-infrastructure-levy-review-report-to-government>

Table 5-1: Comparison between RV for Notional 1ha Sites at 30dph

Area	2019 VA RV	Prices -5%, Costs + 5%	% Fall
Wentworth	£16.18m	£14.92	8%
Virginia Water	£6.87m	£6.06m	12%
Englefield Green	£4.82m	£4.12m	15%
Ottershaw	£4.27m	£3.59m	16%
Woodham	£4.24m	£2.97m	30%
Chertsey	£3.58m	£2.72m	24%
Egham	£3.31m	£2.71m	18%
Addlestone	£2.63m	£2.07m	21%
Staines Border & North	£2.5m	£1.96m	22%

- 4.9 Table 5-1 shows that all areas of the Borough see a fall in RV averaging 18% across the Borough, but with falls varying from 8% in Wentworth and up to 30% in Woodham. Table 5-2 shows what effect this has on potential CIL rates with a 30% buffer applied.

Table 5-2: Potential CIL Rates with 30% Buffer

Area	Draft CIL Rate	RV	LVB	Surplus	Gross sqm*	£ per sqm	Buffer @ 30%
Wentworth	£380	£14,920,000	£2,000,000	£12,920,000	2,776	£4,654	£3,258
Virginia Water	£380	£6,060,000	£2,000,000	£4,060,000	2,776	£1,463	£1,024
Englefield Green	£380	£4,120,000	£2,000,000	£2,120,000	2,776	£763	£534
Ottershaw	£380	£3,590,000	£2,000,000	£1,590,000	2,776	£572	£400
Woodham	£110	£2,970,000	£2,000,000	£970,000	2,776	£349	£244
Chertsey	£185	£2,720,000	£2,000,000	£720,000	2,776	£259	£181
Egham	£235	£2,710,000	£2,000,000	£710,000	2,776	£256	£179
Addlestone	£110	£2,070,000	£2,000,000	£70,000	2,776	£25	£18
Staines Border	£90	£1,960,000	£2,000,000	£-40,000	2,776	£0	£0

* Based on Policy SL19 of the 2030 Local Plan

- 4.10 As can be seen in Table 5-2 the areas of Wentworth, Virginia Water, Englefield Green and Ottershaw could still support a CIL rate of £380 per sqm from 1ha notional sites. Woodham could still meet a rate of £110 per sqm. Chertsey falls a little short of supporting a CIL rate of £185 per sqm and the Egham & Addlestone areas would struggle to meet their respective rates of £235 per sqm & £110 per sqm but still show scope for CIL. Staines Border does not show any scope for CIL with negative values for 1ha notional sites.

Local Plan Allocation Sites

- 4.11 Sites allocated in the Local Plan which have not yet been permitted could be liable for CIL. The sites are a mix of brownfield and greenfield locations predominantly formed from areas of land released from the Green Belt for development either in an existing

agricultural/horticultural use sometimes with a limited number of residential units or a commercial use.

- 4.12 As set out in the December 2019 TBD, using a commercial benchmark for sites which are in existing agricultural/horticultural use would see existing use value (EUV) at around £20,000 per ha uplifted 100-fold. The PPG note on Viability states that land value benchmarks should be based on EUV plus an uplift to incentivise the land owner to sell or 'EUV+', but this should not be based on 'hope value' (PPG Viability para 015). Paragraph 013 of the PPG Viability also notes 'The premium should provide a reasonable incentive, in comparison with other options available, for the landowner to sell land for development while allowing a sufficient contribution to fully comply with policy requirements.'
- 4.13 In this respect where sites are allocated in the 2030 Local Plan, this is for a specific use, however a practical commercial benchmark of £2m per ha is used across the board but in reality some sites will have more scope to pay CIL than is indicated in Table 5-4 especially where they are in a predominantly greenfield use. These sites are indicated with a (G) in Table 5.4 to indicate their predominantly greenfield status and further discussion in this regard is set out below.
- 4.14 Some representations to the draft CIL Charging Schedule consultation in Feb-April 2020 have stated that £2m per ha is not a level of land-owner return sufficient to incentivise a land owner to sell and benchmarks should be increased above £2m per ha. However, using benchmarks of £2m per ha already uplifts land value from an EUV of £20,000, 100 fold which is a significant uplift from EUV. Further, there are no other investments which would see a return of £2m on an investment of £20,000. As, such £2m per ha is considered to be reasonable, although as set out above the greenfield nature of some sites will mean that lower benchmarks can and should be compared.
- 4.15 Table 5-3 extrapolates the percentage fall in RVs from 1ha sites to the 2030 Local Plan allocations sites. The result of the percentage falls in different areas across the Borough and hence to surpluses from allocation sites are shown in Table 5-3. How this effects CIL rates with a 30% buffer for each site is shown in Table 5-4.

Table 5-3: Comparison of RVs for 2030 Local Plan Allocation Sites

Site	Area	2019 VA RV	% Fall	2020 RV
Brox End Nursery*	Ottershaw	£6,780,000	16%	£5,695,200
Blay's House	Englefield Green	£15,202,150	15%	£12,921,828
Pycroft Road	Chertsey	£27,181,100	24%	£20,657,636
Thorpe Lea Rd North	Staines Border	£9,113,420	22%	£7,108,468
Thorpe Lea Rd West	Staines Border	£25,376,375	22%	£19,793,573
Virginia Water North	Virginia Water	£27,175,800	12%	£23,914,704
Virginia Water South	Virginia Water	£31,790,600	12%	£27,975,728
Vet Labs	Addlestone	£8,279,600	21%	£6,540,884
Ottershaw East	Ottershaw	£24,638,650*	16%	£20,696,466
Bittams A	Chertsey	£17,451,600	24%	£13,263,216
Bittams B	Chertsey	£11,818,500	24%	£8,982,060
Bittams C	Chertsey	£528,000	24%	£401,280
Bittams D	Chertsey	£13,861,500	24%	£10,534,740
Bittams E	Chertsey	£7,914,300	24%	£6,014,868
Longcross Garden Village	Ottershaw	£138,173,000	16%	£116,065,320
Addlestone West	Addlestone	£,798,967	21%	£3,001,184

Table 5-4: CIL Rates with 30% Buffer for Local Plan Allocation Sites

Site	Developable Area (ha)	RV	LVB	Surplus	Gross sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer @30%
Brox End Nursery*	1.4ha	£5,695,200	£2,800,000	£2,895,000	3,910	£740	£518
Blay's House	2.9ha	£12,921,828	£5,800,000	£7,121,828	5,556	£1,282	£897
Pycroft Road	6.8ha	£20,657,636	£13,600,000	£7,057,636	23,472	£301	£210
Thorpe Lea Rd North	1.9ha	£7,108,468	£3,800,000	£3,308,468	7,716	£429	£300
Thorpe Lea Rd West	6.6ha	£19,793,573	£13,200,000	£6,593,573	21,261	£310	£217
Virginia Water North	8.5ha	£23,914,704	£17,000,000	£6,914,704	10,230	£676	£473
Virginia Water South	5.3ha	£27,975,728	£10,600,000	£17,375,728	11,911	£1,459	£1,021
Vet Labs	4.7ha	£6,540,884	£7,400,000	£-859,116	12,938	£-66	£0
Ottershaw East	6.6ha + 8.85ha	£20,696,466	£13,350,000	£7,346,466	17,111	£429	£300
Bittams A	4.6ha	£13,263,216	£9,200,000	£4,063,216	14,961	£272	£190
Bittams B	3.4ha	£8,982,060	£6,800,000	£2,182,060	10,246	£213	£149
Bittams C	1ha	£401,280	£2,000,000	£-1,598,720	867	- £1,844	£0
Bittams D	2.8ha	£10,534,740	£5,600,000	£4,934,740	17,111	£288	£202
Bittams E	3.1ha	£6,014,868	£6,200,000	£-185,132	8,991	£-21	£0
Longcross GV		£116,065,320	£60,680,000	£55,385,320	132,952	£417	£292
Addlestone West	0.3ha	£3,001,184	£600,000	£2,401,184	4,425	£542	£379

- 4.16 Table 5-4 shows that when extrapolating a 5% fall in prices and 5% increase in costs scenario to allocation sites and applying a 30% buffer there are 10 sites that could continue to support the CIL rates as set out in the draft Charging Schedule. However, there are a number of sites that see the potential for CIL dip below proposed rates (Bittams B & Ottershaw East) or show no scope for CIL (Bittams C & E and Vet Labs).
- 4.17 Given the nature of the allocation at Bittams C this site has a proposed separate charging zone of £0 in the draft Charging Schedule and therefore the fall in surplus does not affect the CIL rate for this site and a £0 rate should be maintained.
- 4.18 The other lowest values are seen at the Vet Labs Site and Chertsey Bittams E, however, as was stated in the December 2019 TBD and above, these sites are 100% greenfield. If a greenfield benchmark of £400,000 per ha is used for these sites instead of £2m, the scope for CIL with a 30% buffer increases to £252 and £372 respectively.
- 4.19 In terms of Bittams B and Ottershaw East, the potential for CIL drops to £149 per sqm and £300 per sqm respectively, which is some £36 per sqm and £80 per sqm below the rate for Chertsey and Ottershaw. Both sites are predominantly greenfield with a number of existing residential dwellings on site. If a greenfield benchmark is used for each site with a 30% buffer, the scope for CIL increases to £521 or £731 per sqm respectively. Therefore, both sites still exhibit scope for CIL.

Small Scale Sites (Less than 10)

- 4.20 Sites of less than 10 net dwellings will make up a small proportion of the Council's housing land supply. Appendix A shows that of the 4,304 dwellings remaining to be delivered around 261 will be from small sites (less than 10 net units) including windfalls. Whilst small site supply does not make up the bulk of supply, it is considered that the Council should not be placing these at risk given the opportunities they afford to SME house builders and developers.
- 4.21 In line with NPPF paragraph 63 the 2030 Local Plan does not apply affordable housing targets to sites of less than 10 net units. Neither do S106 obligations apply, although small sites still need to avoid impact to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. However, it is considered that a scenario of 5% fall in prices and 5% increase in costs can be extrapolated to small sites (as it is the costs and prices varied not other assumptions).
- 4.22 Benchmarks for small sites are based on commercial at £2m per ha and for consistency a worst-case benchmark is also set out as per the December 2019 TBD.

Tables 5-5 & 5-6 set out surpluses and rates based on a 5% fall in prices/5% increase in costs scenario with a 30% buffer for CIL rates.

Table 5-5: Small Sites with 30% Buffer

Location	2020 RV (£)	BLV (£)*	Difference	Sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer at 30%
Wentworth	£663,811	£66,667	£597,144	95 ³	£6,286	£4,400
Virginia Water	£270,600	£66,667	£203,933	95	£2,147	£1,503
Englefield Green	£183,572	£66,667	£116,905	95	£1,231	£862
Ottershaw	£161,084	£66,667	£94,417	95	£994	£696
Woodham	£113,773	£66,667	£47,106	95	£495	£347
Chertsey	£114,709	£66,667	£48,042	95	£506	£354
Egham	£117,104	£66,667	£50,437	95	£531	£372
Addlestone	£95,274	£66,667	£28,607	95	£301	£211
Staines Border & North	£89,960	£66,667	£23,293	95	£245	£172

* £2m per ha divided by 30

Table 5-6: Small Sites with 'Worst Case' Benchmarks and 30% Buffer

Location	2020 RV (£)	BLV (£)*	Difference	Sqm	£ per sqm	Buffer at 30%
Wentworth	£663,811	£270,231	£393,580	95	£4,143	£2,900
Virginia Water	£270,600	£144,025	£126,575	95	£1,332	£932
Englefield Green	£183,572	£116,352	£67,220	95	£708	£495
Ottershaw	£161,084	£108,805	£52,279	95	£550	£385
Woodham	£113,773	£100,000	£13,773	95	£145	£101
Chertsey	£114,709	£96,436	£18,273	95	£192	£134
Egham	£117,104	£96,226	£20,878	95	£220	£153
Addlestone	£95,274	£87,218	£8,056	95	£85	£59
Staines Border & North	£89,960	£85,744	£4,216	95	£44	£31

4.23 The results in table 5-5 show that small sites in all areas of the Borough could still support the CIL charges set out in the draft Charging Schedule.

Setting Rates for Residential Development (Use Class C3)

4.24 Table 5-7 brings together the results from the high level, Local Plan allocation and small sites testing in the 5% price falls/5% increase in costs with 30% buffer scenario so that a comparison can be made across locations and across development scales.

³ Average size of 3 bed market dwelling.

Table 5-7: Comparison of Site Testing

Location	High Level Testing	Allocation Sites	Small Sites
Wentworth	£3,258	N/A	£2,900 - £4,400
Virginia Water	£1,024	£473 - £1,021	£932 - £1,503
Englefield Green	£534	£897	£495 - £862
Ottershaw	£400	£300 - £518	£385 - £696
Woodham	£244	N/A	£101 - £347
Chertsey ¹	£181	£0 - £210	£134 - £354
Egham	£179	N/A	£153 - £372
Addlestone	£18	£0 - £379	£59 - £211
Staines Border & North (Egham Hythe & Thorpe)	£0	£217-£300	£31 - £172
Longcross	N/A	£292	N/A

¹ Excludes Chertsey Bittams C

- 4.25 Looking across different residential development scales and locations it would appear there is still scope to differentiate CIL rates on a locational basis.
- 4.26 The scope for CIL from small sites are still within a range that can support the proposed CIL rates as set out in the draft CIL Charging Schedule, although some small sites in an existing residential use ('Worst Case' benchmark) may be placed at risk in Woodham, Chertsey, Egham, Addlestone and Staines Border. The total number of units from identified small sites in these areas in an existing residential use is 16 with no anticipated net additional sqm and therefore no impact on CIL. Whilst there are some 74 potential windfalls over the period of the charging schedule (24.5 per annum x 3 years), not all of these will be impacted by a worst case benchmark, fall within the lower value areas and/or may be considered self-builds where CIL exemptions apply. Whilst this leads to a level of risk that windfalls may not come forward as anticipated in some areas of the Borough, this is considered to be balanced by the need for infrastructure funding. In this respect it is not proposed to reduce rates on this basis, but the Council will need to monitor the delivery of small sites in lower value areas.
- 4.27 The scope for CIL from some of the high- level testing and site allocations also appears to show reduced scope for CIL at the rates set out in the draft Charging Schedule.
- 4.28 The highest value areas remain Wentworth, Virginia Water, Englefield Green and Ottershaw which also appear to show the most resilience in terms of the fall in RVs of between 8% and 16%. The high-level testing of 1ha notional and small sites suggest £380 per ha is still viable in proposed charging Zone A.

- 4.29 The exception to this is the site at Ottershaw East which sees scope for CIL at £300 per sqm, some £80 per sqm less than proposed in the CIL Charging Schedule. As set out in paragraph 5.19 above if a greenfield benchmark of £400,000 per ha is used to determine a surplus, this results in scope for CIL of some £1,045 per sqm or £731 per sqm with a 30% buffer. CIL is also charged on a net sqm basis after subtracting existing floorspace and affordable housing. For Ottershaw East net floorspace is estimated at around 11,170sqm. On this basis and with a £2m per ha benchmark the scope for CIL is £638 per sqm or £460 per sqm with a 30% buffer.
- 4.30 However, if a CIL rate of £380 continues to apply to Ottershaw, the actual buffer for Ottershaw East in a 5% price fall/5% cost increase scenario would be 11.5% on gross floorspace, 41% on net and 64% on a greenfield benchmark. This suggests that it would be prudent to adjust CIL rates to ensure a suitable buffer is maintained in the short term should economic circumstances not improve as forecast in 2021 and to continue to take account of site abnormalities and the high level nature of CIL viability testing. This is also on the basis that the Ottershaw East site forms the bulk of development coming forward in the Ottershaw area, some 17,111sqm out of 21,021sqm or 81% and the effect of this on delivery of the 2030 Local Plan spatial strategy. On this basis, maintaining a buffer of 30% on gross, with rates at £300 per sqm is considered to be reasonable and viable.
- 4.31 This means that a modification to the charging schedule is required both in terms of the rate for Ottershaw and the map of CIL charging zones. The map of housing sub-markets on p12 of the 2019 CIL Viability Assessment shows the Ottershaw sub-market northern boundary with Virginia Water close to the M3 motorway. In this respect the M3 can form the new Ottershaw zone boundary to the north, with the Longcross Garden Village, Chertsey and Addlestone/Woodham zones forming the other zone boundaries.
- 4.32 The range of values for Woodham suggest that it can still meet a charge of £110 per sqm and as such there are no modifications sought in this respect.
- 4.33 Again, Chertsey and Egham (west of the M25) show a similar range of values for 1ha notional and small sites between £179 and £372 per sqm. Seven of the Local Plan allocation sites lie within the Chertsey value area with values ranging from £0 to £210. In terms of the Bittams C site this is proposed to have a zero CIL charge and as such there is no evidence to suggest that this should change.
- 4.34 Like Ottershaw East, the Bittams B & E sites in Chertsey show less or no scope for CIL in a 5% price down/5% costs increase scenario. As for Ottershaw East if a greenfield

benchmark of £400,000 is used for Bittams B & E, potential for CIL in a 5% price fall/5% cost increase scenario with a 30% buffer is £521 & £372 per sqm respectively or if benchmarks remain at £2m and rates are based on net sqm for Bittams B (6,677sqm), this would equate to £327 per sqm or £229 per sqm with a 30% buffer, but still £0 for Bittams E. If a rate of £185 per sqm is maintained this would give a buffer for Bittams B of 13% on gross or 44% on net, which again suggests a reduction in the rate for Chertsey would be prudent, especially as 1ha notional sites also dip below the rate of £185 by £4 per sqm. However, as stated in paragraph 5.18, the Bittams E site is 100% greenfield with an EUV of £20,000. If a rate of £185 were maintained this allows a benchmark at the site of £1.4m per ha, which is still significantly above EUV.

- 4.35 In terms of notional sites, there are 220 units anticipated from unallocated sites of 10+ units within the Chertsey area including the Chertsey Opportunity Area which the Council would not wish to place at risk. Without placing any unallocated development at risk, the rate for Chertsey could be reduced to £180 per sqm which includes a 30% buffer.
- 4.36 However, as for Ottershaw East, the greenfield nature of allocation sites and basing CIL on net floorspace appear to show £185 per sqm is viable, but again with a buffer of 13% on gross for Bittams B it would suggest that an adjustment to CIL rates may be required should economic circumstances not improve as forecast in 2021 and to continue to take account of site abnormalities and the high level nature of CIL viability testing. However, unlike Ottershaw East, the Bittams B site does not make up the bulk of supply in the Chertsey area being some 10,246sqm out of 79,841sqm or some 13%.
- 4.37 Further, reducing the rate for Ottershaw from £380 to £300 would see a fall in CIL revenue of just under £0.9m. Should the Chertsey Zone rate be reduced to £150 to accommodate the Bittams B site this would reduce revenue by around £1.9m, which is not a level of contribution the Council would wish to lose to accommodate 13% of development in Chertsey and double the loss from Ottershaw. In this respect either a separate charging zone specifically for this site could be set or a level of risk is brought into the CIL rate in the balancing exercise between setting rates and need to fund infrastructure.
- 4.38 Although setting a separate zone for Bittams C and Longcross is proposed, setting another site specific zone for Bittams B is considered to introduce an unnecessary level of complexity for a site which is a standard residential site not strategic as in the case of Longcross or with a higher mix of lower revenue development (as with Bittams C). As such, setting a rate at £180 per sqm for Chertsey would ensure the bulk of

development is not placed at risk including all Chertsey allocations (except Bittams B), 1ha notional sites and small sites and would see a buffer of 45% for Bittams B on a net basis.

- 4.39 Whilst this adds a level of risk for the Bittams B site, this could be off-set by either the site coming forward with a benchmark value under £2m per ha (around £1.4m per ha) or the site comes forward later in the 2030 plan period when the CIL schedule will be reviewed or the housing market returns to 'normal'. In the case of the latter, the Council's housing trajectory shows the site coming forward in the years 2023/24 to 2025/26 when the housing market may have recovered. Even if the site were delayed by 2 years it would still complete within the plan period and more importantly, the Council's 5 year housing land supply, based on the trajectory considered at the 2030 Local Plan examination would still be 6.9 years 2023/24-27/28 without the site. As such, the CIL rate for Chertsey could be adjusted to £180 per sqm which is a balance between setting rates and funding infrastructure.
- 4.40 In terms of Egham (west of the M25), the proposed CIL rate is £235 per sqm. Although there are no allocation sites in this area of the Borough, a rate of £235 now exceeds that which a 1ha notional site could support at £179 per sqm. The Egham area west of the M25 is anticipated to bring forward 135 units on sites of 10+ and this is a level of the development the Council would not wish to place at risk. Therefore, the rate for Egham (west of the M25) could be reduced. To reduce the level of complexity in the charging schedule and given how close the Chertsey and Egham values are to one another the Egham & Chertsey rates could align and be within the same charging zone (even though this would not be contiguous). On this basis the rate for Chertsey & Egham could be £180 per sqm. Whilst this is £1 per sqm above the rate which Egham could support for 1ha notional sites, this is not considered significant and represents a reduction in the 30% buffer of only 1% (on a gross floorspace basis).
- 4.41 In Addlestone values now range from £0 to £379 per sqm, which reflects the two allocations comprising 223 dwellings at Vet Labs (150) and Addlestone West (73) with 1ha notional sites only supporting a CIL charge of £18 per sqm in a 5% price fall/5% cost increase scenario and 30% buffer.
- 4.42 The Addlestone West site is still viable at the proposed rate of £110 per sqm. This leaves 150 units to come forward on the Vet Labs allocation although this now shows a CIL charge could not be supported. However, as with the Chertsey Bittams E site, the site is 100% greenfield with an EUV of £20,000 per ha. If the CIL rate of £110 per sqm

is maintained this would reduce the benchmark to just over £1m per ha, which is still considerably higher than a greenfield benchmark of £400,000 per ha.

- 4.43 However, the scope to support CIL from notional 1ha sites reduces to £18 per sqm. There are 22 units on 2 sites of 10+ dwellings which could be affected by this rate. Given the overall quantum of development to come forward over the plan period, it is considered that 22 units not coming forward in the Addlestone area in the period of the first charging schedule (or until a return of a 'normal' housing market) is not significant at 0.5% of the residual need. In any event both sites (Woburn Hill and Ongar Brickworks) are not anticipated to deliver any net additional floorspace and as such would not be subject to CIL. Both sites are also anticipated to come forward in 2024/2025 in the housing trajectory when the housing market may have returned to normal and when the CIL charging schedule could be reviewed. As such, the rate for Addlestone is proposed to remain at £110 per sqm.
- 4.44 The lowest value area remains Staines Border & North comprising Egham (east of the M25) and Thorpe. Within the Staines Border & North area values range from £0 to £300, with small sites and allocations sitting comfortably within the proposed rate of £90 per sqm. 1ha notional sites however show no scope for CIL, but there are no sites of 10+ units identified within the area of Egham east of the M25. As such a CIL rate of £90 per sqm should be maintained for Staines Border & North. This would also sit close to the middle of the range for small sites of £31 - £172 per sqm.
- 4.45 The December 2019 TBD also considered the village of Thorpe as a distinct settlement in its own right and concluded that the Thorpe area could support the same CIL charge as Chertsey as house prices were largely similar. As such, all things being equal the CIL rate for Chertsey should continue to apply to Thorpe.
- 4.46 Viability for the Longcross Garden Village site has been dealt with in some detail in the A320 Impact and Longcross Garden Village Viability Update Study (summarised in the CIL Viability Report) which was prepared as evidence to support the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan. The A320 & Longcross Viability Update considered two scenarios for the Longcross site, a static approach to viability and a phased approach.
- 4.47 In the static approach the viability update found that RVs for the Longcross site would be around £130m taking account of affordable housing, infrastructure and sustainable design expectations. This compared to a benchmark of around £60m, thus a potential surplus of some £70m, equating to potential for CIL of £300 per sqm with a 50% viability buffer. With a fall in RV as for the Ottershaw area at 16%, RV falls to some

£116m which with a benchmark of £60m gives scope for CIL at a 30% buffer of £279 per sqm, £21 per sqm less than in 2019.

- 4.48 Given the scope for CIL has slightly worsened in 2020 by £21 per sqm compared to 2019, the conclusions in the 2019 TBD remain valid, namely that in a pessimistic scenario CIL rates of only £32-£109 could be supported and this prior to any contributions to A320 improvements. As such, a proposed CIL rate at £0 for Longcross Garden Village is still recommended.

Specialist C3 Residential Accommodation

- 4.49 The CIL 2019 Viability Report tested this type of development and considered it to be viable with surpluses for CIL of some £2,500 per sqm, which is certainly within the bounds of all of the CIL rates for C3 development even once adjusted to take account of 5% price falls and 5% cost increases and therefore this type of development is still viable.

Safety Net Check

- 4.50 In order to check the CIL rates recommended above, there has been a general rule of thumb with first charging schedules that CIL rates should not represent more than around 5% of Gross Development Value (GDV). As this only relates to the revenue side of viability, GDV for each site has been reduced by 5% to represent a 5% fall in housing prices.
- 4.51 In reality, the calculation of CIL will need to take account of any existing floorspace as it is net floorspace that counts towards CIL not gross and this is likely to lower the total CIL liability on a per sqm basis. Further, for sites of 10 or more units, the affordable housing exemption may be applied which would reduce total CIL liability further. Table 5-8 sets out CIL as a percentage of GDV for each of the allocation sites on a gross and net floorspace basis having taken into account an exemption for affordable housing.

Table 5-8: CIL as % of GDV for Local Plan Allocation Sites Available for CIL

Allocation Sites	CIL Rate	GDV	Gross Floorspace	Net Floorspace	Gross %	Net %
Ottershaw East	£300	£73,997,792	17,111	11,170	6.9%	4.5%
Chertsey Bittams A	£180	£56,962,570	14,961	10,387	4.7%	3.3%
Chertsey Bittams B	£180	£39,681,283	10,246	6,677	4.6%	3.0%
Chertsey Bittams E	£180	£24,627,135	8,991	6,335	6.5%	4.6%
Vet Labs	£110	£41,432,920	12,938	9,654	3.4%	2.6%
Thorpe Lea Rd North	£90	£32,658,549	7,716	3,330	2.1%	1%
Thorpe Lea Rd West	£90	£91,796,006	21,261	14,990	2.1%	1.4%
Virginia Water North	£380	£63,423,710	10,230	3,740	6.1%	2.2%
Virginia Water South	£380	£74,187,970	11,911	7,808	6%	4%
Pycroft Road	£180	£101,305,245	23,472	14,144	4.2%	2.5%
Blay's House	£380	£43,306,843	7,881	1,714	6.9%	1.5%

4.52 As can be seen in Table 5-8, there are no sites where CIL as a percentage of GDV on a net floorspace basis sits above 5%.

4.53 Whilst some sites, particularly in Englefield Green and Staines Border & North exhibit particularly low CIL as a percentage of GDV, the 1ha and small sites tested showed lower potential for CIL and as such raising CIL rates at these sites could place further development at risk.

Recommended C3 Residential Charging Zones

4.54 From the above and on the basis of the viability review there is potential for seven separate charging zones for residential development as follows: -

- A) Englefield Green//Virginia Water & Wentworth (£380)
- B) Ottershaw (£300)
- C) Chertsey, Egham (west of M25) & Thorpe (£180)
- D) Addlestone, Woodham & New Haw (£110)
- E) Egham (east of M25)/Staines upon Thames (£90)
- F) Chertsey Bittams C (£0)
- G) Longcross Garden Village (£0)

Student Accommodation

- 4.55 The CIL Viability Report tested student accommodation. Following representations to the draft Charging Schedule from Stride Treglown on behalf of Royal Holloway University of London (RHUL) and Danehurst, both of whom provide student accommodation, the assumptions were reviewed and retested in the 2020 Viability Review.
- 4.56 The majority of student accommodation will occur in the Englefield Green and Egham (west of M25) areas of the Borough, but again it could also come forward in other areas of the Borough and there is no reason to suggest the viability of student accommodation in the Borough is dependent on location.
- 4.57 Taking account, but not necessarily agreeing completely with all the assumptions suggested by Stride Treglown and Danehurst, the Review adjusts its assumptions on sqm of development per ha, size of student rooms, build costs, rental values and yields. Even so, the Review still finds student accommodation gives surpluses of around £825 per sqm.
- 4.58 The Review notes two sites at The Garage and The Pad which have been developed or acquired for student accommodation and notes that on the basis of EUV + 20%, land values could be up to £2.3m per ha (EUV of £1.84m per ha). However the Review maintains that a benchmark of £2m per ha is still reasonable and practical for the purposes of high level testing.
- 4.59 The representations from Stride Treglown and Danehurst note that student accommodation has to compete with residential development as an alternative use. Stride Treglown suggest a land value benchmark of £3m per ha (63% on EUV), whilst Danehurst sets out that they have typically paid £40,000-£45,000 per student bed in land value. This being the case the site at the Garage as noted in the Review is permitted for 166 bedspaces which at £40,000 per bedspace would result in a land value of £6.64m per ha an increase of some 261% over EUV. This is not considered to represent a reasonable uplift in EUV.
- 4.60 Whilst it is noted that student accommodation competes with residential development for sites, the typical RV for a 1ha residential site in Englefield Green is £4.12m and in Egham £2.71m in a 5% prices down/5% costs increase scenario. This is less than the £8.18m RV generated by a 1ha student scheme, suggesting that student accommodation can compete with residential.

4.61 At a surplus of £825 per sqm, with a 30% buffer this would equate to £578 per sqm and at 50% £413 per sqm. As such, the existing rate for student accommodation at £495 per sqm falls within the middle of this range. As a safety net check, should build costs rise by 5% and assuming rents and yields remain as set out in the Review and with a 30% buffer, the scope for CIL is £477 per sqm. On this basis no modification to the rate for student accommodation is suggested and at £495 per sqm would still leave a viability buffer of 40% and is only some £18 above a rate which could be maintained if build costs increased by 5% with a buffer of 30%.

B1a Office Use

4.62 The 2019 Viability Assessment tested a generic 4,000sqm B1a office on a 1ha site at a rental value of £250 per sqm and yield of 5%. The assumptions tested returned a surplus for CIL of some £669 per sqm or £335 per sqm with a 50% viability buffer.

4.63 Research by Savills⁴ shows offices in the M25 area at yields of 5.25% for primary and 7% for secondary floorspace. This is a fall in M25 office yields by 0.25% since 2019 reflecting some of the impact of Covid-19, however supply of office space is still limited and rents in the 'Office Rest of UK' area (according to realfor) are forecast to increase by 1.3% per annum over the next 5 years.

4.64 The Savills research shows rents increasing but yields decreasing which could cancel each other out in terms of increase/decrease in value. On this basis, the proposed rate for offices in the draft Charging Schedule should be maintained. The Savills research also shows rents in the retail and leisure sector declining with only modest growth for industrial and warehousing. As such, there is no evidence to suggest that viability for other development types are any more viable than when tested in 2019 and as such the rate for all other development should remain at £0 per sqm.

⁴ Market in Minutes: UK Regional Office Investment Market Watch (June 2020) Savills. Available at: https://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/301550-0

5. Estimated CIL Receipts

- 5.1 The previous section set out recommendations for the level of CIL rates which could be set in a CIL Charging Schedule. These are still based on seven different zones for C3 and student units and five for B1a office development. All other types of development are to be zero rated.
- 5.2 To estimate CIL receipts an estimate of net additional floorspace is required by charging zone to establish how much revenue CIL charges could bring and how much of the infrastructure funding gap could be reduced.
- 5.3 Table 6-1 sets out the estimated level of net additional floorspace which would attract a CIL charge by area of the borough and estimated CIL receipts including the top-slicing for the neighbourhood funding element. Estimated floorspace from windfalls has been allocated pro rata based on the level of residential development coming forward in each area in accordance with the Runnymede 2030 Spatial Strategy (excluding Longcross).

Table 6-1: Estimated CIL Receipts by Borough Area

Allocation Sites	Net Floorspace	Estimated CIL Receipts	Neighbourhood Top Slice	Total CIL Receipts
Addlestone (inc Rowtown) (Resi)	13,824	£1,520,640	£228,096	£1,292,544
Chertsey (inc Bittams) (Resi)	46,785	£8,421,300	£1,263,195	£7,158,105
Egham (Resi)	11,122	£1,462,500	£219,375	£1,243,125
Englefield Green (Resi)	3,370	£1,280,600	£320,150	£960,450
Longcross (Resi)	94,599	£0	£0	£0
Lyne (Resi)	136	£40,800	£6,120	£34,680
Ottershaw (Resi)	11,852	£3,555,600	£533,340	£3,022,260
Thorpe (Resi)	1,305	£234,900	£58,725	£176,175
Virginia Water (Resi)	12,603	£4,789,140	£1,197,285	£3,591,855
Woodham & New Haw (Resi)	273	£30,030	£4,505	£25,526
Office	49,188	£2,459,400	£368,910	£2,090,490
Total	245,057	£23,794,910	£4,199,701	£19,595,210

¹ Neighbourhood top slice based on 25% where Neighbourhood Plans are under preparation. 15% in all other locations.

- 5.4 Table 6-1 shows estimated CIL receipts at £19.5m once the neighbourhood funding element has been subtracted from CIL receipts. The Council is also able to redeem a percentage of CIL towards the cost of administering CIL at 5% of CIL receipts. If this is applied after the top slicing of neighbourhood funds, the amount of CIL available for

infrastructure is around £18.5m and the overall funding gap set out in the 2019 TBD is the same at £75.5m.

Appendix A

Estimated Levels of Development in Remaining Plan Period

Estimated Development

Site and (Net Dwellings Required or sqm)	Estimated Existing Floorspace	Estimated Proposed Floorspace ¹	Net Floorspace ² (discounted for affordable and existing floorspace)
C3 Residential Completions 01/04/2015-31/03/2019 (1,635)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pipeline C3 Residential Development (1,378 with Permission as at 31/10/2019)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sites Likely to be Unavailable for CIL³			
SL8 – Thorpe Lea Road West (220)	6,376sqm	18,467sqm	9,003sqm
SL17 Bittams D (200)	0sqm	17,111sqm	12,065sqm
SL3 – Hanworth Lane (52 remaining)	0sqm	3,370sqm	2,350sqm
Sites Available for CIL			
SD10 – LGV North & South (1,560)	9,980sqm	132,952sqm	86,845sqm
SL5 – Blays House (92 remaining)	5,450sqm	7,881sqm	1,714sqm
SL6 – Pyrcroft Road (275)	3,470sqm	23,472sqm	14,144sqm
SL7 – Thorpe Lea Road North (90)	2,950sqm	7,716sqm	3,330sqm
SL8 – Thorpe Lea Rd West (55)	1,249sqm	4,552sqm	2,379sqm
SL9 – Virginia Water North (120)	4,947sqm	10,230sqm	3,740sqm
SL10 – Virginia Water South (140)	854sqm	11,911sqm	7,808sqm
SL11 – Vet Labs (150)	0sqm	12,938sqm	9,654sqm
SL12 – Ottershaw E (200)	1,270sqm	17,111sqm	11,170sqm
SL14 Bittams A (175)	235sqm	14,961sqm	10,387sqm
SL15 Bittams B (120)	800sqm	10,246sqm	6,677sqm
SL16 Bittams C (9)	0sqm	867sqm	867sqm
SL18 Bittams E (105)	0sqm	8,991sqm	6,335sqm
IE1 – Byfleet Road (20,000sqm B8)	0sqm	20,000sqm	20,000sqm
IE8 – Addlestone West (73)	3,240sqm	4,200sqm	1,305sqm
IE8 – Addlestone West (500sqm comparison Retail)		500sqm	156sqm
IE9 – Egham Gateway East (45)	1,215sqm	1,790sqm	526sqm
IE11 - Chertsey Opportunity Area (142)	4,570sqm	8,395sqm	3,655sqm
IE11- Chertsey Opportunity Area (294sqm comparison retail)		294sqm	294sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (50)	2,690sqm	2,955sqm	1,197sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (814sqm convenience retail)		814sqm	814sqm
IE11 – High Street North, Egham (685sqm comparison retail)		685sqm	685sqm
IE11 - Egham Library (40)	712sqm	1,863sqm	1,398sqm
CABI, Bakeham Lane (25)	3,744sqm	3,744sqm	0sqm
Coltscroft, Rosemary Lane (24)	532sqm	1,542sqm	1,169sqm
Thorpe Park Farm (20)	2,870sqm	2,870sqm	0sqm
Hurst Lane (10)	850sqm	850sqm	0sqm
Ongar Hill Brickworks, Ledger Drive (12)	947sqm	923sqm	0sqm

Alwyn House, Windsor Street, Chertsey (35)	1,870sqm	1,870sqm	0sqm
Land at Howards Lane (6)	612sqm	612sqm	0sqm
Woburn Hill, Addlestone (10)	2,182sqm	2,182sqm	0sqm
Units 1 & 1a Downside, Chertsey (30)	820sqm	1,775sqm	538sqm
Pantiles Nursery, Almnors Lane (20)	5,537sqm	1,588sqm	0sqm
Trys Hill Farm (6)	1,690sqm	568sqm	0sqm
Villa Santa Maria (9)	1,327sqm	1,327sqm	0sqm
Sandhills & Lyne Lane (11)	1,527sqm	1,527sqm	0sqm
Garage Site, Trumps Green Rd (5)	256sqm	356sqm	100sqm
Webbs, The Green (14)	1,132sqm	1,132sqm	0sqm
Two Bridges, Guildford St (13)	850sqm	850sqm	0sqm
9-11 Victoria Street, EG (10)	487sqm	779sqm	292sqm
Padd Farm, Hurst Lane (5)			0sqm
33 Station Road (15)	717sqm	1,200sqm	483sqm
Windfalls (221)	7,348sqm	20,995sqm	13,647sqm
Estates Regeneration ¹ (170)	All affordable so net floorspace = 0sqm		
Prior Approvals (192)	No net floorspace so = 0sqm		
Total Net Floorspace			234,727sqm
Total Net Floorspace Available for CIL			211,309sqm

¹ Based on SHMA Mix of units or planning application as submitted.

² Based on CIL Regulation 40 & 50.

³ Outstanding applications which may be permitted prior to CIL implementation and not included in estimated CIL receipts.

Appendix B

Section 106 Contributions Secured 2015-2020

Developer Contributions Secured from 01.04.2015

Site	App No	Contributions Secured	Contribution per dwelling
Land at 22 Ferndale Avenue, Chertsey (12 net dwellings)	RU.12/0904	Playspace - £180,000 Libraries - £2,932 Crime & Disorder - £7,968 Yellow Bus - £15,935 SANG - £24,000 SAMM - £7,560	£18,338
Tamchester, Pretoria Rd, Chertsey (57 net dwellings)	RU.13/0023	Highways - £58,132 Yellow Bus - £21,805 Crime & Disorder - £10,902 Libraries - £4,012 SANG - £114,000 SAMM - £35,910	£4,294
72-82 Holbrook Court, Pooley Green Rd, Egham* (26 net dwellings)	RU.13/0401	Highways - £44,164 Playspace - £21,093 Libraries - £3,369 Crime & Disorder - £10,000 Yellow Bus - £18,310	£3,728
Aviator Park, Addlestone	RU.13/0770	CCTV - £20,000 Yellow Bus - £97,860 SANG - £400,000 SAMM - £126,000	£3,219
Former DERA site, Longcross	RU.13/0856	Traffic Calming Works - £165,000 Bus Service - £880,000 Rail Service - £700,000 Rail Station - £754,641 Travel Initiative - £150,000	

		Primary Education - £669,103 Secondary Education - £763,070 SANG - £272,852 Off-site Highway Works	
Land at Dashwood Lang Rd, Addlestone	RU.13/1311	Transport (Bus & Rail) - £250,000 Yellow Bus - £15,000 Crime & Disorder - £32,000	N/A
Royal Holloway University of London, Englefield Green	RU.14/0099	Transport - £100,000 Crime & Disorder - £25,000	N/A
Land at Station Rd, Addlestone (188 net dwellings)	RU.14/0435	Travel Initiative - £123,660 Primary Education - £169,129 Secondary Education - £172,513 SANG - £376,000 SAMM - £118,440	£4,506
Land at Wick Road, Englefield Green (89 net dwellings)	RU.14/1208	Highways - £38,500 Primary Education - £277,855 Secondary Education - £337,993 Playspace - £14,000 Yellow Bus - £76,000 SANG - £178,000 SAMM - £56,070	£10,993
Tamesis 1, The Causeway, Egham	RU.14/1699	Highways - £123,000* Crime & Disorder - £20,000	N/A
Land at Hanworth Lane (North), Chertsey (130 net dwellings)	RU.15/0855	Primary Education - £273,462	£7,687

		Secondary Education - £299,933 Cycle - £4,000 Play Space - £80,000 SANG - £260,000 SAMM - £81,900	
Land Fronting the Glanty, The Causeway, Egham	RU.15/1933	Highways - £123,000*	N/A
Land at Coombelands Lane, Addlestone (43 net dwellings)	RU.16/0845	Early Years - £28,941 Primary Education - £111,746 Secondary Education - £123,076 SANG - £86,000 SAMM - £27,090	£8,764
31 The Causeway, Egham	RU.16/0926	Cycling/Walking - £300,000	N/A
Former Brunel University Campus (59 net dwellings)	RU.17/1649	Community Support - £400,000 Minor Projects - £85,253 Cycle Lane Link - £100,000 RT Bus Info - £15,000 Yellow Bus - £80,000 Highway Works – On-site delivery	£11,530
St Peter's Hospital, Chertsey (386 net dwellings)	RU.17/1815	Highways Contribution - £1,194,160 Bus Service - £70,000 Community Centre - £90,870 Early Years - £189,801 Primary Education - £847,017 Secondary Education - £ Police - £30,307	£8,905

		SANG - £772,000 SAMM - £243,180	
Land at Brox End Nursery, Ottershaw (40 net dwellings)	RU.17/1940	Early Years - £26,922 Primary Education - £122,454 Secondary Education - £134,659 SANG - £80,000 SAMM - £25,200	£9,731
159-175 Station Rd, Addlestone (65 net dwellings)	RU.18/0743	Early Years - £46,440 Secondary Education - £92,669 Health - £56,925 SANG - £130,000 SAMM - £40,950	£5,646
Land at Hanworth Lane (South), Chertsey (158 net dwellings)	RU.18/1280	Early Years Education - £106,342 Primary Education - £389,052 Secondary Education - £391,360 Community Facilities - £23,800 Highways (A320) - £827,604 SANG - £316,000 SAMM - £99,540	£13,631
Egham Gateway West, Egham (101 dwellings + student bedspaces)	RU.19/0437	Early Years Education - £66,632 Primary Education - £88,271 Secondary Education - £66,399 Allotments - £11,610 Playspace - £43,700	£2,958

		SAMM - £22,144	
Average			£8,138

*Contribution towards Runnymede Roundabout and/or Egham Sustainable Transport Package 1