



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to the London Borough of Enfield Council

by Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMl

an Examiner appointed by the Council

Date: 18 December 2015

PLANNING ACT 2008 (AS AMENDED)
SECTION 212(2)

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION
OF THE DRAFT LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD
COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE**

Charging Schedule submitted for examination on 16 July 2015

Examination hearing held on 4 November 2015

File Ref: PINS/Q5300/429/8

Non Technical Summary

This report concludes that the London Borough of Enfield Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule provides an appropriate basis for the collection of the levy in the Borough. The Council has sufficient evidence to support the schedule and can show that the levy is set at a level that will not put the overall development of the area at risk.

Two modifications are needed to meet the statutory requirements. These can be summarised as follows:

- Produce the Residential Charging Zones map with National Grid lines and reference numbers;
- Make changes to remove unnecessary text and make the document clearer.

The specified modifications recommended in this report are based on matters discussed during the public hearing and do not alter the basis of the Council's overall approach or the appropriate balance achieved.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the London Borough of Enfield Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule in terms of Section 212 of the Planning Act 2008. It considers whether the schedule is compliant in legal terms and whether it is economically viable as well as reasonable, realistic and consistent with national guidance (Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance – February 2014).
2. To comply with the relevant legislation the local charging authority has to submit what it considers to be a charging schedule that sets an appropriate balance between helping to fund necessary new infrastructure and the potential effects on the economic viability of development across the district.
3. The basis for the examination, on which a hearing was held on 4 November 2015, is the Draft Charging Schedule (December 2014) (DCS) submitted for examination on 16 July 2015.
4. The Council propose a matrix approach to charging, as set out in the following tables.

Table 1: Residential CIL Rates (Comprising all the C3 ¹ Residential Use Class ²)	
Zone	Rate
Meridian Water Masterplan Area	Nil rate
Lower Rate Eastern corridor (to include the following Wards: Turkey Street, Enfield Lock, Enfield Highway, Southbury, Ponders End, Jubilee, Lower Edmonton, Upper Edmonton, Edmonton Green, Haselbury and parts of Bush Hill Park and Chase Wards).	£40 per square metre.
Intermediate rate Area south of the A406 and A110 Bowes Road, Bowes Ward and part Southgate Green. Enfield Town (with parts of adjacent Chase and Highlands Wards).	£60 per square metre.
Higher rate Remainder of the Borough	£120 per square metre.

¹ CLASS C3 Dwelling Houses – Use as a dwelling house (whether or not as a sole or main residence):-
a) by a single person or by people living together as a family, or b) by not more than 6 residents living together as a single household (including where care is provided for residents).

² The Use Classes Order for England 1987 (with amendments: 2005, 2006 & 2010) puts uses of land and buildings into various categories known as 'Use Classes'.

Table 2: Non Residential and Commercial Rates	
Retail (A1), financial and professional services including betting shops (A2), restaurants and cafes (A3), drinking establishments (A4) and hot food takeaways (A5).	A borough wide rate of £60 per square metre.
All other uses – (including offices, industrial, hotels, leisure facilities, community and other uses).	£0 per square metre.

Does the charging schedule meet the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and Guidance?

The Residential Zoning Map

5. The submitted Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) complies with the CIL Regulations except in relation to the Residential Charging Zones Map. Where charges are to be differentiated by zones, Regulation 12(2) has to be followed. This states:
“(2) A draft charging schedule submitted for examination in accordance with section 212 of PA 2008 must contain—
 - (a) Where a charging authority sets differential rates in accordance with regulation 13(1)(a), a map which—
 - (i) identifies the location and boundaries of the zones,
 - (ii) is reproduced from, or based on, an Ordnance Survey map,
 - (iii) shows National Grid lines and reference numbers, (emphasis added) and
 - (iv) includes an explanation of any symbol or notation which it uses.
6. The Residential Charging Zones Map did not have the National Grid lines or reference numbers, as required by Regulation 12(2)(a)(iii). I drew this matter to the Council's attention, and whilst doing so, referred to the possibility of making the Map clearer and reducing the text in the Schedule by omitting out-of-date and other unnecessary elements and improving clarity.
7. The Council agrees to make the following changes to the Draft Charging Schedule:
 - i) Delete the consultation section at the front of the document;
 - ii) Delete the words “Proposed Draft” so that the title of the document reads “Enfield's CIL Charging Schedule”;
 - iii) Delete the sub section entitled “Schedule of Rates”;
 - iv) Delete the sub section entitled “Scope of CIL”;
 - v) Delete the sub section entitled “Payment Instalments”;
 - vi) Delete the sub section entitled “Discretionary Relief”;
 - vii) Move section entitled “Statutory Compliance” to the beginning of the document;
 - viii) Add National Grid lines to an Ordnance Survey base on Figure 1;
 - ix) Add a reference to the Charging Schedule indicating that Figure 1 can be found and enlarged online at the Council's website.
8. The resulting Charging Schedule is recommended for approval.

The Draft Regulation 123 List

9. The Council has published its Draft Regulation 123 Infrastructure List:

Draft Community Infrastructure Levy regulation 123 List

Meridian Water (Rail and Causeway Infrastructure)

10. This single item encompasses the relocation of the Angel Road station (the 'Rail' element) and the Causeway, which is a new spine road through Meridian Water. Meridian Water is the Council's flagship regeneration scheme in which a new community is proposed for the area on approximately 85 hectares of former industrial brownfield land. The delivery of a minimum of 5,000 homes is a corporate priority that will help the Council meet its housing target as set by the GLA. In June 2015 Meridian Water was approved as a Housing Zone by the Mayor of London. The area also forms part of the proposed route for Crossrail 2 which, if approved, will stop at Angel Road Station.
11. Within the representations there is concern raised about the content of the Regulation 123 List (R123list), with its single item, and how this relates to the general need for infrastructure and its impact on section 106 obligations and the 'pooling' rules. It is also a matter that immediately caught my attention when first examining the documents as part of the evidence base for the submitted DCS. Of course, the normal scope of my examination would not include more than that which is required to satisfy me that the R123list relates well to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Review (IDPR)
12. Before going further in this respect, I draw on the advice in the government's National Planning Practice Guidance. (Emphasis added):

*"At examination, **the charging authority should set out a draft list of the projects or types of infrastructure that are to be funded in whole or in part by the levy.** The charging authority should **also set out any known site-specific matters for which section 106 contributions may continue to be sought.** This is to provide transparency about what the charging authority intends to fund through the levy and where it may continue to seek section 106 contributions. **The role of the list is to help provide evidence on the potential funding gap** – it is not the purpose of the examination to challenge the list.... "A charging authority may undertake additional infrastructure planning to identify its infrastructure funding gap... "Where infrastructure planning work which was undertaken specifically for the levy setting process has not been tested as part of another examination, it will need to be tested at the levy examination. **The examiner will need to test that the evidence is sufficient in order to confirm the aggregate infrastructure funding gap and the total target amount that the charging authority proposes to raise through the levy.**"*

(extracted from paragraph 017 Reference ID: 25-017-20140612)

13. In this connection, at the same time as the Council consulted on its draft Regulation 123 List, it published a Draft Revised S106 SPD (Document CILSD-01) for public consultation. This is intended to replace the adopted 2011 S106 Supplementary Planning Document. The Draft Revised S106 Supplementary Planning Document has contents that are very similar to the 2011 version. It includes a number of infrastructure types where financial obligations will be sought for what appear to be non-site specific requirements, such as Education where prescribed contributions are based on "child yield" times capital cost; and Libraries and other Council Community Facilities have a standard charge set out. Other infrastructure types such as health facilities, public realm and policing have more generalised requirements that will be sought on a "site by site basis".
14. Thus, whilst I am not examining the Draft Regulation 123 List as such, it is part of the evidence for me to take into account, and it is therefore important that I should have a proper understanding of its significance. As a consequence I wrote to the Council (Examination Document ED-4) seeking a better understanding of the basis on which it intended to charge CIL and seek s106 contributions post-CIL. The Council's reply to me is in Examination Document ED-08. I need not detail here the full response, but in brief and for the purposes of this part of my report I will simply record that:

"The Council's specific approach to the inclusion of items on the draft regulation 123 List rather than listing a type of infrastructure such as 'health' or 'education' will provide flexibility to continue to seek contributions through S106 agreements, subject to the legal tests set out in Regulation 122 and the pooling restrictions in Regulation 123 of the CIL Regulations (as amended). "S106 will therefore continue to be sought for items of infrastructure such as 'education' subject to viability and legal considerations. The Council is currently developing a pooling strategy that will inform how this will be managed going forward. Where necessary, S106 contributions will continue to be negotiated with planning applicants in line with the legal tests set out in Reg 122 based on items of infrastructure identified in the pooling strategy where:

- the infrastructure / development mitigation needs are proven;*
- the other tests are met, as above;*
- the pooling restriction has not yet been triggered and also;*
- subject to site-specific viability considerations where necessary."*

15. Having considered this response, I concluded that for the purposes of my examination, the important issue is whether the viability evidence made sufficient allowance for the scale of s106 obligations that are likely to be sought after CIL is introduced in the Borough. If sufficient allowance has been made, the restricted content of the R123list, the eventual form and content of the Council's Section 106 SPD, and how it deals with 'pooled' contributions, which are not matters for me, will then not further impact on the viability of development in the Borough. I took the opportunity to pursue this at the examination hearing.

16. The early assumption in the commissioned CIL Viability Assessment was that an allowance for section 106 payments (in addition to affordable housing), anticipated alongside CIL, would amount to £1,000 per dwelling. This is a fairly standard allowance assumed in many CIL viability studies. However, it was then recognised that the circumstances in Enfield Borough warranted a higher allowance. As a consequence, notional appraisals of larger schemes have been carried out, based on the current Section 106 SPD. Of necessity these appraisals are 'high level' because each individual site will present individual characteristics and demands. The results of these appraisals is that for residential scenarios up to, and including, 50 dwellings, the latest appraisals have included a notional sum of £3,000 per dwelling to allow for such s106 costs. For the 250 dwelling scenario, representing one-off development or perhaps a portion of a larger strategic development, this base assumption was increased to £7,500 per dwelling. It is considered by the viability consultants that this type of scenario could be relevant to regeneration or redevelopment. I agree.
17. In the light of the above I am satisfied that, although the R123list is very unusual, and it is necessary to guard against unfair charges for developments which do not come within the scope of that list, the Viability Assessment which is submitted to justify the proposed CIL charge levels has made adequate provision in the individual scenario assessments for the S106 obligations which are likely to arise from both the extant S106 SPD and from the successor document which is currently emerging.

Is the charging schedule supported by background documents containing appropriate available evidence?

Infrastructure planning evidence

18. The London Borough of Enfield Core Strategy (CS) was adopted in November 2010 covering a fifteen to twenty year period. This sets out the main elements of growth that will need to be supported by further infrastructure during the plan period. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) was published in March 2010 as part of the evidence base for the CS. Subsequently the Council has worked with service and infrastructure providers to update the IDP to support the introduction of CIL in the Borough – the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Review 2014 (IDPR). This identifies the known infrastructure requirements arising from the planned increase in new homes and jobs and the projected population growth within the Borough up to 2026 and beyond.
19. The IDPR identifies eleven infrastructure types: Transportation, Utilities and Renewable Energy, Water and Drainage, Education, Historic Environment and Public Realm, Health Care, Community Services, Leisure and Cultural Services, Parks and Open Spaces, Waterways. A funding gap for each of these infrastructure types is identified with a total estimated Funding Gap of £187.65m. It is pointed out that this figure should be considered an underestimate: I consider that it is a firm foundation for determining any funding gap.

20. Against this list of infrastructure needs, the Council has published its Draft Regulation 123 Infrastructure List: I have dealt with this extensively in paragraphs 9 to 17 above. I need say no more at this point about its content. The infrastructure on the R123 list is expected to be delivered within the five to ten year period. I am told that its total cost is likely to be £38.1m. Taking into account other funding streams, a funding gap of £22.1m is anticipated.
21. The potential income from CIL has been estimated by the Council as generating approximately £23m for the period 2016-2027. Enfield Council has been collecting CIL on behalf of the Mayor since April 2012. In estimating likely future receipts an exercise has been undertaken which looks at actual CIL receipts collected and transferred to TfL over the financial years 2013 – 2014 and 2014 –2015. These figures have then been translated using the rates proposed in the CIL Draft Charging Schedule into monies that the Council would have received if its own CIL had been in place. This exercise confirms that the Council would have received £726,714 in 2013/14 and £4,016,202 in 2014/15. On this basis, the £23m looks to be a conservative estimate. Nevertheless, against a total funding gap of circa £188m, the proposed charge would make a very modest contribution towards filling the likely gap. While the Meridian Water project is currently the sole item on the R123list, it is of course open to the Council to amend the list in future to include other items of infrastructure. The figures demonstrate the need to levy CIL.

Economic viability evidence

22. The Council commissioned a CIL Viability Assessment (VA), dated April 2013. The VA uses a residual land value method, involving calculating the value of completed schemes and deducting development costs such as build costs, fees, finance, and CIL plus developer's profit. This is a standard method used by developers when determining how much to bid for land – the residual amount is the sum left after the costs have been deducted from the value of the development. Levels of CIL have been tested in combination with the Council's planning requirements, including the provision of affordable housing and residual s106 obligations and the existing Mayoral CIL.

Conclusion

23. The draft Charging Schedule is supported by evidence of community infrastructure needs and a funding gap has been identified. Accepted valuation methodology has been used which was informed by reasonable assumptions about local sale values, rents and yields, etc. On this basis, the evidence that has been used to inform the Charging Schedule is robust, proportionate and appropriate.

Are the charging rates informed by and consistent with the evidence?

24. A representation suggests that the rates proposed for residential development are excessive and may put at serious risk future growth

within the Borough. I deal with the material points raised by the Representor in the following two paragraphs.

25. In particular it is said that the higher levy of £120 per sq. m within the 'remainder of the Borough' is not financially viable in certain areas. The Viability Assessment Market Update Information Supplementary Report (October 2014) refers to a significantly improved market and a Land Registry House Price Index pick-up of 14.8% (say 15%), quoted as presenting a *"relatively conservative picture in respect of some local level house price movements since information was gathered and assumptions were set for the Assessment first completed in 2013"*. The update also refers to an increase across both more expensive areas and typically lower value areas. This is misleading with respect to the generally mixed picture across the Borough in terms of values and relative viability. Insufficient evidence has been provided to determine how many schemes will be made unviable and that impacts are indeed 'highly localised'. In addition, insufficient evidence has been provided to suggest that the rates could go higher in terms of the margins of viability.
26. The seven main scheme scenario types tested do not sufficiently account for high-density residential led mixed-use schemes that incorporate retail floorspace (the maximum site coverage tested is only 200%). Here, the potential cumulative impact of the charging rates has not been addressed where the potential margin for CIL can be affected. This is of particular concern in relation to the 'remainder of the Borough', where both rates of £120 per sq. m for residential use and £60 per sq. m for retail floorspace can become chargeable.
27. The Council's response to this is that the VA that informed the rates was undertaken using well established and appropriately applied residual land valuation principles. The study tested the financial impact of conformity with the Council's Core Strategy and emerging Development Management Document (DMD) policies as detailed in the then Submission DMD, as well as other development costs in determining viable CIL rates for residential development in Enfield. The assessment work informed the development of the DMD document as well as the CIL proposals. In terms of residential development, the study assumed compliance with the Council's Core Strategy requirement that for developments of over 10 units, 40% of dwellings should be for affordable housing. Policy DMD 1 of the adopted DMD (CILSD-05) states that of this 40%, 30% should be intermediate housing and 70% social rent/affordable rent housing, as was tested.
28. I note that, for the area of the Borough where the higher CIL rate is proposed, residential rates could in fact have been set higher than the £120 per square metre proposed. This rate was set within the viability parameters so as to accommodate any local variations in property sales, land values and other factors that inherently vary from scheme to scheme. For value areas 4 – 7 which typify values in the west of the borough, the trial showed that a CIL rate of £120 per square metre represents just 2.5% to 3.33% of schemes' GDV. At

£140 per square metre the figures equated to between 2.92% and 3.89% of GDV. The proposed rates are within the percentage of GDV that is generally considered to be a good secondary indicator that a CIL rate is not excessive.

29. The Viability Market Update Report of October 2014 (document CIL-06) supplements and updates the market information provided in the VA undertaken in April 2013. The update shows that there had been a significant uplift in property values by approximately 15% as recorded by the Land Registry House Price Index since the original assessment was undertaken, and that this indicates a trend of improving stability and strength in the market. Whilst the future trajectory of the market is uncertain, there is a wide range of market reporting and forecasting supporting the reasonable possibility of a continued strong market in the coming few years.
30. As for points about mixed-use developments, the Council's Core Strategy and Area Action Plans make reference to such developments, particularly on potential development sites within or adjacent to town centres. However, these are an indication of the type of development envisaged - so as to encourage the consideration of mixed use developments in appropriate locations. This is a part of the general strategy approach but no specific mix, percentage splits of uses or other particular criteria, accompany these sites: the scenarios posed are currently high level and indicative.
31. My conclusion on all these matters is that the VA and the Council's balanced view on it is reasonable, and nothing raised suggests that the rates will prevent the majority of schemes within the highest value areas from going ahead.

Alma Estate Regeneration

32. Concern has been expressed about the impact of the CIL proposals on the viability of the Regeneration of the Alma Estate. The Alma Estate Regeneration project is located within the Council's North East Enfield strategic growth area and in the priority Regeneration Area of Ponders End. The site also occupies a key position in a wider growth area that includes the London-Stansted- Cambridge growth corridor and the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area. The draft North East Enfield Area Action Plan (NEAAP) identifies the Alma Estate as the flagship housing renewal project for the Council that is also anticipated to act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the wider Upper Lee Valley and Ponders End area. The Alma Estate has been identified by the Council's housing estate renewal strategy as one of the most unpopular estates in the borough, which is costly to maintain and suffers from structural defects.
33. The Representor has agreed with the Council to provide funding for community uses outside of the S106 obligations. This funding totals £480,000 (index linked). The scheme proposes the demolition of the existing Estate in a phased programme of decant, demolition and new build. The demolition includes four 21-storey tower blocks plus low-rise maisonettes, all of which will

require asbestos removal. When complete the scheme will provide a total of around 990 new homes, plus a new gym, retail units and a medical centre. The regeneration will also include the rebuilding of the Ponders End Youth Centre and Welcome Point Community Centre on South Street. Possible planning obligations for strategic and site-specific infrastructure for the Alma Estate include:

- Affordable Housing
- Transport / sustainable transport measures
- Education
- Climate change
- Health facilities and services
- Childcare
- Public realm provision
- Public art, culture and community infrastructure
- Business and employment initiative
- Built heritage
- Open space and recreation
- Green infrastructure and landscape
- Biodiversity
- Policing and fire and emergency services

34. A supporting viability assessment report has been submitted confidentially separately to the main representation document and this demonstrates that the proposed development cannot afford the proposed local CIL. In fact the assessment demonstrates that the scheme is currently unviable. The considerations that have justified zero-rating Meridian Water apply equally to the Alma Estate. Normally the CIL charge is intended to be deducted from the land value paid for sites, but here the land value agreed with the Council is based on the scheme's viability position – if the land value is calculated as nil without applying the CIL charge, there is nowhere to offset the CIL levy, which becomes an additional cost undermining the scheme's viability. The Draft CIL Charging Schedule should identify the Alma Estate as a specific zone subject to a Nil rate for residential and retail development.
35. The viability assessment report for the Alma Estate, referred to in paragraph 34 above was submitted to the Council, in the response to the consultation on the DCS, as "confidential". Since it was not a document in the public domain, it could not be provided to me. Nevertheless, I wrote to the Council saying that I would wish there to be exploration, with the Representor, of any means by which the general conclusions of the confidential assessment could be provided to me (and therefore in public), with perhaps the 'headline' outputs that might be published. I noted that, on a previous occasion, I have been provided with an officers' assessment of confidential viability evidence that was sufficient to enable me to place some reliance upon it. I asked that the Council assist in ensuring that I have the best evidence available for my deliberations. As a result, in due course, I was provided with a statement from the Council, informing me that the Representor had agreed to CIL calculations, (document ED-16), which were detailed to me. It is not necessary to set out

the results of these calculations in detail: it is sufficient for my report to record the following:

Phase	Mayoral CIL	Enfield LBC CIL	Total CIL
1A	£47,931	£91,884	£139,816
2A(i)	£0	£0	£0
2A(ii)	£63,945	£78,120	£142,066
2B	£23,985	£47,970	£71,956
3A	£16,081	£32,163	£48,245
3B	£72,998	£145,996	£218,994
4	£36,609	£73,219	£109,828
Total	£261,552	£469,355	£730,907

36. In fact, in all likelihood planning permission for Phase 1A of the development will be in place before the implementation of Enfield's CIL. This will reduce the total payable as Enfield CIL to £377,470, bringing the total CIL to £639,023. On the basis of these calculations the Representor agreed that the draft CIL charges accord with their CIL calculations.

Undercroft and multi-storey car parking

37. Representations propose that ancillary car parking in the form of undercroft and multi-storey car parking should be zero rated and, for the avoidance of doubt, be specifically mentioned within the charging schedule. In line with sustainable planning policies that promote the efficient use of land, developers are seeking to build schemes that are flexible and make the best use of land. Many operators will therefore explore potential options for providing car parking and will seek to incorporate undercroft or decked car parking within their scheme. It would prejudice the best and efficient use of land if these forms of ancillary parking were included within the gross internal area of commercial floorspace (employment, retail, sui generis uses) for CIL charging purposes. This has been acknowledged by an Examiner in his report on the examination for the draft Barnet CIL. A zero rating for ancillary undercroft/decked car parking should be specified within the CIL Charging Schedule.
38. The Council responds that schemes in Enfield are varied: open or other relatively inexpensive forms of car parking provision are generally expected to be provided on development schemes throughout the Plan period. Looking at the potential impact on viability of particular types of ancillary car parking provision, the Council's view is that in most cases the development receipts (including enhanced revenue as a result of the car parking provision) balance out and justify the particular type of provision selected. Furthermore, whilst basement car parking is expensive to construct and may be regarded as an abnormal construction cost, it is only likely to be brought forward where the overall sales or rental values justify it as part of the overall viability equation.

In terms of the viability of undercroft type ancillary car parking this is relatively inexpensive to provide, so the overall impact on viability is minimal. This is because such schemes generally result in an optimised density; an increased level of development achieved and value created and/or a lower land-take to achieve a similar level of development compared with traditional open car parking provision. It is also possible that increased security and other benefits can be achieved, to enhance a scheme's marketability and values.

39. I accept the Council's response as being reasonable, and I have nothing that provides evidence to the contrary. I do not see that there is any similarity within Enfield to the situation, as described to me, in Barnet. I see no justification for setting a separate Nil CIL rate for undercroft and multi-storey car parking.

Does the evidence demonstrate that the proposed charge rates would not put the overall development of the area at serious risk?

40. The Council's decision to have a matrix approach is based on reasonable assumptions about development values and likely costs. The evidence suggests that development will remain viable across most of the area if the charges are applied.

Conclusion

41. In setting the CIL charging rates the Council has had regard to detailed evidence on infrastructure planning and the economic viability evidence of the development market in the London Borough of Enfield. The Council has tried to be realistic in terms of achieving a reasonable level of income to address an acknowledged gap in infrastructure funding, while ensuring that a range of development remains viable across the authority's area.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
National Policy/Guidance	The Charging Schedule complies with national policy/guidance.
2008 Planning Act and 2010 Regulations (as amended)	The Charging Schedule complies with the Act and (subject to the modifications I recommend) the Regulations, including in respect of the statutory processes and public consultation, consistency with the adopted Core Strategy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan and is supported by an adequate financial appraisal.

42. I conclude that subject to the modifications set out in Appendix A the London Borough of Enfield Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule satisfies the requirements of Section 212 of the 2008 Act and meets the criteria for viability in the 2010 Regulations (as amended). I therefore recommend that the Charging Schedule be approved.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

Examiner

This report is accompanied by:

Appendices A and B (attached) – Modifications that the examiner specifies so that the Charging Schedule may be approved.

Appendix A

Modifications that the examiner specifies so that the Charging Schedule may be approved.

Modification number	Modification
EM1	Make the following amendments to the existing Draft Charging Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Delete the consultation section at the front of the document;ii) Delete the words "Proposed Draft" so that the title of the document reads "Enfield's CIL Charging Schedule";iii) Delete the sub section entitled "Schedule of Rates";iv) Delete the sub section entitled "Scope of CIL";v) Delete the sub section entitled "Payment

	<p>Instalments”;</p> <p>vi) Delete the sub section entitled “Discretionary Relief”;</p> <p>vii) Move section entitled “Statutory Compliance” to the beginning of the document;</p> <p>viii) Add National Grid lines to an Ordnance Survey base on Figure 1;</p> <p>ix) Add a reference to the Charging Schedule indicating that Figure 1 can be found and enlarged online at the Council’s website.</p>
EM2	Replace Figure 1 Residential Charging Zones boundaries Map with the version set out in Appendix B

Appendix B

The modified Figure 1 Residential Charging Zones boundaries Map that the examiner specifies so that the Charging Schedule may be approved.