

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
00007	Cheriton Parish Council	00007/00001/057	
Affordable housing should not be taxed.			
00009	Compton And Shawford Parish Council	00009/00001/056	
Option 1 should allow for provision of infrastructure in lieu of a financial contribution.			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00001/012	
All development should contribute to improving infrastructure prior to commencement of development.			
00015	Durley Parish Council	00015/00002/058	
All development should contribute to improving infrastructure prior to commencement of development.			
00089	Hampshire County Council	00089/00001/047	
Affordable housing should not contribute less towards school provision, as affordable family size housing tends to accommodate more children than market housing Our formula for calculating contributions already allow for a "normal" ration of affordable to market housing. Any discounting of affordable units would have to be offset by a premium for market units.			
00156	Mr Philip Ross	00156/00002/053	
There should be no exceptions because there is always somebody who is making a lot of money from all the developments.			
00381	Mr Paul Byers	00381/00001/048	
Perhaps some developers should give houses from the development to the council for allocation to young or key workers for the council to control to meet the local area needs.			
00415	Ms Laura Clarke	00415/00002/046	
Surely if option 2 is preferred the district would have to meet the costs			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
00511	Mr Keith Story	00511/00002/061	
All development puts a strain on infrastructure and it should be paid for. In addition to a financial contribution or tariff, all premises should be charged a business rate or council tax, including all student housing.			
01151	Mr C H Dore	01151/00002/051	
Make contributions in some way proportional to the environment credentials of the development so, for instance if the development stores and uses rain water for flushing toilets and clothes washing water, their assessment for infrastructure contribution reduces and the ongoing waste rates reduces for the homeowners.			
01265	Ms N A Holladay	01265/00002/063	
New models such as Community Land trusts will flourish (as they should) if they don't have to carry the same burden as housing association or private developers.			
01430	Mr John F T Harris	01430/00002/038	
Some infrastructure (e.g. Wickham, sewage works) must be completed before any development commences.			
01501	Revd David Simpson	01501/00005/053	
Where residents alone have control of the management, perhaps with support from City Council specialist advisor. In no circumstances should local government collude with developers in a way that can financially disadvantage local people for generations to come.			
01923	Captain John Ellis	01923/00001/065	
All projects must contribute to infrastructure costs/provision as they will all depend on/use that infrastructure.			
01929	Mr Anthony Marshall	01929/00001/057	
Government Funding			
01956	Mrs Barbara Holyome	01956/00002/063	
But exceptions be limited to affordable housing and should not be £ but a small % reduction in contribution.			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
01960	Mr Ian Merritt	01960/00001/063	
All forms of development impact the existing infrastructure, therefore all developments should pay for the upgrading that they will benefit from.			
01961	Mr Daniel Wilden	01961/00001/065	
As affordable housing is subsidised by new development and the taxpayer there seems little point requiring infrastructure contributions.			
01964	Mr John Beveridge	01964/00001/063	
Option 1 should be followed subject to special circumstances in which case lesser contributions may be possible if there are other clear public benefits in doing so which override the infrastructure provision.			
01968	Mr Barry Collins	01968/00001/037	
Since all development will increase the usage of, and thus the strain on existing facilities and infrastructure we see no reason why there should be exceptions for any kind of development.			
01973	Mr Ewan Simmonds	01973/00001/069	
I have no opinion on this.			
01989	Dr Keith Paskins	01989/00001/062	
Option 1 is a tax whereas option 2 should permit some more local government influence to direct developers towards needs rather than just profits. However, experience suggests that developers will find loopholes to distort this process unless the provisions are very carefully drafted.			
01994	Miss J Nicholson	01994/00001/065	
Should be paid for by the EU.			
01995	Mrs Diana Paskins	01995/00001/060	
Local government must influence developers towards needs rather than profit. The process will be distorted by developers finding loopholes. Provisions must be very carefully drafted to help young families and so the future of society.			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
01998	Mrs Susan English	01998/00001/042	
<p>Charitable/ non-profit making uses should also be excluded from contributions. Please note: On behalf of Winchester Gospel Halls Trust, we feel that it is very important that core documents include specific reference to places of worship. This could be covered by a reference to churches/ places of worship in a list of community uses. It is also very important that plans for SDA's and other major development areas have a requirement to consider need for places of worship.</p>			
01999	Mrs Barbara Garfath	01999/00001/061	
<p>Whether dwelling are affordable or not, there are still going to be a number of people adding to health, education and transport costs.</p>			
02003	Mr Ptol Slattery	02003/00001/072	
<p>Developers only choose exceptions if cheaper to developers- which means others must pay. "Per roof" tax would mean all development must pay.</p>			
02011	Mrs Elizabeth Hutchinson	02011/00001/032	
<p>It is important to establish guidelines but also to recognise that every site is different and needs to be addressed responsively not according to a rigid formula. Principles of good place making are essential, as is a sensitive approach to aiming to the highest environmental principles.</p>			
02017	Miss Diana Chierchia	02017/00001/052	
<p>I agree with a maximum of 1,500 to 2000 houses in order to solve the transport problems in Whiteley. For public health and safety there should be no more houses built until a new access road is constructed. Or at the very least, the houses should be built in conjunction with the new access road. Therefore area 1 would be the best area to develop to ensure there is a new access road.</p>			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02018	Mrs Janet Chierchia	02018/00001/051	
<p>Of the 3 proposed areas in Bishops Waltham, areas 1 (Albany Farm) or 2 (Priory Park) would be the best options because: 1. In area 2 there are already lots of community facilities (football pitches, community hall, play park) which could serve the new community very well. 2. In area 1 it is a little further from the centre but the allotments and green belt could serve the new community. 3. Meanwhile, in area 3 (Coppice Hill) is near a 50MPH speed limit and there is a question of the deer heritage site, which needs to be protected.</p>			
02049	Mrs Wendy Thorpe	02049/00001/053	
<p>Yes. Look at examples overseas. Developers could provide roads, lights and houses, but be required to leave spaces for surgeries, shops and business. These would be developed by those interested in putting them in place.</p>			
02070	Mr And Mrs Roger Hockin	02070/00001/060	
<p>And help pay for clearing up land pollution maybe. General comment: I have spent a lot of time completing this despite most people thinking noone will take a blind bit of notice of what we say. Go on, prove us wrong</p>			
02117	Persimmon Homes	02117/00001/027	Southern Plannin
<p>This should be considered on a site by site basis.</p>			
02123	Winchester College	02123/00001/025	Adams Hendry
<p>It is agreed that affordable housing schemes should not be required to contribute to infrastructure. Similarly, charitable bodies should only be required to fund those elements of physical infrastructure, in the absence of which development could not take place.</p>			
02174	Tichbourne Estate	02174/00001/046	Dreweatt Neate
<p>Developer contributions must have regard to the viability of development proposal. It is not appropriate to seek the same level of development contributions for a scheme involving the redevelopment of contaminated land, or the conversion of a listed building as would be sought from a Greenfield site.</p>			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02229	Gleeson Homes	02229/00001/067	Turley Associates
A flexible site by site approach should remain, taking into account site viability, existing infrastructure capacity and other material circumstances in the usual manner.			
02230	Knightspur Properties Ltd	02230/00001/019	Turley Associates
Flexibility is important and therefore the provision for exceptions to be made should feature in emerging policies.			
02237	Martineau Trustees	02237/00001/043	Dreweatt Neate
Developer contributions must have regard to the viability of development proposal. It is not appropriate to seek the same level of development contributions for a scheme involving the redevelopment of contaminated land, or the conversion of a listed building as sought from a Greenfield site.			
02238	Holmes And Sons	02238/00001/048	Dreweatt Neate
Developer contributions must have regard to the viability of development proposal. It is not appropriate to seek the same level of development contributions for a scheme involving the redevelopment of contaminated land, or the conversion of a listed building as would be sought from a greenfield site.			
02239	Trustees Of E M Toogood Settlement	02239/00001/048	Dreweatt Neate
Developer contributions must have regard to the viability of development proposal. It is not appropriate to seek the same level of development contributions for a scheme involving the redevelopment of contaminated land, or the conversion of a listed building as would be sought from a greenfield site.			
02374	Campaign To Protect Rural England (CPRE)	02374/00001/066	
Exemptions risk exploitation by any developer seeking just to cut costs or minimise their responsibilities. A risky planning strategy, worth avoiding.			
02377	Mr Colin Penfold	02377/00001/054	
Any deviation to option 1 should only be done based on earlier. 1. A local referendum 2. ALI local councillors in affected area standing for re-election			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02385	Mrs Elisabeth Hopson	02385/00001/065	
Why would you want developers to profit even more than they do already			
02403	Mrs Pat Mann	02403/00001/057	
Again, not enough information to enable an informed reply.			
02415	Ms Kelsie Learney	02415/00001/050	
Exceptions only in very limited circumstances.			
02416	Mr David Thompson	02416/00001/050	
Affordable housing should be partially exempt from developer contributions.			
02417	Mr Dennis Curling	02417/00001/053	
Whilst option 1 will provide the best solution, it should also recognise that someone just wanting to build his own home, i.e. 1 off property, is not a developer. They should be an exception and excluded from any tariff imposed. Whereas all developers including those providing affordable housing should contribute to the infrastructure tariff.			
02421	Ms Catherine Macintosh	02421/00001/034	
The guidelines for the exceptions would need to be clearly set out.			
02428	Mrs Christine Gardner	02428/00001/039	
Don't develop any more green fields or back gardens.			
02430	Mr Roger Challis	02430/00001/054	
Must be strictly policed to ensure exceptions are the exception and only where the social benefit is disproportionately high.			
02435	Mr William Stroud	02435/00001/049	
If development is to be truly sustainable then all costs should be borne by the developer. If there is an uneconomic development proposed for the public good, then local people should be given the opportunity to vote for it and raise an additional local tax. I would prefer a lower basic Community Charge and the opportunity to pledge a proportion of the additional tax to specific local projects.			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02445	Mr David Roger-Jones	02445/00001/031	
Possible exemption for Housing Associations & Trusts but not for commercial developers' schemes.			
02454	Mr David Phillips	02454/00001/061	
The problem with option 2 is that whatever you build someone has to pay for the necessary services. It has to be the person or persons who will eventually use the services. Tax payers who buy their own houses already pay huge amounts of tax to support those who won't support themselves. No one objects to supporting those who cannot support themselves, or to assist essential workers, but where housing associations are involved in the provision of affordable housing then they should meet all the upfront costs involved in the provision of affordable housing.			
02469	Mr A Digby	02469/00001/056	
All housing, regardless of type or affordability represent a net drain (consumption) on local infrastructure resources.			
02500	Mrs Heather Smith	02500/00001/054	
Developers are in the game to make money therefore they should all contribute.			
02558	Mr Kevin Andreoli	02558/00001/045	
Provision of a large percentage of affordable housing. Presentation of a football pitch size area of land.			
02565	Mr Alfred Witham	02565/00001/054	
I seem to detect a wish to bribe developers to provide so called affordable housing. They should simply be obliged to do so as part of the accepted planning principles.			
02626	Mrs Sandra Harris	02626/00001/051	
Infrastructure in Wickham must be completed before any new development begins. Sewage is a problem in the village with heavy rain and any new development would only make the problem worse			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02630	Mr Robert Shepherd	02630/00001/035	
<p>This is quite a long and tedious questionnaire, in my opinion not user friendly to all who may like to express their views and opinions. As there is no general comments section, I can only comment here near the end.</p>			
02635	Mr Chris Benham	02635/00001/022	
<p>It is inappropriate to identify exceptions where developments do not need to contribute any kind of developer contribution. The IOCS suggests this might be appropriate for schemes such as affordable housing. This fails to recognise the needs that will arise from occupiers of affordable housing for open space, school places, etc. This requirement for services and infrastructure from occupiers would arise irrespective of tenure of the housing. This would be likely to result in pressure to secure alternative funding such as by increasing the proportion of financial contributions from other forms of development. This would be inequitable. Whilst there might be a small number of specific circumstances where a lower than standard provision is requested (such high development costs which undermine the economic viability of a scheme) these should be assessed on a case-by-case basis having regard to the individual circumstances. It would not however be appropriate to defined specific allowances within a development plan document. The Core Strategy should not allow exceptions to the need to contribute to the requisite infrastructure provision reasonably arising from developments.</p>			
02662	Mrs Lynda Banister	02662/00001/059	
<p>I could not support option 2 because the infrastructure is still necessary and the costs would presumably fall back on LAs who may not provide it.</p>			
02663	Mr Nigel Dollery	02663/00001/055	
<p>But this option need a firm hand.</p>			
02665	Mr Martin Burton	02665/00001/048	
<p>If you allow exceptions then it will be exploited by developers. The tariff system can be structured to protect affordable housing. Who will decide the tariff, will there be public consultation on this, a major issue</p>			
02764	Mr Graham Mulholland	02764/00001/056	
<p>Alternatively based upon the benefits of the housing being provided such as sustainability, green methods of construction, renewable heat, grey water etc.</p>			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
02923	North Whiteley Consortium	02923/00001/053	Terence O'Rourk
<p>The LPA should reduce the thresholds but flexibility is required whereby developers of larger schemes should be given the option of off setting any significant strategic infrastructure against any affordable housing obligations.</p>			
02924	Mrs Helen Field	02924/00001/054	
<p>Why should they They make enough profits that is only right that they should put money back into the infrastructure.</p>			
02930	Mrs Jacey Jackson	02930/00001/040	
<p>There is no where else I have seen to make the point as advised by Stephen Whetnall - These are my preliminary views. I have not finally made up my mind on any of the options presented and I will consider further information arising out of the consultation process. Also the next page asks if I would like to be kept informed of this Campaign. That implies a particular (political) ambition or way forward. I sincerely hope that the consultation process is a real and open consultation without any pre-determined outcome.</p>			
02932	Mr Jonathan Simmons	02932/00001/070	
<p>Developers look set to become filthy rich as a result of this spatial "strategy". Make them pay!</p>			
02941	Mr Piers Austin	02941/00001/064	
<p>Otherwise, where is the money going to come from Look at worsening trends in our economy, which is basically broke, and the enormous stupid waste of money our incumbent government embarks on. Iraq war how much has that cost us, the Olympics was not a good idea and is going to break out back. We have lost the plot, Metronet, Railtrack, too late on more Nuclear Power, Severn Tidal Barrage to meet climate change and the energy gap etc.</p>			
02993	Tesco Stores Limited	02993/00001/013	DPP
<p>The local development framework should fully consider viability to ensure the benefit of investment is not threatened. To the detriment of the community.</p>			

Question 25b. Are there any suitable alternative approaches to allow exceptions to developer contributions for infrastructure?

<b>Customer Reference</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Reference</b>	<b>Agent</b>
03029	Mr Robert Toleman	03029/00001/027	
<p>All irrelevant in the circumstance, if the council who we elect listen to the people who put them into power. Remember, any large extent of building, can never be removed in the future. Proceed only with the greatest care - no one has the right to destroy the environment of the majority of existing residents.</p>			
03071	Mr John Hayter	03071/00001/073	
<p>Any exception is normal and should only apply to affordable housing and should be used to maximise affordable housing provision.</p>			
03199	Sport England (South East Region)	03199/00001/014	
<p>All developments should make a contribution unless there is a clear and robust case to be made otherwise. All residential development of a net increase of one or more dwellings require sport and open space provision and therefore a development size threshold should not be included within a tariff system.</p>			