
FW: S.15/0476/OUT Littlecombe community infrastructure

Geoff Wheeler <geof.wheeler@btinternet.com>

Wed, Nov 18, 2015 at 7:28 PM

To: Adrian Judge <adrian@chantrycentre.org>, Chris Lambert <chris@chantrycentre.org>

Adrian, Chris,

FYI.

The Chantry Centre meets the criteria given below. Dursley Town Council have also received this e-mail. They know that the Chantry Centre should among the projects to be listed, but it would be good to confirm that,

Geoff.

From: John.Longmuir@stroud.gov.uk [mailto:John.Longmuir@stroud.gov.uk]**Sent:** 17 November 2015 16:53**To:** clerk@camparishcouncil.gov.uk; John Kay <clerk@dursleytowncouncil.gov.uk>**Cc:** Krista.Harris@stroud.gov.uk; nick.gardiner@stroud.gov.uk**Subject:** S.15/0476/OUT Littlecombe community infrastructure

I am conscious that time is creeping on following our meeting in mid October and the decision notice will have to be issued soon.

£355,000 is identified in the legal undertaking for community projects. That has been agreed and not in dispute. However we do need to list the projects which will be eligible to comply with the CIL regulations

I thought it would be helpful to explain the legal parameters of CIL. As I have explained before this new regime has moved the goal posts. Previously a Section 106 could be flexible and open, leaving projects to come forward. Nowadays it is more onerous. We have to name specific projects and they have to be justifiable.

Paragraph 122 of the CIL Regulations states that the project must be “necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms”, “directly related to the development”, “fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development”.

Assuming that there are competing project(s), priority needs to be given to those which relate best to Littlecombe. What will serve the needs of the new residents. Projects that are closest/most accessible should be prioritised. Similarly projects which deliver a widespread social need for new residents. For example performing the same function as a village hall. Obscure or unusual facilities that only serve a selective few would be less justifiable in contrast to a general facility will cater for more. Need will also come

into the picture. Indeed originally a community hall was envisaged at Littlecombe itself (which is similar to approaches at Coopers Edge, Hunts Grove and West of Stonehouse). This was dropped as it was felt better to expand facilities off site.

Please can I ask both Parishes to reach a conclusion on the project(s) that should be listed in the undertaking.

I hope this is helpful. Krista and I are happy to advise.

John

The information included in this e-mail is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Disclosure to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive privilege or confidentiality.