- 1 This Addendum has been produced because we received additional information by an email link from SNDC officer Tim Horspole on Friday 17th May at 1740.
- 2 The additional information is the SNDC Cabinet report on CIL" Consideration of Examiner's Report and Recommendations to the CIL Charging Schedule for South Norfolk", now available at http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/CARMS/meetings/cab2013-05-07ag05.pdf. This report relates to bullet points 20-23 of our submission.
- 3 We wish to draw the Inspector's attention to these two paragraphs in the above report.
 - **2.6.5.** "If there is a material shortfall in the anticipated yield from CIL, then the infrastructure projects of partners in the GNDP may need to be re-prioritised and re-ordered both in terms of local projects within each Council area and those strategic elements that contribute to the whole JCS. Some previously identified projects may not be affordable."
 - **5.6.** "The GNDP published a draft infrastructure list, schedule and framework in August 2012 as a background document to the Examination. From this, each district partner in the GNDP will need to clarify its own S123 Infrastructure list. Determining the extent to which these will be re-ordered in the light of the reduction in the proposed charging schedule and, in turn the order in which projects/authorities will receive funds as monies are received from developers, is to require clarification and discussion. Once the level of CIL is known, The Environment, Regulation and Growth Policy Sub-Committee felt that agreements relating to the order of priority between the various GNDP Councils and between local and strategic projects should be made to give clarity and avoid uncertainty and are, in any event, desirable in the interests of good governance."
- 4 These paragraphs support our bullet point 20 that there is and will be insufficient money for the JCS infrastructure. Crucially, the SNDC report suggests the need for local JCS infrastructure projects *to be re-prioritised and re-ordered within each Council area*. SNDC, therefore, believe that the CIL shortfall has implications across the Broadland area and including the NEGT.
- 5 The report also identifies the need for those strategic elements that contribute to the whole JCS to be reviewed, and that some previously identified projects may not be affordable. This also has implications for the Broadland area and for the NEGT, and for the soundness of the JCS.
- 6 Both points support our bullet point 23 where we state <u>the JCS is not sound in terms of</u> <u>infrastructure delivery</u>, and that before the JCS is adopted, the GNDP Councils should be required to instigate a review of the LIPP, followed by a further public Inquiry.
- 7 We also note, from the SNDC document, that another version of a draft infrastructure list was in circulation in August 2012 for the Inspection of Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules. We suggest that the Inspector should ascertain if this version is the same as the most recent LIPP (Version 4.1, published Feb 2012), or is yet another variant.

8 We also remind the Inspector that bullet 13, third bullet of our submission notes "The Postwick Hub junction [T2a] is estimated at £19m in the JCS and £15.5m in the LIPP." We have since noted that there is currently a consultation "Growth Triangle Area Action Plan Issues and Options (Reg 18) Options Consultation Draft" which contains a Growth Triangle Framework Plan Study (Sept 2011) study document [http://www.broadland.gov.uk/PDF/Growth_triangle_study_rdcd_red.pdf] and that this document also uses the £15.5m figure. The public is, therefore, currently being consulted on the basis of a set of infrastructure costs which do not agree with the costings in the JCS. Clarification is needed from the GNDP and should the information in the current consultation be erroneous, appropriate corrective action is needed.

Councillor Andrew Boswell, Norwich Green Party, May 20th 2013