

BY POST AND E-MAIL ldf@haringey.gov.uk

Our Ref: JNS/6349
Direct dial: 020 7832 1395
Email: john.smith@cgms.co.uk

Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation
Planning Policy
6th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
N22 8HQ

14 June 2013

Dear Sirs

**REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE MAYOR'S OFFICE FOR
POLICING AND CRIME/METROPOLITAN POLICE SERVICE**

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE
LEVY
DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE CONSULTATION INFRASTRUCTURE
DELIVERY PLAN UPDATE**

I write on behalf of our client, the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service (MOPAC/MPS), with regard to the Council's consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule and updated Draft Community Infrastructure Plan (CIP).

The MOPAC/MPS provide a vital community service to Haringey and it is essential that the required community infrastructure, such as policing, comes forward in line with development in order to maintain safety and security in the Borough.

Policy context to representations

These representations should be read alongside those submitted in relation to the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule dated 17 September 2012 (attached) which contained details of the policy context which we do not wish to repeat.

CIL Draft Charging Schedule

Table 2 within Section 7 sets out the Draft Charging Schedule. The approach is that whilst office, industrial and warehouse uses are proposed to be charged a nil rate, all other uses which includes both sui generis and D Class uses, will be charged £50.

This would impact on future operational policing floorspace. Much of this is similar in function to B Class uses but are classed sui generis, including police stations and patrol bases. An extract from the Land Use Gazetteer is attached for information to highlight this. It would also impact on any training facilities proposed within the Borough since D Class would be liable.



140 London Wall
London EC2Y 5DN

Tel: 020 7583 6767
Fax: 020 7583 2231

www.cgms.co.uk

Offices also at:
Birmingham, Cheltenham,
Dorset, Edinburgh,
Kettering, Manchester,
Newark



By being subject to a CIL payment, policing floorspace would be prejudiced in being able to provide essential policing facilities contrary to the objectives of the NPPF, London Plan and Core Strategy. It is therefore essential that CIL is not payable for new policing floorspace in the Borough which would take funding away from frontline policing.

Section 216 of the Planning Act 2008 highlights that regulations can add, remove or vary the list of matters included within the meaning of infrastructure. The DCLG 'Community Infrastructure Levy: An Overview' document (May 2011) at paragraph 12 highlights that police stations and other community safety facilities are infrastructure. Emergency Services including policing is listed in the Haringey Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There is therefore no doubt that policing is therefore infrastructure.

Consequently in providing community infrastructure (i.e. new policing facilities) which would attract a CIL liability, the MPS contribution to community infrastructure would effectively be double counted – on the one hand being charged CIL whilst on the other being a potential beneficiary. The provision of new floorspace is generally a consolidation of the estate therefore there is no greater impact on infrastructure than existing.

Such an approach has been adopted elsewhere:

- the Bristol CIL Charging Schedule lists 'Residential and Non-residential Institutions (Classes C2, C2A, D1) and development by the emergency services for operational purposes' as attracting £0 CIL rate/m²
- The Huntingdonshire District Council CIL states that Business (B1), General Industrial, Storage & Distribution (B2 and B8), Community Uses (provided by the public, not-for-profit or charitable sectors)(within D1 - except Health Uses - and D2) and Agricultural attract a nil rate.

In relation to London Boroughs:

- Brent's CIL Charging Schedule lists Police station and police facilities (Sui Generis) as attracting a zero charge; and
- the London Boroughs of Barnet, Sutton, Harrow, Haringey, Merton, Wandsworth and Newham amongst others all propose a nil rate for uses that would include policing facilities

For the above reasons, the MOPAC/MPS strongly recommend that the Submission Version ensures that applications or development for policing attract a nil rate in the Charging Schedule.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update

Section 12 of the IDP Update refers to Emergency Services, with paragraphs 12.1 – 12.4 relating to Policing.

Paragraph 12.1 states that the Council met with the Borough Commanders or their representatives at which asset plans were discussed. We are not aware of any such meetings taking place although this may have been direct with the Borough Commander.

Paragraph 12.2 refers to recent GLA announcements in relation to emergency services provision. Paragraph 12.3 discusses the temporary patrol facilities at Quicksilver Place, Western Road, whilst paragraph 12.4 mentions the Asset Management Plan 2007 and the policing facility at Wood Green Police Station no longer including a patrol base.

We would firstly highlight that the Haringey Asset Management Plan has now been replaced. However the MOPAC / MPS have recently adopted the following which should be referred to within the IDP:

- Police and Crime Plan
(<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/PoliceCrimePlan%202013-16.pdf>)
- Estate Strategy 2013-2016
(http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MOPAC%20Estates%20Strategy_0.PDF)
- The Local Police Estate and Public Access document for Haringey
(http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Haringey_1.pdf)

These strategies are seeking better and more accessible facilities for community policing and exiting older properties which are no longer fit for purpose and inefficient to maintain. The latter sets out the future public estate within the borough. It highlights that the existing facilities at Tottenham Police Station will not meet longer term policing needs and a replacement Police Station will be provided with appropriate public access and deployment. This is one particular example why policing facilities should be exempt from CIL. As things stand the proposed facility would be liable for Borough based CIL and given the likely scale of the proposals would draw a substantial charge that would be taken away from front line policing at a time when significant cost savings are sought.

I trust that this is acceptable and the objectives of the MOPAC / MPS will be reflected in the forthcoming documents. Please do not hesitate to contact Matthew Roe or me should you have any queries or require any further information.

Yours faithfully



John N. Smith
Senior Associate Director