

# MONARD STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT ZONE

## Development Contribution Scheme



2 July 2015

CORK COUNTY COUNCIL



## **Contribution Scheme for Monard SDZ**

Under the Planning Acts, a planning authority can make one or more Development Contribution Schemes, in respect of different parts of its functional area<sup>1</sup>. Until now, the General Development Contribution Scheme adopted in 2004 has applied to all parts of Cork County, and a Supplementary Contribution Scheme for the Cobh/Midleton – Blarney Suburban Rail Project also applies to areas within 1 kilometre of the rail line, including the southern part of Monard SDZ.

A new General Contribution Scheme - to apply to Monard SDZ only – was adopted in 2012 in parallel with the 2012 Monard SDZ Planning Scheme, because

- development costs in Monard differed widely from those in other parts of County Cork.
- creating a new town through an SDZ Planning Scheme in a previously undeveloped area involves a radically different development process, to which a contribution scheme drafted with incremental expansion of pre-existing settlements in mind would not have been appropriate.
- new items were added to the types of infrastructure which can be funded by a General Contribution Scheme in 2010<sup>2</sup>, and several of these have more than usual relevance in a new town project.

This revised Contribution Scheme takes account of changes affecting development contributions which have occurred since 2012, including the transfer of responsibility for water services other than storm water to Irish Water, the consequent reduction in the amounts charged under the Council's 2004 General Contribution Scheme from the end of 2013 onwards, and the 2013 Development Contributions Guidelines.

### **(A) Development Costs in Monard**

This Scheme has the advantage of being prepared in parallel with the Planning Scheme for Monard SDZ, which provides projections of future development, population and infrastructure needs in more detail than is usually available for a Contribution Scheme.

Table 1 indicates expected costs to public bodies and to the County Council of the various types of infrastructure listed in s.48.17 of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2010 in Monard.

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning and Development Act, 2000, s.48.2(a)

<sup>2</sup> Planning and Development Amendment Act, 2010, s.30(b)

**Table 1 Estimated Infrastructure Costs for Monard SDZ**

Sub-section, s.48.17	Type of public infrastructure	Expected net cost (€m)
(a)	Acquisition of land (excl. (b), (g))	1.5
(b)	Open spaces, recreation, community facilities and landscaping	2.5
	Advance planting grant scheme	0.24
(c)	Roads	16.9
(d)	Car parking	0.25
	Flood relief works	1.1
	Public transport, cycle and pedestrian facilities, traffic calming	2
(e)	Refurbishment or upgrading of existing infrastructure	4.7
(f)	Broadband	0.45
(g)	School sites	0.85
Total		30.49

Seeking to raise the full amount indicated in Table 1 poses some difficulties. At present, there would be a risk that the higher level of contributions needed to fully cover expected development costs in Monard would deter development there, through its effect in squeezing development land values and builders margins.

However, Monard is different from edge of town greenfield land. Even if the latter is unzoned and unserviced, this may change, and landowners' expectations are influenced by the value of adjacent zoned and serviced land. In areas such as Monard which have no realistic prospect of urban development in the absence of an overall package of infrastructure investment such as that set out in the SDZ Planning Scheme, landowners reserve prices might reasonably be expected to be somewhat lower.

In the longer term, recovery in either real or nominal property values (or both) is likely, and an increase in contributions at that stage would be reasonable, particularly in view of the unusual extent to which Monard requires new infrastructure, for development to be possible there. However, it would be desirable for this Contribution Scheme for Monard to have some built-in ability to respond to market conditions.

The way in which this can be achieved is outlined in section (F) below. This follows a description of the approach to setting contribution rates which is appropriate in the context of a completely new town - in the broad context set by the established policies of Cork County Council – in sections (B) – (E).

## **(B) Differences in Development Process**

The development and planning processes which will apply in the SDZ will involve an unusually strong need for:

- (a) **Networks:** The historical pattern of development in Cork's satellite towns involved incremental expansion along existing roads radiating out from the town centre. Blocks of farmland close to the centre were typically developed from the surrounding perimeter roads inwards, so housing estates ended up back to back when they met in the middle of the block. This often resulted in a layout which encouraged driving and discouraged walking and cycling, but convergence of the existing road system on the town centre partly compensated for this.

Even if this type of solution were acceptable in a planned new town and SDZ, it would not work in Monard, because there is only one – very large – developable block of farmland there, with no internal road system, other than two single track boreens. The two roads on the edge of the developable area converge on Blackpool, not on any existing centre or cross roads in the SDZ. The Planning Scheme therefore has to create a town centre (and local service centres), and ensure that the planned transport networks converge on them.

The developable part of Monard also slopes south and west towards the Old Mallow Road, and foul and storm drainage will also have to fall in that direction, from residential areas which will be up to 1 km away from it. This again requires the creation of networks internal to the existing large block of farmland.

- (b) **Substantial (but variable) proportions of sites for community, recreation and amenity uses:** Monard needs schools, playing fields, and linear open spaces which allow creation of attractive cycle and pedestrian routes in addition to their amenity value, and advance planting of tree belts.

The Council's Recreation and Amenity Policy uses a points system to encourage developers to provide – say - playing fields, without necessarily indicating which development sites should make provision for them, or where they should go. The points system is used to equalise the recreational and amenity obligations of different developers, and allows for a majority of these obligations to be met by financial contribution if so desired. This solution needs modification to suit Monard, because

- for some community uses, Monard has only limited areas which are suitable
- an SDZ Planning Scheme needs to be specific on where large users of land are located
- the facilities need to be in Monard itself, not in some other settlement in the general area

- Monard requires a larger than normal amount of landscaped areas, because of the substantial proportion of the SDZ which is elevated and prominent
- Specifying where extensive recreational and other public uses should go within the SDZ will result in variations in the proportion of landholdings required for such uses. It is important that landowners or developers who are providing a higher than normal proportion of their sites for such uses do not feel that they are at a disadvantage, relative to adjoining landowners. Some substitute for the equalisation process offered by the points system will therefore be needed.

### **(C). New Forms of Infrastructure of Special Relevance to Monard**

While it is quite complicated and expensive to provide comprehensive ducting for **broadband** in an existing settlement, it is simple in a new town, as almost all roads will be new ones, and the necessary trenches can be dug and ducts laid as part of the process of constructing them. Requiring ducts to connect to each house as it is built is also a practical proposition. The main fibre optic cable providing trunk connections from Cork to Dublin and to places outside Ireland runs along the adjoining rail line, which will facilitate a high quality broadband service for Monard, and should be a source of competitive advantage for it. This trunk cable, and the cable connecting Cork and Blarney and running along the N20, could be connected to a loop laid along the service corridor, allowing onwards connection by developers to the various neighbourhoods.

It is also easier to apply the **Sustainable Urban Drainage** approach in a new town, as this allows SUDS principles to be implemented for the full length of a channel for surface water through a settlement, and the necessary works are simpler and more economic in undeveloped areas. Monard is upstream of settlements which have a history of flooding, and they will need to be protected from any increase in flood risk arising from its development.

A new town is particularly dependent on timely provision of **schools**. It is envisaged that the first primary school site will be provided to the Department of Education at cost on land to be acquired by the County Council. Availability of sites for the other three primary schools could be promoted by including them in an equalisation scheme, with this incentive reinforced by a provision making housing development in specified areas contingent prior construction of the primary schools serving them. As the proposed secondary school is likely to be provided only when substantial population growth has occurred in Monard, and is on a site detached which will not benefit from housing development, collection of a contribution towards the costs of this site would be appropriate.

Where possible, tree planting needs to occur well in advance of construction. As a way of encouraging early allocation of land for amenity planting - and thus improving the appearance of new development in Monard in challenging topography – **tree planting grants** are proposed, at a similar level to those offered by the Department of

Agriculture for forestry, taking account of the fact that trees planted for amenity rather than timber production would not be eligible for Department grants. This incentive would allow for the fact that almost all the land in the SDZ is owned by farmers, and that while they may make large development gains on their land in the longer term, they are likely to continue to run their farms as a business in the interim.

## **(D) Equalisation through Extension of the Recreational and Amenity Policy**

The contribution regime for Monard thus needs to

- (i) include a form of equalisation, which reflects differences in the proportion of a landholding or development site provided for recreational, amenity or community facilities, including school sites
- (ii) encourage the connection of infrastructure provided by developers on their own sites into networks
- (iii) include broadband, SUDS and advance tree planting as forms of infrastructure in the Scheme

The Council's existing Recreational and Amenity Policy awards points for the type of recreational facilities which include significant construction works, as well as requiring land. Specifically, it allocates points to different types of hard surfaced play areas, courts, playing pitches and community buildings. The points available for these facilities were based on estimated construction cost, plus the land required, with the latter valued at €250,000 per acre (€618,000 per hectare).

The Council's Recreation and Amenity Policy has been in operation since 2006. Some useful experience was gained in its operation before development largely came to a halt in 2009. It may be regarded either as a requirement on the form of new development, or as a form of contribution in kind. The latter aspect was highlighted by provision for converting part of it into a monetary payment, at the rate cited above.

The additional facilities which need to be brought within the remit of the Recreational and Amenity Policy in Monard include school sites, passive open space, linear open spaces containing cycle and pedestrian routes, and SUDS features. The works which a developer is expected to carry out in providing such facilities are more limited than for those qualifying for points under the existing Policy. They involve less or no hard structures, and works which are less intensive, relative to the area of land involved. The main need to supplement the existing Policy arises from the value of the land for such facilities, rather than the cost of the works.

To allow for inclusion of these additional facilities, points will be allowed for the provision of land for them, and there will be a balancing increase in the number of points required, from one point per 6 dwellings to one point per 5 dwellings. To avoid double counting, land used by developers to accommodate the facilities already listed under the existing Recreation and Amenity Policy, or in buffer areas around them, cannot be counted again, and only community land in excess of the 12-18% of site area already required for open space under the existing Recreational and Amenity Policy will be eligible.

Equalisation will be achieved by reimbursing developers who qualify for more than 1 point for every 5 dwellings in Monard for the excess, on the principle that this recognises their contribution in kind to the infrastructure needs of the wider Monard development. They would thus be entitled to a reduction in the aggregate contribution charged. Conversely, those providing community land equivalent to less than 1 point per 5 dwellings would be regarded as benefitting from community land provided outside their site by other developers, which the Council would be paying for, in making this reimbursement. Their contribution would thus include an additional element to reflect this.

Land is recognised in s.48 of the Planning and Development Act as one of the items for which charges can be made in a General Contribution Scheme, as are all the items for which points can be allocated under the 2006 Recreational and Amenity Policy. This makes it possible to integrate the General Contribution Scheme for Monard with a wider version of the Recreation and Amenity Policy, and to make provision in the Scheme for charges and reimbursement, depending on whether the applicant has more or fewer points than the modified Policy requires.

Drastic changes in values since 2008 have drawn attention to the limitations of fixing costs to developers in absolute amounts. The high land content of the items to some of the facilities already covered by the Recreation and Amenity Policy, and also some of those which it is proposed to add to it, raises the question of whether the system could take more account of fluctuations in land values. Development land values vary in line with - but more widely than – average house prices<sup>3</sup>, while construction costs are also influenced by the housing market, but vary less widely than house prices.

In order to value points at levels which are more realistic than a fixed value in the particular housing market in which contributions have to be paid or reimbursed, their value will be linked to house prices. The effect of using house prices to index the value of points is illustrated in Table 2 below, using average prices in at the top of the market in 2006 (the year the Recreation and Amenity points system was initiated) and at the bottom of the market in 2012.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is because land value rises as a proportion of (rising) new house prices during booms, and the reverse in downturns



**Table 2 Effect of varying the financial value of points to reflect house prices**

	Value per point (€)	Value per ha of land (€)	Points equivalent of land value per ha	Average House price	Points equivalent of average house price
Points and Values used in Recreation and Amenity Policy, 2006	18,800	618,000	33	305,000 <sup>4</sup>	16
<i>Effect of adjusting values in line with average house prices, 2006-January 2012</i>	<i>10,600</i>	<i>349,800</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>172,000<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>16</i>

Table 3 indicates the points value for recreation and amenity facilities, as indicated in the existing Recreation and Amenity Policy, and for other community use of land, with these values to be incorporated into the Monard General Contribution Scheme. A lower land value is used for steep areas, which would have a lower development value, and for land for schools sites, where it is expected that a purchase price will be paid for the land, but that this would be less than full development value.

‘Additional works’ – designated cycle/pedestrian routes - are also included in Table 3, because of their special importance in Monard. They are expressed as ‘additional works’ to indicate that they are estimated net of land, and that claiming points for their construction does not prevent developers from also claiming for the land on which they are carried out as ‘additional land’.

Reimbursement in respect of surplus points cannot exceed the amount chargeable under other parts of the General Contribution Scheme, and cannot result in a contribution of less than zero (ie a net payment from the Planning Authority to the developer).

The method used to determine whether a planning application qualifies for points in excess of requirement would involve showing a red line around a part of the (large scale) layout drawing containing the required points and 18% open space. The applicant would be entitled to be compensated for any further points value outside that line.

<sup>4</sup> The average new house price nationally was the same as in Cork in 2006 (Annual Bulletin of Housing Statistics, 2006).

<sup>5</sup> Adjustment to 2006 values using CSO Residential Property Price Index (national – all residential properties).

**Table 3 Modified Points for use in Monard SDZ**

Points Value of Items	Points	Comments
Neighbourhood Play Area	1	Minimum provision – 1 per 100 dwellings
Local Play Area	3	Minimum provision – 1 per 300 dwellings
District Play Area	6	Minimum provision – 1 of each, to adjoin town centre, and each of the 3 village centres
Multi-Use Games Area	6	
Double Tennis Court	7	Space for provision of at least 2 more courts must adjoin
Grassed Pitch	42	Specified development conditional on provision of 4-5 pitches
Dressing Rooms	6	
Community (1) - basketball	23	Calculation of points value of other recreational buildings (eg gyms, squash courts, swimming pools/leisure centres, theatre/arts centres, youth clubs) to use same methodology
Community (2) - badminton	58	
Additional Land (1) – per ha	33	Recreational and Amenity Land in excess of 18% of site and of the area needed to accommodate other facilities for which points are claimed or in buffer areas around them. Areas with gradients of 1 in 5 or steeper should be excluded from calculation of 18% of the site, and from additional land (1) or (2).
Additional Land (2) – per ha	16	School sites
Additional Works – Cycle and Pedestrian routes (per km)	14	Applies only to routes designated in Figures 2.4 and 5.11 in the Monard SDZ Planning Scheme

While the minimum of 30% of the points value provided in kind (with the remainder as a contribution) will be continue to be allowed in Monard in cases where the Council is satisfied the developer is clearly very constrained spatially, in most cases the Council will be seeking most or all of the points requirement to be provided in the form of facilities, and will not accept the 30% minimum as adequate. This provision reflects the greater than normal proportion of land within the SDZ which has been designated for open space

### **(E) Creation of Networks**

The proposed layout for Monard has been designed to facilitate connection of infrastructure provided by developers on their own sites into overall networks serving the SDZ area as a whole. Creating these networks would involve much greater public cost, if developers do not take the principal roads, sewers, swales, linear open spaces and pedestrian and cycle routes to the boundary of their property, as the Council would probably have to acquire land to fill ‘missing links’. The Council would have to recoup such costs from developers through higher contributions, raising the financial cost of development to them.

For this reason, it will be a condition of all relevant permissions within the SDZ, that the developer shall provide all such infrastructure to or through the boundary of the site, so that owners of adjoining lands in which the Planning Scheme envisages further development can connect to it from their own property free of charge, and that the development, occupation or sale of a specified part of the permitted development cannot occur until this has been done.

If the ownership of landholdings currently in a single ownership became fragmented after publication of the Draft Planning Scheme, in such a way that developable blocks of land became separated from each other by land reserved for amenity uses and in the ownership of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party, the same need for acquisition of land by the Council is likely to arise. For this reason, a higher rate of contributions will be charged in cases where permission is granted, but the Council is not satisfied that infrastructure on the subject site can be connected to adjacent developable land in accordance with the intentions of the Planning Scheme, without acquisition of land in the ownership of 3<sup>rd</sup> party.

It is estimated that if the Monard SDZ were developed without being able to rely on the infrastructure being provided by individual developers being connected up into networks, the public costs involved would be around 50% higher. Accordingly, an additional charge equal to 50% of the overall contribution which would apply under the General Scheme, prior to the deduction of any reductions or reimbursements, will be made if permission were granted. If, however, the Council considered a proposed development was not consistent with the SDZ Planning Scheme, it would be obliged to refuse permission in accordance with s.170.2 of the 2000 Planning and Development Act.

## (F) Basis for Determining Contributions in Monard

The contributions required were calculated by dividing the planned expenditure shown in Table 1 by the amount of development proposed in Monard in Table 4 below, subject to some adjustments.

**Table 4. Volume of development Projected in Monard Planning Scheme**

Village	Dwellings		Floorspace ('00m <sup>2</sup> )	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Lower Monard	1490	1835	1747	2228
Upper Monard	1250	1525	1440	1785
West Village	740	925	839	1064
Kilcronan	1270	1565	1402	1787
Total	4750	5850	5428	6864

The amount of floorspace which is actually chargeable is considerably less than that shown in Table 4, principally because of the desirability of conforming to the exemption provided for in the 2004 County wide General Contribution Scheme, whereby no charge was made in respect of the first 40m<sup>2</sup> of a house. As most of the proposed development in Monard is housing, this exemption has a substantial effect on chargeable floorspace.

If allowance is made for this reduction, and is applied to a gross floorspace halfway between the maximum and minimum amounts cited in Table 4, the resulting amount would average around €70 per square metre. Charging this at present would make Monard uncompetitive, as the current amount charge per square metre under the General Scheme is €24.49.

Cork County Council used an ‘escalator clause’ in the 2004 Scheme, whereby contributions were started at lower than the target level, to minimise adjustment problems, and then increased at 8% per annum, of which 5% was ‘nominal’ (ie an allowance for construction inflation based on experience in the previous decade), and 3% was an increase in real terms. This system worked quite well in the 2004-8 period, and effective in developers to bring forward payments, but indexation had to be suspended from the end of 2008 onwards. This was in accordance with intentions of the Scheme, in that construction costs were falling rather than rising, and the ‘real’ value of contributions being charged remained close to that intended.

The Council’s experience is thus that escalator clauses are workable and of practical value, but that their operation may have to be suspended under certain circumstances.

More generally, the main features of the General Contribution Scheme for Monard are similar to those in the existing 2004 County-wide General Contribution Scheme, except where subsequent events, or conditions special to Monard, require otherwise.

The Council also has experience of applying Supplementary Contributions to areas which will benefit from the suburban rail project, and which are seen as priority development areas in CASP and the County Development Plan. There was a concern that charging higher contributions in the area where development was to be encouraged could be self defeating, and provision is made in the existing 2004 General Scheme to partly offset the supplementary contribution in the rail corridor with a reduced roads contribution. Substantial amounts of development were permitted and did occur in the rail corridor in the 2004-8 period, so a differential of this sort may not be a serious obstacle to development, providing care is taken to ensure it is relatively modest.

Having regard to this, and also to special situation in Monard, as being more dependent on provision of new infrastructure than most land at the edge of existing built up areas, and undevelopable in its absence, contribution levels in the proposed Scheme for Monard will start approximately €10 per square metre above the level of contributions were charged for non water services in the remainder of the CASP rail corridor, from December 2008 onwards. As the first 40m<sup>2</sup> of a house are not charged for, either under the existing Scheme or the proposed Monard one, the initial General Contribution for an average house of 115m<sup>2</sup> would be €2625, or €750 above current rates.

The purpose of starting reasonably close to the current level of contributions in the remainder of the CASP area is to avoid any significant initial disincentive to develop in Monard rather than elsewhere. In order to make it possible to start contributions close to the same level as in the rest of the CASP area, while at the same time levying

the overall amount necessary, a modified version of the indexation system in the existing General Contribution Scheme has been used. The Monard Scheme:

- (a) provides for a 4% per annum increase in contributions in real terms, but it is envisaged that this will be suspended if real house prices are static or falling over a substantial period. The calculations assume that the 4% per annum increase applies for a 28 year period. This 4% increase will not start to take effect until the first substantial permissions for development have been granted under the terms of the SDZ Planning Scheme.
- (b) will not include any percentage allowance for expected construction inflation. Experience over the last 20 years has shown that construction prices are too variable to be captured by a fixed rate of this type. Instead, contributions will be adjusted for inflation or deflation in line with the CSO's Capital Goods Index (Building and Construction – Wages and Materials) Index. This means that in a period of economic recession, when construction prices are typically falling, indexation will tend to offset the 4% annual increase, and may result in a temporary decrease in the euro contribution payable at that time.

Starting contributions below the average that will need to be charged and allowing them increase over time recognises the greater uncertainties and risks faced by first movers, and provides an incentive for bringing development forward where possible. This incentive is an important component of the Council's overall policies to ensure that there is a timely flow of developable land onto the market in the right locations in Monard.

**Table 5 Development Contributions in the Monard SDZ area**

s.48.17	Type of public infrastructure	Cost (€m)	Charge per m2 (€)		
			initial	(average)	ultimate
(a)	Acquisition of land (excl. (b), (g))	1.5	1.72	3.44	5.17
(b)	Open spaces, recreation, community facilities, landscaping	2.5	2.87	5.74	8.61
	Advance planting grant scheme	0.24	0.28	0.55	0.83
(c)	Roads	16.9	19.40	38.80	58.20
(d)	Car parking	0.25	0.29	0.57	0.86
	Flood relief Schemes	1.1	1.26	2.53	3.79
	Public transport, cycle and pedestrian facilities, traffic calming	2	2.30	4.59	6.89
(e)	Refurbishment or upgrading of existing infrastructure	4.7	5.40	10.79	16.19
(f)	Broadband	0.45	0.52	1.03	1.55
(g)	School sites	0.85	0.98	1.95	2.93
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30.49</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>70.00</b>	<b>105.00</b>

The higher non-residential rate applicable to shopping and offices in the existing General Scheme has been omitted from the Monard Scheme, because of the greater than usual importance of attracting them to a new town with no existing shops or local employment. The benefit to housing developers and residents of having these services in place at an early stage would be considerable, and support omission of the normal differential in this particular instance.

Also, proposals for the town and village centres in particular aim for some buildings which are flexible, and designed to be capable of conversion between retail, other commercial and residential use. All floorspace will therefore be charged at the same rate.

As in the existing General Contribution Scheme, the first 40m<sup>2</sup> of conventional houses (ie excluding apartments and duplexes) will not be subject to any contribution. Reduced contributions will apply to the same categories of development as in the General Contribution Scheme, as set out in Tables 6 and 7.

It is recognised that having separate Contribution Schemes for Monard and the rest of County Cork which may be varied independently creates a risk that, over time, the differential between contributions in Monard and other parts of the Cork Metropolitan Area could become excessive and adversely affect the viability of the SDZ. To avoid this risk, the upper limit to contributions to the difference between contributions in Monard and those which apply generally to other parts of the Cork Metropolitan Area will be as follows:

*The contribution leviable under this General section 48 Contribution Scheme in Monard SDZ shall not be more than €20 per square metre above that leviable under the corresponding section 48 Contribution Scheme which applies generally to other parts of the Cork Metropolitan Area within the functional area of Cork County Council.*

The normal means by which this would be achieved is temporary suspension of the 'escalator' clause.

The relatively high level of charges envisaged in the long term would thus be influenced by the level of charges applying in the surrounding area under the County wide Scheme, and this may limit the rates actually achieved under the Monard Contribution Scheme. However, there are periods in which development land values and construction margins are high, and in those circumstances a realistic contribution towards infrastructure costs is justifiable. Prices to housebuyers will be controlled by the need to remain competitive with prices in other parts of the Cork area.

## **(G) Supplementary Contributions**

The 2004 Supplementary Scheme will continue to apply to the parts of Monard within 1 km of the rail line. The Council has power under s.49.4 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 to enter into agreements with any person in relation to the provision of infrastructure which is the subject of a Supplementary Contribution Scheme, and intends to use that power to ensure supplementary contributions collected in Monard are applied initially to the provision of a station there.

The 2004 General Contribution Scheme includes a provision that developments which contribute to the Supplementary Scheme will be entitled to a 75% reduction in the roads element of the General Contribution. Roads are a much larger component in overall contributions in the Monard Scheme than in the 2004 Scheme, and the 75% reduction would thus be excessive, relative to the supplementary contributions which were being charged. The current value of the concession can nevertheless be maintained, by allowing the current reduction of €13.27 per m<sup>2</sup> in road contributions set out in Table 6. This reduction would apply to developments liable for supplementary contributions for the suburban rail scheme.

**Table 6 Reductions in Roads Contributions for Developments subject to Suburban Rail Scheme**

Development Type	Contributions as actually charged in 2009-13, under the 2004 General Scheme		
	Overall	Roads element	<i>Reduction</i>
Residential	76.19	17.69	13.27

## (H) Process

The Draft General Contribution Scheme for Monard was subject to a separate approval process from the Draft SDZ Planning Scheme. As the two are closely interlinked, the two processes ran in parallel, and were put on display at the same time (from 17 April to 2 June 2015), and the Chief Executive's reports to the elected members on submissions received was considered at the same time.

This Contribution Scheme will come into effect as soon as the 2015 Monard SDZ Planning Scheme has passed through all stages of the planning process.

## (I) Reduced Contributions and Waivers

Table 7 lists forms of development which will benefit from reduced or nil contributions. It includes development types which have this status in the Council's General Contribution Scheme, and also types which the Monard Planning Scheme is seeking to encourage.

The reductions and waivers sought by the 2013 Guidelines will be available, primarily because the way in which development charges will be applied, will mean that a specific exemption is not required. Specifically:

- (i) this Scheme, like the County wide one, charges on a floorspace basis, and as a result does not involve any General Contribution Scheme charges for structures which have no floorspace, such as broadband antennae or wind turbines
- (ii) In Monard, flat rate charging under the General Scheme - whereby the same rate per square metre is charged for residential and commercial development - will act as an incentive for the latter, as it normally faces higher charges. This

reflects the need to promote early provision of services in a new town – particularly in the town centre – and coincide with the Guidelines’ concern that contributions reflect planning strategy and do not inhibit business development.

- (iii) Flat rate charging will also benefit the c.10,000m<sup>2</sup> of office or office based industry proposed in the town centre, some of which may be used by IDA aided businesses.
- (iv) Charges for change of use will not arise under a flat rate system. Temporary permissions are normally for changes of use, rather than construction of buildings.

**Table 7 Development to which reduced or nil contributions will apply**

Categories	Reduction
Provision of facilities by organisations which are considered to be exempt from planning fees as outlined in Part 12 Article 157 (1a-c) of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001	100%
Voluntary organisations / voluntary or co-operative housing bodies as outlined in Part 12 Article 157 (2) of the Planning & Development Regulations 2001	100%
First 60 sq. metres of extensions to private dwellings	100%
Works to Protected Structures	100%
Social Housing Units	100%
First 40 sq. metres of conventional houses, but excluding apartments and duplexes, other than those which are part of a complex restricted by agreement and planning condition to owner occupation, and/or part of complexes intended for older households	100%
Primary and Secondary Schools	100%
Dwellings provided for sale by voluntary bodies as prescribed in Article 157 (2), Planning and Development Regulations 2001 ( <u>including</u> the first 40 m <sup>2</sup> )	40%
Floorspace <sup>6</sup> between double party walls (both masonry) created to allow access to rear gardens of mid-terrace houses, providing the walls extend up between upper floors as well, and the space between the two walls is accessed via doors with good sound proofing from one side only	100%
Garages with a pitched roof which connect semi detached houses, including any accommodation or storage area above the garage and under the pitched roof <sup>7</sup>	100%

<sup>6</sup> Including the thickness of the party walls themselves

<sup>7</sup> Providing the garages are fitted with doors – front and back - and conform to the section on garages on p.104 of the Residential Estates Design Guide