

London Borough of Croydon
Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Review Examination

Hearing Agenda

Thursday, 26th February 2026 at 10.00 a.m.

To be held at: Croydon Town Hall, Katharine Street, Croydon, CR0 1NX.

1. Introductions
2. Opening Remarks by the Examiner
3. Opening Statement by the London Borough of Croydon
4. Matter 1- Croydon Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement (Document Ref. LBC-04)
5. Matter 2 – Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Review (Document Ref. LBC-02)
6. Matter 3 – Draft Charging Schedule (Document Ref. LBC-01)
7. Statement of Compliance (Document Ref. LBC-08)
8. Statement of Consultation (Document Ref. LBC-07)
9. Any Other Matters
10. Close

Participants

London Borough of Croydon

East Coulsdon Residents Association

Sports England

Note It is not possible to identify a 'cut-off' point between those parts of the Agenda that are programmed to be considered in the morning and afternoon sessions of the Hearing. The intention is to complete the Hearing as quickly as possible, whilst allowing for full discussion on each of the above main issues. The aim is to complete the Hearing in one day.

Derek Stebbing B.A. (Hons), Dip. E.P., MRTPI

Examiner

5th February 2026

London Borough of Croydon
Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Review Examination

Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 1 - Croydon Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement

1. What period of time does the Infrastructure Funding Gap statement cover?
2. Can the Council confirm that the Transport funding gap relates to accessibility improvements at West Croydon Station?

Can the Council confirm that the Education funding gap relates to an expansion of Gresham Primary School?

Can the Council confirm that the Public Realm & Masterplans funding gap relates to the Fairfield Public Realm project and to the Minster and St. John's Memorial Gardens Public Realm project?

3. Many infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2025 are not costed, and do not identify funding sources. What alternative sources of funding is the Council considering to enable these projects to be progressed?
4. Has a separate Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) been prepared to accompany the IDP identifying the sources of funding for the projects set out in the IDP?
5. Historic England seek the inclusion of heritage-related projects within the IDP, which may be wholly, or partially, funded by CIL. Has the Borough Council identified any such projects?

Matter 2 - Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Review

1. How robust are the assumptions used in the Viability Review (March 2024) for residential development relating to:

- sales values
- affordable housing tenure and values
- build costs
- profit margins
- abnormal costs
- finance costs
- marketing costs
- other assumptions, e.g., Biodiversity Net Gain

Do such assumptions continue to remain valid?

2. How robust are the assumptions made regarding Benchmark Land Values?

3. What is the '*modest impact*' on affordable housing levels that can be delivered arising from a reduction in residual land values?

4. What viability evidence supports the proposed inclusion of residential developments within the Croydon Metropolitan Centre (CMC) Zone at the proposed CIL rates of £300 per m² (for 9 or fewer units) and £225 per m² (for 10 or more units)?

5. What viability evidence supports the proposed inclusion of student housing developments within both the Croydon Metropolitan Centre (CMC) Zone and the Rest of the Borough Zone at the proposed CIL rate of £225 per m²?

6. What viability evidence supports the proposed inclusion of Use Class C2 developments within both the Croydon Metropolitan Centre (CMC) Zone and the Rest of the Borough Zone at the proposed CIL Rate of £204.89 per m²?

7. Transport for London (TfL) note that the forthcoming Building Safety Levy (BSL), with rates of £52.03 per m² for residential developments on non-previously developed sites and £26.01 per m² on previously developed sites in the London Borough of Croydon, will come into force in October 2026. TfL

considers that the implications of this additional cost have not been taken into account in the Viability Review. Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?

(The Council should also note that TfL has made a number of comments and suggested amendments regarding the IDP 2025, which are not within the purview of this Examination).

Matter 3 - Draft Charging Schedule

1. Prologis consider that the Draft Charging Schedule should exclude ancillary spaces, such as enclosed service areas, ramps and access roads in the Gross Internal Area (GIA) calculation for multi-storey industrial developments? Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?
2. Churchill Living and McCarthy Stone consider that the proposed Use Class C3 (residential) CIL rate of £225.00 per m² for schemes of 10 or more units will render their retirement living schemes and other specialist housing for older people in the Borough unviable. Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?
3. SKM Croydon Limited and KS Croydon Limited consider that the proposed Use Class C3 (residential) CIL rate of £225.00 per m² for schemes of 10 or more units will impact upon the deliverability of their proposals for the development of the Norfolk House site in the CMC Zone. Have the higher abnormal costs associated with the development of this site been taken into consideration by the Council?
4. Unibail-Rodamco-Westfield (URW) consider that its proposals for the redevelopment of its landholdings within the Croydon Opportunity Area, which are within the CMC Zone, should attract a Nil CIL rate, in view of the high site-specific abnormal costs, totalling ca. £295 million, associated with this scheme. Have the higher abnormal costs associated with the URW proposals been taken

into consideration by the Council?

5. Southern Housing consider that the proposed Use Class C3 (residential) CIL rate of £225.00 per m² for schemes of 10 or more units and £300.00 per m² for schemes of 9 or fewer units will impact upon the deliverability of their residential schemes in the Borough, including affordable housing. Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?

6. IKEA consider that the proposed CIL rate of £50 per m² for Industrial and Warehousing schemes in the Rest of the Borough Zone should not be confirmed and that such schemes should continue to attract a Nil CIL rate, in order that existing employment uses can be intensified in line with the Local Plan's objectives. Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?

7. Sport England consider that Sports Facilities should be exempt from CIL payments and be placed within the development category of "Places of Worship, Clinics/Health Centres, etc.", in view of their importance to the health and wellbeing of Borough residents. Can the Council please provide a response to this issue?

Note

Representors and the Borough Council may wish to submit Hearing Statements to address the above Matters, Issues and Questions. If so, such Statements should not exceed 3,000 words and should be sent to the Programme Officer no later than **19th February 2026, 5pm**, to be added to the Examination Library. It is not necessary to repeat or attach previously-made Representations, as they will be fully considered as part of the Examination.