

Royal Borough of Greenwich Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Copy of representations made through Commonplace

March 2024

The following table includes all representations received through RB Greenwich's Commonplace platform – the Council's platform for public consultation, from 31st July to 25th September 2023.

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
001	Mon Sep 25 2023 17:34:56	Disagree	-	It is not clear in the proposal text if agreeing means that the owners of a flat/house should pay more (through the council tax bills) for amenities like playgrounds or GPs or schools.		
002	Mon Sep 25 2023 15:52:27	Agree	-	-		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
003	Mon Sep 25 2023 14:45:14	Disagree	Danny Gazzi	The CIL charges in Greenwich have always been too low compared with comparable boroughs, and they will continue to be so under these proposals.	No	
004	Mon Sep 25 2023 13:51:50	Disagree	-	People are already struggling with the cost of living crisis, expanded ULEZ zones, increased parking charges and increased permit charges. People can not afford pay anymore and developments should be taken out of existing tax or existing council tax payments! How long before more residents in RBG have to go to food banks to survive! It's not fair to everyday people to pay more!		
005	Mon Sep 25 2023 11:22:20	Disagree	Sylvia Williams	I disagree with the proposed increases as I trust that increases should be higher. Greenwich has been one of the lower charging CIL schedules in London. The residential charging schedule for zone one could go higher to £200 to £250 persqm. Zone one has shrunk in this proposal, it's the prime locations in Greenwich with good transport links. The council has the chance to get developers to pay for more infrastructure that is desperately needed in Greenwich. Hotels, Warehouses, Hotels could all be charged e.g. £150persqm. I have lived in Greenwich for 19 years and more monies can be gained from developers for residents to have both basic and improved facilities. New primary schools being built do not even have large enough school halls for the children to have assembly all together or suitable outdoor shading installed when built e.g. St Mary Magdalene Primary School Peninsula Site. There is no leisure centre or library on Greenwich Peninsula,	Yes	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				<p>limited GP surgeries, the few open spaces do not have enough funds to maintain them e.g. the Ecology Park and Southern Park, a vibrant area with a growing population needs more infrastructure investment. More funds, spent in the correct way would make Greenwich a much better place to live. CIL is a way the developers can contribute more to the borough. Other neighbouring and near by inner London boroughs have recently increased their zone one residential charge to £280 for Tower Hamlets, £435 for Southwark, £500 for Lambeth. Some neighbouring Inner and Outer London boroughs are still on their original residential schedules like Lewisham £100, Newham £80, Barking and Dagenham £70. Once they increase, Greenwich is likely to go back to the bottom of the London charging schedules. Please let this be Greenwich's chance to charge the right amount for future years.</p>		
006	Mon Sep 25 2023 10:35:59	Disagree	A	<p>the increases for the Residential CIL are more than welcome but still lag behind the other major London councils (for instance, Hammersmith, Camden, Tower Hamlets). Greenwich is growing at fast speed and more is required to keep up with its residential population and hence infrastructure. Schools, GPs, cleaning services and many other infrastructures of public interest would benefit the growth of the community (libraries, sport centres for instance); while the doubling of the residential levy is a step forward, it is still lower than other areas.</p>		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
007	Mon Sep 25 2023 10:22:47	Disagree	Faran Mir	It should be higher. Eg £280 in tower hamlets. £150 is substantially low.	No	
008	Mon Sep 25 2023 10:22:47		Faran Mir			<i>No representation provided.</i>
009	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:59:32	Agree	Duncan Platt	The cil money received recently has been much less than similar boroughs. There is a clear business case to increase the levy	No	
010	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:57:25	Disagree	Pantazis Theotokis	The proposed CIL increase should be higher than proposed here in accordance with other boroughs in the capital. Other councils have increased their charges to: Southwark £435, Tower Hamlets £280, Lambeth £500	No	
011	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:52:29	Disagree	-	The price should be lot higher for the amount of flats per square mile and the amount of council tax collected		
012	Mon Sep 25	Agree	-	-		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
	2023 09:49:22					
013	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:46:40	Agree	-	I am only agreeing as I am worried that the motion could be rejected if too many of us disagree without explaining HOWEVER the increase requested should be higher in order to have a real impact on the neighbourhood	No	
014	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:19:16	Disagree	Abira	The residential development charge should be higher than £150 persqm. This is not sufficient please increase it to something higher than that. £200 persqm seems good.	No	
015	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:17:35	Disagree	Primrose Fielding	It's nowhere near high enough. The developers here on the Peninsula are making millions and millions. Also Greenwich itself needs cleaning up. The streets are filthy, there's been continuing work carried out which makes pavements virtually impassable for people in wheelchairs/mobility scooters like myself. Dropped kerbs need to be properly dropped , not with big drops; it's very uncomfortable on mobility aids.	No	
016	Mon Sep 25 2023 09:11:47	Agree	Alberto Silva Filho	Dev		
017	Mon Sep 25	Disagree	Wendy Durrant	It should be higher	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
	2023 08:31:54					
018		Agree	-	-		
019	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:27:51	Agree	-	-		
020	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:25:56	Disagree	Gareth Miller	-	No	
021	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:24:03	Disagree	Kerim O	The charging schedule needs to be higher, more in line with other Councils (Southwark £435, Lambeth £500 etc).	No	
022	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:23:37	Disagree	Nicole	We need to demand developments pay more towards infrastructure.	No	
023	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:23:16	Disagree	Simran Sandhu	I believe the charges should be higher. In Tower Hamlets (which is considered one of the poorer boroughs) the charge is almost double. In areas like Southwark it is almost three times the amount that Greenwich council are proposing.	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
024	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:21:56	Disagree	Anthony Da Mota	I wish developers should be charged more to assist the village development	No	
025	Mon Sep 25 2023 07:12:54	Disagree	Nitish Mittal	Believe that the charges should be higher in line with neighbouring councils	No	
026	Sun Sep 24 2023 23:00:48	Disagree	Michael Conroy	I agree with increasing the rates but the proposed rates are too low.	No	
027	Sun Sep 24 2023 14:43:50	Disagree	George Edgar	-	Yes	
028	Fri Sep 22 2023 16:23:20	Disagree	-	<p>While we accept that due to the circumstances set out in the consultation there does need to be some increases to CIL in Greenwich, we believe the current proposals go too far and could have an impact on scheme viability/ pipeline developments and in turn the delivery of all tenures of housing in the borough, including much needed affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposed increase in charges is not consistent across Use Classes. For schemes with 10 or more units in zone 1 the increase will be 56% and in zone 2 the increase will be 75%; meanwhile there would be no increases for hotels, student</p>	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				<p>accommodation or supermarkets. We also note that it would not be comparable with the rates of neighbouring and comparable boroughs. For example for housing developments in Lewisham CIL in 2023 is between £137.07 and £95.95psm, Newham between £118.82 and £59.41 and Bexley between £82.56 and £55.04. Only Lewisham's prime zone would be above the lower range of £96psm propose for the zone 2 of Greenwich.</p> <p>Owing to the Borough's funding commitments to TfL for the Woolwich Crossrail Station, we are concerned that even if the proposed rates are adopted, much of this funding will be directed to Crossrail above other important infrastructure items on the Regulation 123 list.</p>		
029		Agree	Giuseppe Palena	-	No	
030	Mon Jul 31 2023 17:03:31		Mrs A Hat	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>
031	Mon Jul 31 2023 17:03:31		Mrs A Hart	<p>I cannot comment on what I cannot find or read.</p> <p>There would be a lot more housing for residents of RBG if there was a ban on foreign ownership of housing in Greenwich. At the moment all this new housing is marketed abroad, eg Malaysia, China, India, Hong Kong, etc. There are absentee landlords and flats left unoccupied. It is a racket, it is bad for local people desperate for housing, it should be illegal and must be stopped.</p>	Yes	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
032	Thu Sep 21 2023 10:41:28	Disagree	John Ferguson	<p>Summary of letter attached: Representation made by Collective Planning, on behalf of Sabreleague Ltd.</p> <p>As part of the pre-application planning process for Lyndean Industrial Estate, constrained viability has been one of the major issues for deliverability of the scheme. The scheme has limited ability to make a policy compliant level of affordable housing due to factors including high build costs, high existing use value of the site, high finance costs, and relatively low sales values.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rate increases in the Draft Charging Schedule would erode even further the potential quantum of affordable housing a scheme would deliver, and would result in lower or no affordable housing provision on major schemes in Abbey Wood and across the Borough.</p> <p>Therefore, it is requested that the CIL rate is not increased for new residential development and other uses.</p>	Yes	<i>A copy of the attached representation is provided separately.</i>
033	Wed Sep 20 2023 15:57:21	Disagree	Bronwyn	I am concerned that it will increase the cost of new houses and flats in the area, as the developer passes the cost on to the sale/rental price. we need more affordable housing in the Borough and I worry that these increases will be passed onto people trying to buy or rent.	No	
034	Wed Aug 16 2023 16:04:36	Agree	David N	This should have been done years ago, I understand Greenwich had some of the lowest CIL charges in London. It is vital new development comes with sufficient money to pay for the necessary infrastructure to support it.	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
035	Tue Sep 19 2023 16:14:16	Agree	John Lawton	I am not clear as to why the changes has not been made sooner. It would seem that developers have been getting an enhanced deal from RBG for far too long. This change to bring RBG in line with other boroughs is long overdue.	No	
036	Tue Sep 19 2023 13:58:23	Disagree	-	-	Yes	
037	Mon Sep 18 2023 20:23:32	Agree	Becky Holmes	-	No	
038	Mon Sep 18 2023 18:25:57	Disagree	Ilya Kabanov	Developers will pass on the new fees to customers/residents, exacerbating the cost of living crisis. The council should support development, not impose new restrictions on it. The old CIL charges will still contribute quite a lot to the budget.	No	
039	Mon Sep 18 2023 16:01:19	Agree	-	I believe it is a good source of funding for community projects.		
040	Mon Sep 18 2023 15:13:35	Disagree	-	They are too low and there is not enough transparency about what actually happens to the money when received.		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
041	Mon Sep 18 2023 15:11:06	Agree	Andrew Charles Blundy	-	Yes	
042	Mon Sep 18 2023 14:40:17	Disagree	terence macey	There is a severe shortage of housing This charge will further discourage new house building due to the additional expense	No	
043	Mon Sep 18 2023 13:49:15	Disagree	MJB	I think the charges should be consistant with other London Boroughs. If they are lower to help attract developers into RBG we should not undervalue the boroug or its communities. This will only flood the area with cheap development. It feels liekt eher is more than enough development at the moment and pricipally aimed at attracting new middle class residents into the area and not service the existing communities	No	
044	Sun Sep 17 2023 20:26:33	Disagree	John Holmes	-		
045	Sun Sep 17 2023 19:42:56	Disagree	Hannah Poppy	Too low, particularly given how well connected much of the borough is. Hotel and student rates should be much higher given appeal of area.	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
046	Tue Sep 05 2023 15:10:58	Disagree	Maciej wasilewicZ	Every tax creates a disincentive in some way. By taxing development, you are taxing housing supply. By taxing housing supply, you are reducing housing supply, so you are causing hardship and pain to people who rent. Tax other things, like wealth, inheritance, sugar, tobacco, fuel, or road use.		
047	Tue Sep 05 2023 06:22:03		Oliver Mayo	-		
048	Wed Aug 30 2023 07:07:23	Agree	Jane Dickenson	RBG is a very desirable area for new development. This charge is a commensurate way to ensure that all of the community benefit from development projects.	No	
049	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:49:19	Agree	Karen Gillies	There needs to be a better investment into council housing along with better infrastructure	No	
050	Mon Aug 28 2023 17:25:19		Mitchell Hunter	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>
051	Tue Aug 22 2023 17:26:07	Disagree	b.morris	-	Yes	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
052	Tue Aug 22 2023 14:12:03	Agree	Isabella Malcolm	Grenwich have fallen behind on costings for years.	No	
053	Tue Aug 22 2023 10:54:20	Disagree	Matthew R Mitchison	This is a tax on building plain and simple. It is also a an additional burden on builders and developers. Greenwich should eliminate the CIL altogether and encourage more houses to be built. That would result in lower prices and more housing for residents.	No	
054	Sun Aug 20 2023 09:42:32	Agree	Lucy Preston	RBG needs to recoup as much as possible, which it hasn't been doing to date	No	
055	Thu Aug 17 2023 09:55:52	Disagree	Tim	Rates are too low when compared to other borough's in London; this is effectively taking up to levels they should have been at several years ago. It's clear from a lot of the built environment in the Borough (particularly around some of the new developments and the connections to the peninsula) would indicate that either not enough is being raised or it's being badly spent.	No	
056	Wed Aug 16 2023 16:04:36	Agree	-	-		
057	Wed Aug 16	Disagree	David Lang	-	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
	2023 08:33:02					
058	Sat Aug 12 2023 10:31:36	Agree	-	As a Resident of Woolwich (Woolwich New Road area) I would be keen to see increased local council revenue uplifted to continue to support respectful regeneration of the area. * Respectful here refers to the architectural and historic prevalence of the area and also that of native demographic / residents of the area.		
059	Thu Aug 10 2023 10:48:25	Disagree	Rob Horsley	I think the levy should be higher. I suggest increasing it to £200+ in line with Lambeth, Lewisham and other boroughs. The profit made by developers and the construction industry in general from these projects is immense. The levy should also be linked to inflation or the consumer price index, otherwise it becomes devalued over time, necessitating repeat revision (which costs the council time and money to administer).	No	
060	Wed Aug 09 2023 20:34:04	Disagree	Joseph Thomas	-	Yes	
061	Wed Aug 09 2023 16:32:46	Agree	Toby Coleman	If the independent consultant advice is being followed, then this feels like the best course of action	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
062	Tue Aug 08 2023 13:01:53	Disagree	Kevin Orford	Greenwich should be charging more	No	
063		Agree	-	-		
064	Sun Aug 06 2023 06:58:06	Disagree	-	The changes are not strong enough. Berkeley homes for example have failed to deliver commercial tenants in royal arsenal, have constantly looked to thwart planning permission regarding advertising stands etc and are failing to encourage biodiversity or protect the green spaces. Insufficient funding has gone towards the increased traffic, gps, dentists etc.		
065	Sat Aug 05 2023 15:06:50	Agree	Peter Ferenz	Makes sense to require new homes/facilities to contribute to maintaining and expanding necessary infrastructure.	No	
066	Fri Aug 04 2023 12:39:03	Disagree	George Luiz Morais Rocha Melo	Speaking only about the Greenwich Millennium area, the amount of land available and the current plans to develop a considerable number of additional housing units demand for a higher charge than currently proposed. There will be a need to substantially increase green areas, adequate pedestrian pavement, signalling, transportation links, cycleways, access to tube and train stations, better and cleaner links to central Greenwich, as well as ordinary infrastructure. The current proposed charge seems to be placing central Greenwich on the same level with the peninsula, which is in my view an unbalanced approach to the level of future infrastructure necessary.	No	<i>This representation is a duplicate of the representation above (Ref. 066).</i>

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
067	Fri Aug 04 2023 12:39:03	Disagree	George Luiz Morais Rocha Melo	Speaking only about the Greenwich Millennium area, the amount of land available and the current plans to develop a considerable number of additional housing units demand for a higher charge than currently proposed. There will be a need to substantially increase green areas, adequate pedestrian pavement, signalling, transportation links, cycleways, access to tube and train stations, better and cleaner links to central Greenwich, as well as ordinary infrastructure. The current proposed charge seems to be placing central Greenwich on the same level with the peninsula, which is in my view an unbalanced approach to the level of future infrastructure necessary.	No	
068	Thu Aug 03 2023 18:51:23	Disagree	JOHN BARTER	Another rip off as usual, no reason for it the biggest Borough in London. Tourism brings in Millions. Council cut your waste, and then NO need to increase any thing. Just cut Council waste.	No	
069	Thu Aug 03 2023 18:26:20	Disagree	Pieter De Baets	Too low compared to other boroughs	No	
070	Thu Aug 03 2023 11:14:01	Disagree	D Herring	-	No	
071	Wed Aug 02 2023 14:13:27	Disagree	Donatella Calegaris	Greenwich Council, you have approved planning permission for a number of highrises when you shouldn't have. Obviously, you saw the increase in the number of council tax paid by the new units, a big cash injection to the budget you play and dilapidate and... you couldn't resist. Now because there are and will be too	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				many dwellings more infrastructure is needed, hence money collected from the new dwellings council tax is not enough? And what you do? Tax and levy the Woolwich residents. Not much to expect from Civil Servants, you are and expensive admin to the taxpayers, always have been, always will be. Good for very little, not even a one trick pony. You really disgust me, rest assured I will vote for the opposite party on the next elections, just for a similar good for nothing bunch to take over and screw it all once again.		
072	Wed Aug 02 2023 13:56:58	Agree	RASHMEE ROSHAN LALL	The Council needs to leverage our shared assets to raise funds for the community in Greenwich	Yes	
073	Wed Aug 02 2023 13:56:58	Agree	RASHMEE ROSHAN LALL	The Council needs to leverage our shared assets to raise funds for the community in Greenwich	Yes	<i>This representation is a duplicate of the representation above (Ref. 072).</i>
074	Wed Aug 02 2023 10:42:52	Agree	nick wilson	CIL desperately needs increasing to support local development and infrastructure, including active/sustainable travel and environmental improvements	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
075		Agree	-	-		
076	Tue Aug 01 2023 12:40:58	Disagree	-	Greenwich is a popular area with good (albeit declining) transport links and I think higher charges are supportable.	No	
077	Tue Aug 01 2023 11:48:22	Disagree	Richard Sharp	-	No	
078	Tue Aug 01 2023 10:04:46	Disagree	Stacy Smith	The zoning does not capture the real value of land on the river and undercharges in zone 2. These properties once built sell for prices that are far above average house prices due to their location on the river. Also the riverside lacks infrastructure in Charlton and West Thamesmead that CIL could help to fund.		
079	Tue Aug 01 2023 10:04:46	Disagree	Stacy Smith	The zoning does not capture the real value of land on the river and undercharges in zone 2. These properties once built sell for prices that are far above average house prices due to their location on the river. Also the riverside lacks infrastructure in Charlton and West Thamesmead that CIL could help to fund.	Yes	<i>This representation is a duplicate of the representation above (Ref. 078).</i>
080	Tue Aug 01 2023 09:56:43	Agree	Andy Lee	-	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
081	Tue Aug 01 2023 08:59:54	Agree	Adrien Herubel	-	No	
082	Tue Aug 01 2023 08:49:05	Disagree	tamasin rhymes	These rates are far too low to make up for the years of undercharging you as a council are responsible for. No matter how many of you seem to move into roles with developers you cannot get away from the extreme lack of basic services from safe crossings to suitable pedestrian routes and community projects that should have been supported by this money over decades. This in negligence in the extreme.	Yes	
083	Tue Aug 01 2023 06:56:25	Agree	Anushka Aubeelack	Makes sense to me that as Greenwich property values continue to rise, developers should be charged more in order to continue to reap that benefit, and those funds paid should benefit the community.	No	
084	Tue Aug 01 2023 05:21:25	Disagree	Dustin Benton	Many charges are too low, and the area could be split into 3 CIL zones, not two. For example, both student accommodation and hotel rates are far below those of neighbouring boroughs.		
085	Mon Jul 31 2023 21:34:32	Disagree	Nigel Scaife	I believe the CIL charges should be higher across the board, and in particular those on hotels and student accommodation, and in particular in the areas within Greenwich with excellent access to public transport (Greenwich, North Greenwich, Lewisham, Woolwich etc). As a minimum our CIL charges should match those of Newham and Tower Hamlets (very equivalent). Additional CIL funding (currently the lowest of equivalent councils)	Yes	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				should then be ringfenced for real capital infrastructure investment in transport and local area bettering and with ongoing support to that infrastructure in terms of repairing etc. it should not be used to support local job creation schemes and other activities ongoing revenue spending as has patently happened previously.		
086	Mon Jul 31 2023 21:34:32	Disagree	Nigel Scaife	<p>I believe the CIL charges should be higher across the board, and in particular those on hotels and student accommodation, and in particular in the areas within Greenwich with excellent access to public transport (Greenwich, North Greenwich, Lewisham, Woolwich etc).</p> <p>As a minimum our CIL charges should match those of newham and tower hamlets (very equivalent).</p> <p>Additional CIL funding (currently the lowest of equivalent councils) should then be ringfenced for real capital infrastructure investment in transport and local area bettering and with ongoing support to that infrastructure in terms of repairing etc. it should not be used to support local job creation schemes and other activities ongoing revenue spending as has patently happened previously.</p>	Yes	<i>This representation is a duplicate of the representation above (Ref. 085).</i>
087	Mon Jul 31 2023 21:16:27	Disagree	Simon Lee	<p>I am writing to express my deep concern and disappointment regarding the recent proposal for the modest and unambitious uplift of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CiL) in the Royal Borough of Greenwich. As a resident in this community, I strongly urge the council to reconsider these proposed rates and set more ambitious levels that truly reflect the value of this borough.</p> <p>It is evident that Greenwich Council has fallen significantly behind</p>	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				<p>other London authorities in terms of CiL income over the past decade. The failure to review rates since the adoption of CiL in 2015 and the subsequent shortfall in predicted income have had a considerable impact on the funding available for essential services and projects within our borough. This is particularly acute with the high residential growth rate within the borough over the past decade.</p> <p>This missed opportunity has not only affected the council's ability to invest in vital infrastructure but has also hindered the development of our community.</p> <p>While I appreciate that a recent report by BNP Paribas suggested changes to the rates, I find the proposed alterations to be inadequate, particularly but not limited to hotels and student accommodation. Comparisons with nearby boroughs, such as Newham and Tower Hamlets, clearly indicate that Greenwich is considering rates well below the average for similar developments. This approach does not align with the the current value our borough and its proximity to prime locations in London.</p> <p>I strongly urge the council to adopt varying rates for different zones, taking into account the prime areas within Greenwich that warrant higher contributions from developers. By doing so, we can ensure that our local services receive the necessary funding to thrive, similar to successful examples in other boroughs like Lambeth.</p>		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				<p>Furthermore, it is vital to note that the lack of rate revisions for many years not only affects Greenwich but also puts us at a disadvantage compared to other comparable boroughs, such as Lewisham. Maximising the potential revenue from CiL is essential for funding essential services and projects that benefit the entire community.</p> <p>The potential benefits of a more ambitious CiL rate cannot be overstated. It can significantly contribute to funding of big and progressive plans that the council has outlined, which the borough rightly need and deserves. From various essential services, including tree planting, community centres, to infrastructure like transportation improvements, parks, healthcare, and education. As a resident who values the growth and development of our community, I believe we must seize this opportunity to invest in our borough's future.</p> <p>I understand that the proposed rates for residential levels are currently under consultation. I implore the council to seriously reconsider the proposed rates for hotels and student housing as well. Our borough's excellent transport links and strategic location present prime opportunities for development, and we should capitalise on these attributes to secure a more prosperous future for our community.</p> <p>In conclusion, I respectfully request the Royal Borough of</p>		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				Greenwich to set more ambitious CiL rates that genuinely reflect the value and potential of our borough. Let us learn from the mistakes of the past decade and ensure a brighter future for our community by investing in essential services and projects that will benefit us all for years to come.		
088		Agree	-	-	No	
089	Mon Jul 31 2023 20:06:27	Disagree	Jonathan Blower	The proposed increases in CIL charges are welcome but too modest. The proposed Zone 1 is too small and should be expanded to include other well connected areas of the borough. Housing developers are making vast profits while communities in poorer areas have to bid (beg) for paltry improvements.	No	
090	Mon Jul 31 2023 19:50:30	Agree	Blake Jackson	-	No	
091	Mon Jul 31 2023 18:26:16	Disagree	-	You are soon them too low so help me god		
092	Mon Jul 31 2023 18:22:17	isagree	Sam Taylor	This seems to make provision of new housing less attractive while long terms assets that provide a significant return to developers such as student accommodation are treated more favourably.	No	
093	Mon Jul 31 2023 17:06:10	Agree	-	Providing the col is going to be going to be spent toward community infrastructure the. I have no objection to a raise		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
094	Mon Jul 31 2023 17:03:31		Mrs A Hart	-	No	<i>No representation provided.</i>
095	Mon Jul 31 2023 16:52:10	Disagree	Guy Wilton	Far too low compared to similar London boroughs. The cosy relationship between senior council staff , past and present , and developers may be completely innocent but gives opponents and cynics a stick to beat them with. Nick Raynsford , Chris Roberts , Danny Thorpe , Steven Brain off the top of my head as well as current leader Mr Okereke and his ex employers.	No	
096	Mon Jul 31 2023 16:47:08	Disagree	Richard Gibbs	Far too low for the borough, amazing transport links new and old, areas such as abbey wood and Thamesmead seeing mass housing with no improvement to the local area because of these rates.	No	
097	Mon Jul 31 2023 16:15:11	Agree	Paul Mooney	I agree with the proposal to increase CIL charges, but do believe this is not going far enough. They should be greatly increased to match the level of equivalent boroughs in London such as Lambeth or Haringey.	No	
098	Mon Jul 31 2023 15:50:05	Agree	Ian Netherwood	For gods sake raise them! You've been giving away development permissions for pennies. The poorer parts of the borough are crying out for development money, which you have spectacularly failed to collect at a suitable rate!		

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
099	Mon Jul 31 2023 15:04:58	Agree	C Price	These charges seem to be aimed at contributing to community projects.	No	
100	Mon Jul 31 2023 15:04:58	Agree	C Price	These charges seem to be aimed at contributing to community projects.	No	
101	Mon Jul 31 2023 14:44:15	Disagree	John Edwards	Proposed rate appear too low given vast recent transport changes and high demand for housing, services and development. This is particularly true for retail, hotels and student accommodation in areas of the borough near the Elizabeth line in Woolwich plus the DLR/tube in North Greenwich and Greenwich. Why are they not being increased?	No	
102	Mon Jul 31 2023 12:24:04	Agree	-	-		
103	Mon Jul 31 2023 14:33:26	Agree	Katerina Petroff	The borough needs to step up its infrastructure investment in light of all the new housing/commercial property projects	No	
104	Mon Jul 31 2023 14:11:58	Agree	Andy Macdonald	Hopefully better services	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
105	Mon Jul 31 2023 13:54:48	Agree	-	-		
106	Mon Jul 31 2023 13:16:11	Agree	Sarah Hope	I think it is imperative that we continue to invest in our local community infrastructure, especially if we are adding additional housing / strain on existing.	No	
107	Mon Jul 31 2023 13:09:06	Agree	E Hollands	-	No	
108	Mon Jul 31 2023 12:24:04	Agree	Ann Hill	-	No	
109	Mon Jul 31 2023 12:17:48	Agree	Alan Thompson	-	No	
110	Mon Jul 31 2023 12:17:48	Agree	Alan Thompson	-	No	
111	Mon Jul 31 2023 12:09:03	Agree	-	-	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
112	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:56:04	Agree	Paul	Increasing the charges is long overdue. Building has had a massive impact on quality of life in East Greenwich and there appear to be few tangible benefits for the community.	No	
113	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:50:03	Disagree	Dan Swann	More money is needed	No	
114	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:49:19	Disagree	Karen Gillies	The rates are too low and the money is Not invested in any infrastructure	No	
115	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:43:17	Agree	Marcus Belli	-	Yes	
116	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:34:34	Agree	-	About fucking time. Well done missing the building cycle, muppets.	No	
117	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:33:16	Agree	Max Green	An uptick in CIL rates in Greenwich is long overdue, it's hard to calculate the amount of revenue from developers that we've already missed out on that could have been put towards public services. Glad to see Woolwich town centre is in Zone 1, although I feel Charlton Riverside will be due for development soon and therefore could be included in Zone 1 to maximise revenue for the borough.	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
118	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:09:54	Agree	james montgomery	-	No	
119	Mon Jul 31 2023 11:09:54	Agree	james montgomery	-	No	
120	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:53:27		Sally Ann Gadbury	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>
121	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:53:27		Sally Ann Gadbury	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>
122	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:40:18		Julie Johnston	I agree in principle but do wonder if the money collected is used in the best way. Recently my GP surgery asked all registered patients if we would agree to them including 3 new areas within their 'catchment' so they could retain THE SAME NUMBER OF GP DOCTORS they already have. If we didn't agree they would lose 1 or 2 doctors!!! If your infrastructure levy works how can this happen??	No	
123	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:27:32	Agree	Robert Vesuv	The levy was historically far too low, preventing RBG from investing in necessary infrastructure. With the large amount of Riverside development planned, one	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
				area that the increased levy should support is improving the Thames River path and preserving what little nature there is there.		
124	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:20:49	Agree	-	-	No	
125	Mon Jul 31 2023 10:19:20	Disagree	Nick Sankey	-	No	
126		Disagree	Hazel	They are still not high enough. More money is needed to provide infrastructure to support large residential developments.	No	
127	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:53:53	Disagree	Hazel	They are still not high enough. More money is needed to provide infrastructure to support large residential developments.	No	<i>This representation is a duplicate of the representation above (Ref. 126).</i>
128	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:54:43	Disagree	Kaila Yates	-	No	
129	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:54:18		Rob Hayles	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
130	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:36:37	Agree	-	-	No	
131	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:17:30	Disagree	Alan Jarrett	I prefer a charge that increases as density of housing increases. High density/high rise housing is encouraged using a square meter calculation and puts more pressure on local facilities.	No	
132	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:15:37	Disagree	Catherine Kell	Greenwich has an unique location, is a world heritage site, has historical attractions, green spaces , transport and leisure infrastructure and a University, which opportunities which means that values of CIL should be much higher than proposed. Certainly much higher than all neighboring boroughs eg Lewisham, Newham, Bexley, Barking.	No	
133	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:08:35	Disagree	ollie mustill	-	No	
134	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:05:09	Agree	Barbara	The increase for residential/supermarkets/hotel is not large enough. We need to increase the charges to fund public transport and connections between transport hubs. I live in Greenwich and none of the buses go where I need to go: Canary Wharf and the City. Unfortunately it's much cheaper and, depending on route, faster to drive than to take the train. Greenwich to London Bridge return £6!!! Two people £12!	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
135	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:03:25	Agree	K Mandix	-	No	
136	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:03:25	Agree	K Mandix	-	No	
137	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:02:54	Agree	Victor	-	No	
138	Mon Jul 31 2023 09:04:05	Disagree	M	If you use it you should pay and if not the don't... le why when a family of 4 are struggling and don't use public transportation, bikes pay for them and the same for a Pensioner who doesn't use , public t, museum, schools, cycles, pay Parkes have to put up with bad roads because 90% of there tax goes else where... If you use it pay, if you have a child and cycle and use the park and the bus and train and the pool and the museum and car then you pay for them because you use them and not subsidized by everyone else	No	
139	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:55:57	Agree	Yura Nalepa	I very strongly agree because when the developers build flats, they need to build communities, not just the properties. They should be responsible for making sure that the people that they sell the properties to have all the necessary services around them.	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
140	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:54:04	Agree	-	The entire Greenwich borough is becoming an utter shithole and it's getting worse by the day. The council seems to be completely unable to collect money for infrastructure needs. Roads, pavements, street cleaning and traffic management is now on par with a developing third world country, so it's just about time someone starts paying for this, since the council is simply incapable of raising council tax for political reasons.	No	
141	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:51:02	Agree	-	We need to get the deal for residents of the Royal Borough of Greenwich. So the Borough can see improvements to public realm, public transport including bus services, GP Surgeries, Health Centres and amenities for the Borough. Including leisure facilities etc..		
142	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:50:16	Disagree	Marianna Bia	I feel the proposed charges are still too low to ensure that vital community infrastructure is delivered.	No	
143	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:48:31	Agree	James Wood	-	No	
144	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:49:59	Agree	-	-	No	

Ref	Date and time	Agrees/ Disagrees	Name	Explanation (as received*)	Would like to speak at the public examination	Notes
145	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:48:09	Agree	Alan Shaw	-	No	
146	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:46:51		-	-		<i>No representation provided.</i>
147	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:46:38	Agree	Phil Bridger	-	No	
148	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:41:47	Disagree	Steve Smythe	-	No	
149	Mon Jul 31 2023 08:41:47	Disagree	Steve Smythe	-	No	

* With the exception of representation Ref 032, the text in the Explanation column textually reflects the comments received through Commonplace.