

## **Appellant Response to:**

### **The Inspector's Queries ahead of the RTS on Conditions and Obligations:**

It is noted that the appellant's calculations are based on 38 units, and the GCC are based on 39 – what is the reason for this difference?

Appellant response: GCC had not appreciated that the number of qualifying dwellings in the Proposed Development stands at 38. This has now been realised, and GCC has submitted an updated CIL Compliance Statement based on 38 qualifying dwellings.

The Inspector notes the position set out in table 8 of Jan Kinsman Proof (page 28 or 5248). This sets out the parties preferred sums (notwithstanding the clarification on the above). A third position in terms of the use of EFM PPR Figures is also set out – what is GCC comments/position on this as an option?

Appellant response: This is for GCC to comment on.

The Inspector would also encourage the parties to work together to reach agreement on other matters (ie the particular points of detail highlighted in the Note from Ms Boucher) and to submit a revised draft obligation where necessary.

Appellant response: A revised draft UU is being progressed – please see detailed comments on the Note, being provided separately.

In light of the late receipt of the evidence from GCC, the Inspector would invite written comments in response to the above documents from the appellant (by way of 'final' comments). A timetable can be agreed at the Inquiry tomorrow, although it is hoped that a response would not take too much time to compile – bullet points and tables are encouraged.

Appellant response: It is intended that a final comments response will be submitted before or at the RTS

Jan Kinsman, for the Appellant 31 March 2021