

Planning, Transport & Sustainability Division
Planning and Rights of Way Panel 17th November 2015
Planning Application Report of the Planning and Development Manager

Application address: King George PH, Oakley Road, Southampton, SO16 4LJ.			
Proposed development: Redevelopment Of The Site. Erection Of 6X 3-Bed Houses With Associated Parking And Cycle/Refuse Storage (Outline Application Seeking Approval For Access, Appearance, Layout And Scale)			
Application number	15/01551/OUT	Application type	OUT
Case officer	Laura Grimason	Public speaking time	5 minutes
Last date for determination:	27/10/2015	Ward	Millbrook
Reason for Panel Referral:	Request by Ward Member and five or more letters of objection have been received	Ward Councillors	Cllr Galton Cllr Denness Cllr Furnell
Called in by:	Cllr Galton	Reason:	Highways safety. Poor design. Out of character with the surrounding area.

Applicant: Witchampton Developments Ltd	Agent: Tony Oldfield Architects
--	--

Recommendation Summary	Refuse
-------------------------------	---------------

Community Infrastructure Levy Liable	Yes
---	------------

Appendix attached			
1	Development Plan Policies		

Recommendation in Full

Refuse.

1. REFUSAL REASON - Loss of community facility

The redevelopment proposal would result in the loss of the existing King George Public House. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the pub is no longer viable and that it would not be viable as a community building for alternative community use. Furthermore, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the other community facilities which are available in the surrounding are adequate to meet existing need. This proposal is therefore, contrary to paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and policy CS3 of the adopted City of Southampton Local Development Framework Core Strategy Partial Review (March 2015).

2. REASON FOR REFUSAL: Inappropriate Design

The proposed design would fail to establish a high quality, context sensitive development in this location. Specifically, this would be by reason of:

- (a) The design of the proposed roof terraces to the front elevation which would become the dominant feature of the development contrary to the prevailing character of the surrounding area.
- (b) The failure to incorporate any architectural features which are characteristic of the local area in the proposed design resulting in a bland appearance that would fail to relate appropriately with the character of the surrounding area.
- (c) An excessive amount of site coverage by buildings and hard standing resulting in an overdevelopment which does not respond to existing spatial characteristics including building to plot ratios resulting in a cramped form of development.

The proposed development would have a poor quality design which would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. As such the development would be contrary to Policies SDP7 (ii) (iv), SDP8 (i) and (v), SDP9 (i) and (iv) of the adopted City of Southampton Local Plan Review (March 2015); policy CS13 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Revised 2015); and paragraphs 3.7.8, 3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.9.5, 3.9.6, 3.10.2, 3.10.4, 3.10.6, 3.10.7, 3.10.12, 3.10.13, 3.10.14, 3.10.16 and 3.10.17 of the adopted Residential Design Guide SPD (September 2006).

3. REFUSAL REASON - Lack of Section 106 agreement

In the absence of a Section 106 agreement the development fails to mitigate its impact in the following areas:

- (a) Contributions towards site specific transport improvements in the vicinity of the site in line with Policy SDP4 of the adopted Amended Local Plan Review (2015); Policies CS18 and CS25 of the adopted amended Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015); and the adopted Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2013).
- (b) Submission of a highway condition survey to ensure any damage to the adjacent highway network attributable to the build process is repaired by the developer.
- (c) Provision of affordable housing in line with Policy CS25 of the adopted amended Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015) and the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (April 2013).

- (d) A scheme of mitigation or financial contribution towards the Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project (SDMP) in accordance with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and policy CS22 of the adopted amended Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015).

1.0 The site and its context

- 1.1 This application relates to the King George public house which occupies a prominent plot of land at the junction of Oakley Road and King George Avenue. There is one residential dwelling located above and associated with the ground floor use in addition to a single storey garage to the side of the property fronting Oakley Road. The site area for this plot is approximately 900 sq m.
- 1.2 At present, there is vehicular parking for 10 cars immediately to the front of the property within a large front forecourt. A large dropped kerb spanning from Oakley Road to King George Avenue provides access to these spaces.
- 1.3 Site levels slope upwards in an easterly direction from the road frontage. As a result, properties to the rear along Prince of Wales Avenue are set at a higher level than the application site.
- 1.4 The site is located within a predominantly residential area characterised by pairs of two storey, semi-detached dwellings. There are however, a number of commercial uses immediately adjacent to the site along Oakley Road.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the redevelopment of the site by the demolition of the existing building and the construction of 6 x 3 bed houses with associated parking and cycle/refuse storage. This is an outline application seeking approval for Access, Appearance, Layout and Scale. Landscaping is reserved for a later date.
- 2.2 The proposed units would be arranged in two terraces and would each have a footprint of approximately 104 sq m. Each unit would be three storeys in height and would have a recessed roof terrace fronting Oakley Road. Front doors for each unit would be accessed via a recessed porch which would also provide space for bin storage for each unit.
- 2.3 Each unit would have a private rear garden. Garden sizes for the proposed units range from 38.4 sq m to 54.5 sq m.
- 2.4 Seven car parking spaces would be provided to the front of the proposed dwellings. These would be laid out at a 90 degree angle to the front elevation of the proposed units. Two temporary bin storage areas would also be provided within the front forecourt. A new 0.6m high boundary wall would be constructed along the front boundary of the site.

3.0 Relevant Planning Policy

- 3.1 The Development Plan for Southampton currently comprises the “saved” policies of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (as amended 2015) and the City of

Southampton Core Strategy (as amended 2015). The most relevant policies to these proposals are set out at **Appendix 1**.

- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 27th March 2012 and replaces the previous set of national planning policy guidance notes and statements. The Council has reviewed the Core Strategy to ensure that it is in compliance with the NPPF and are satisfied that the vast majority of policies accord with the aims of the NPPF and therefore retain their full material weight for decision making purposes, unless otherwise indicated.

4.0 Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 No relevant planning history.

5.0 Consultation Responses and Notification Representations

- 5.1 Following the receipt of the planning application a publicity exercise in line with department procedures was undertaken which included notifying adjoining and nearby landowners and erecting a site notice 14/08/2015. At the time of writing the report 7 representations (including 1 from a Ward Councillor) have been received from surrounding residents. The following is a summary of the points raised:

- 5.1.1 The proposed development would increase parking in an area which is already subject to significant parking stress.

Response: According to the Parking Standards SPD, a maximum parking requirement of 12 spaces would be required for this development. 7 spaces have been proposed and a car parking survey has been submitted to examine the availability of on road parking in the surrounding area. This parking survey doesn't specifically follow the Lambeth model however it does give a clear insight into the parking availability within the surrounding area and demonstrates capacity for any overspill. The application site is located approximately 726m from Shirley Town Centre and approximately 275m from the large Tesco superstore located to the north of Oakley Road and to the west of Teboura Way. As such, it is considered that the site benefits from good access to local services and public transport facilities. Census data obtained from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) suggests that within the postcode area:

- 5.1.2 The proposed scheme would be detrimental to highways safety. The proposed landscaping would reduce visibility for vehicles moving out of the site onto King George Avenue and Oakley Road. It would result in an increase in the number of collisions in this location.

Response: The City Council's Highways department have raised no objection in terms of highways safety. There is an existing continuous dropped kerb around the perimeter of the site along both King Georges Avenue and Oakley Road. As a result, at the current time, vehicles are able to drive or reverse onto the highway at any time to utilise the existing parking spaces on the front forecourt. This is considered to be a poor arrangement. The proposed scheme would improve this arrangement by providing turning room on site and establishing formal access and egress points for use by future occupiers.

- 5.1.3 The proposed dwellings would overlook the rear garden of the property located to the rear at no.103 Prince of Wales Avenue.

Response: Paragraph 2.2.4 of the Residential Design Guide outlines minimum distances which should be retained between 2 / 3 storey housing and other 3 storey housing as is the case with this development. In this instance, a minimum distance of 21m should be retained. Where there are differences in site levels, this separation distance should be increased by 2m for every 1m rise in ground level. The submitted information indicates that site levels increase by approximately 3.2m from the north western boundary along King George Avenue to the south eastern boundary of the site. As such, the minimum separation distance increases to 27m. No.103 Prince of Wales Avenue is located approximately 38m away from the rear boundary of the application site. This separation distance greatly exceeds the minimum separation distance and is acceptable. Further discussion on the impact of the scheme on the residential amenities of other neighbours is discussed later in the report.

- 5.1.4 The proposed design is at odds with the character of the surrounding area.

Response: Agree. This constitutes a reason for the recommendation to refuse the application.

- 5.1.5 The proposed scheme would overdevelop the site.

Response: The proposed density level at 67 dph is considered to be acceptable in this location in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS5. It is however, considered that the site coverage is excessive for this site.

5.2 Consultation Responses

5.2.1 SCC Highways – No Objection.

The principle of the redevelopment of this site in the manner shown is acceptable. The existing public house has a continuous dropped kerb around the site perimeter resulting in vehicles being able to drive/reverse onto or off of the forecourt in an uncontrolled manner. The development offer 2 parking courts to serve the 6 dwellings, both providing the opportunity to turn on site, so that vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward gear over defined access points. I have viewed the parking survey, although it doesn't specifically follow the Lambeth model, it does give a clear insight into the levels of parking during weekday daytime and at night, albeit the survey was conducted during the school holidays.

Conditions should be imposed requiring details as follows:

1. Sight lines at this location require careful consideration at this junction, and sight lines will need to be shown on detailed plans indicating forward visibility sight lines for users of the two new accesses, but also users of the adjacent junction.

2. Details of materials to be used on the driveways and the method of prevention of surface water from running out from the site onto the highway will be required. Alterations to the kerb alignment will be required and will require licencing from

BB to do this.

3. Details of the cycle and bin storage will need to be agreed, and the location of the collection point for the bins on collection day. Glass recycling must be catered for.

5.2.2 SCC Heritage – No objection.

Any archaeological remains are likely to have been removed by the significant level reduction associated with the former use as a Public House.

No archaeological conditions will be required.

5.2.3 SCC Sustainability Team – No Objection.

A 4x array of 250w Solar Panels will be provided on the south facing roof pitch of each property to contribute too and reduce the developments energy use, thus enabling the scheme to incorporate green sustainable technologies. These have been shown on the plans. A sustainable drainage system shall be utilised within the proposed scheme to control surface water run-off and reduce the effects of localised flooding through the use of permeable block paving and a soakaway systems to collect larger volumes of water runoff. If the case officer is minded to approve the application, the following conditions are recommended in order to ensure compliance with policy CS20

5.2.4 SCC CIL Officer

The development will become CIL liable at reserved matters stage. The charge will be levied at £70 per sq m on the Gross Internal Area of the new development. If any existing floorspace is to be used as deductible floorspace the applicant will need to demonstrate that lawful use of the building has occurred for a continuous period of at least 6 months within the period of 3 years ending on the day that planning permission first permits the chargeable development.

5.2.5 SCC Environmental Health (Pollution & Safety) – No objection.

No objection subject to conditions relating to bonfires, hours of work for demolition and clearance, dust suppression for demolition and the provision of a construction environment management plan.

5.2.6 SCC Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) – No objection.

This department considers the proposed land use as being sensitive to the effects of land contamination. There is the potential for these off-site hazards to migrate from source and present a risk to the proposed end use, workers involved in construction and the wider environment. Therefore, to ensure compliance with Para 121 of the National Planning Policy Framework - March 2012 and policies SDP1 and SDP22 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review (adopted version, March 2006) this department would recommend that the site be assessed for land contamination risks and, where appropriate, remediated to ensure the long term safety of the site.

5.2.7 SCC Ecology – No objection.

The application site consists of two buildings, hardstanding, bare ground and a small area of overgrown lawn. The buildings are in good condition and an ecological survey accompanying the planning application confirms that there is negligible potential for bat roosts. The garden area at the rear doesn't contain any significant vegetation and as a consequence there are unlikely to be any impacts on nesting birds, foraging bats or other local wildlife. The ecology report includes recommendations for simple biodiversity enhancements which I would like to see implemented.

5.2.8 **Southern Water – No objection.**

No objection but informatives requested if approval is recommended.

6.0 Planning Consideration Key Issues

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The key issues for consideration in the determination of this planning application are:

- (a) The principle of development;
- (b) The quality of residential environment for future occupiers;
- (c) Design;
- (d) Effect on residential amenity;
- (e) Highways safety, car and cycle parking and;
- (f) Planning obligations and mitigation.

6.2 Principle of Development

6.2.1 Core Strategy Policy CS4 (Housing Delivery) suggests that: 'An additional 16,000 homes will be provided within the City of Southampton between 2006 and 2026. This proposal would make good use of previously developed land within a predominantly residential area to provide 5 much needed additional homes and is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in principle subject to other considerations relating to the loss of a community facility.

6.2.2 Core Strategy Policy CS5 (Housing Density) outlines density levels for new residential development which will be acceptable in different parts of the city. This property is located within an area of moderate accessibility (Band 3) to Public Transport where densities of between 50 and 100 dph would be considered. As such, the proposed density of 67 dph is considered to be appropriate and in line with Core Strategy policy CS5.

6.2.3 Paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that: 'To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should: Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day to day needs'.

6.2.4 Core Strategy Policy CS3 states that: 'Proposals that result in the loss of a community facility throughout the city will not be supported if it is viable for the commercial, public or community sector to operate it and if there is no similar or replacement facility in the same neighbourhood'. Public houses are classed as community uses by the NPPF and so policy CS3 applies for this scheme. No justification showing the following has been submitted:

- (a) Marketing information to show that the property was marketed for continued use as a public house for a substantial period of time.
- (b) Information on any expressions of interest during the marketing of this property
- (c) Information to show where alternative community facilities are located in the surrounding area.

In the absence of this information, the applicant has failed to address policy CS3 and the requirements of the NPPF and it is considered that this scheme would result in the loss of a community facility. This scheme is therefore, contrary to policy until this information is provided.

6.3 Quality of Residential Environment

6.3.1 The proposed units would be of an adequate size to provide a high quality standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers. Habitable room windows (serving bedrooms, living and dining areas) within all of the proposed units would benefit from sufficient access to light and outlook and all units would benefit from good levels of privacy.

6.3.2 The Residential Design Guide outlines minimum standards for amenity areas within the city. For terraced properties, a minimum of 50 sq m of amenity space should be provided for use by future occupiers. Gardens for the proposed units range in size from 39 sq m to 54 sq m. In addition to this, each unit has a roof terrace of approximately 17 sq m. As a result, each unit would have access to private amenity space of more than 50 sq m. The amenity areas provided would be private and usable and this proposal would therefore, be compliant with the requirements of the Residential Design Guide SPD.

6.4 Design

6.4.1 The application site occupies a prominent location at the junction of King Georges Avenue and Oakley Road. Both King George Avenue and Oakley Road are characterised by pairs of two storey, characterful 1930s semi-detached dwellings. Properties in the surrounding area have distinguishing features including; two storey projecting bay windows, decorative gables and porch canopies. They are predominantly of brick construction with hipped side roofslopes. A number of properties have front gardens whilst some have front driveways providing off road parking for residents.

6.4.2 Paragraph 3.7.8 of the Residential Design Guide suggests that: 'The proposed development should be similar in scale, massing, position on the plot, vertical and horizontal rhythm and a high quality of architectural detailing that is harmonious with existing adjacent development'. The proposed development fails to adopt any of the distinguishing features which characterise the surrounding area. The front elevations have a bland appearance and do not incorporate any of the features

which characterise the surrounding area. Furthermore, there are no defined front entrances given the incorporation of recessed porches at ground floor level which obscure the front entrance doors from the streetscene. It is considered that the design of the scheme could be vastly improved through the addition of features characteristic of the local area.

- 6.4.3 Paragraph 3.10.2 of the Residential Design Guide explains that: 'New development should respond to the character and context of its site and establish a high quality 21st century contemporary architecture that makes appropriate reference to the local vernacular architecture'. Recessed roof terraces have been provided within the front roofslope of each dwelling to provide additional private amenity space for occupiers of the development. These features are considered to be at odds with the prevailing character of the surrounding area where front roofslopes tend to be hipped and where there are no similar roof terraces present. Due to their siting within the front roofslope of each property, these would become the most prominent features of the development. They would dominate this prominent plot and would subsequently, be considered out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
- 6.4.4 Pairs of semi-detached dwellings along both King Georges Avenue and Oakley Road tend to have gaps of approximately 3.5m between them providing sufficient room to provide side accesses leading to the rear of the property. This development, due to the number of units proposed, would fail to retain a similar separation distance between the proposed terraced blocks resulting in a cramped appearance in relation to the surrounding area.
- 6.4.5 Paragraph 3.9.2 of the Residential Design Guide states that: 'In all cases outside the city centre, the footprint of buildings and hard surfaced areas should not exceed 50% of the site'. The site area is approximately 900 sq m and approximately 677 sq m of that would be covered by buildings and hardstanding. As such, more than 50% of the site would be covered by building and hardstanding. This is considered to be symptomatic of overdevelopment.
- 6.4.6 The design of this scheme is therefore unacceptable and contrary to policy.

6.5 Residential Amenity

- 6.5.1 Site levels increase in an easterly direction from Oakley Road and as a result, the residential properties to the rear along Prince of Wales Avenue are located at a higher level than the application site. Paragraph 2.2.4 of the Residential Design Guide outlines minimum distances which should be retained between 2 / 3 storey housing and other 3 storey housing as is the case with this development. In this instance, a minimum distance of 21m should be retained. Where there are differences in site levels, this separation distance should be increased by 2m for every 1m rise in ground level. The submitted information indicates that site levels increase by approximately 3.2m from the north western boundary along King George Avenue to the south eastern boundary of the site. As such, the minimum separation distance increases to 27m.
- 6.5.2 Separation distances ranging from 23m to 29m would be retained between habitable room windows within the rear of the proposed units and those within the rear of the units located at 111 – 117 Prince of Wales Avenue. It is the northern and the central unit within the northern terrace which would fail to meet the

minimum separation distance of 27m. The Residential Design Guide advises that the City Council can apply these standards flexibly depending on the context of the surrounding area. Given that it is the properties to the rear that are located at a higher level than the application site, it is not considered that this would give rise to a loss of amenity for these neighbouring residential properties. Specifically, it is not considered that any overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact would occur. The separation distances that have been proposed are therefore, considered to be acceptable.

- 6.5.3 The nearest residential dwelling to the application site along King Georges Avenue is located at no.214. It is the side elevation of this property which faces the application site. At first floor level, there is an obscure glazed window within the side elevation of this property whilst the windows at ground floor level are obscured by the existing boundary fence and do not therefore, benefit from a good outlook or access to light. These windows appear to be secondary to primary windows within the rear elevation looking out into the rear garden and with an easterly orientation. As the proposed terrace of dwellings would only exceed the depth of this neighbouring property by approximately 1.5m, it is not considered that the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the residential amenities of its occupiers.
- 6.5.4 The nearest residential dwelling to the application site along Oakley Road is the first floor flat above the ground floor commercial use at no.94. There is one obscure glazed window within the side elevation of this property. As this is obscure glazed, it does not benefit from good outlook or access to light at the current time. Having regard to this and the retention of a separation distance of approximately 3m, no further loss of light or outlook is considered likely to occur as a result of this proposal.
- 6.5.5 This scheme is therefore, considered to respect existing amenity in terms of privacy, overlooking, overshadowing and outlook.

6.6 Highways Safety, Car and Cycle Parking

- 6.6.1 The City Council's Highways team have raised no objection in terms of highways safety. There is an existing continuous dropped kerb around the perimeter of the site along both King Georges Avenue and Oakley Road. As a result, at the current time, vehicles are able to drive or reverse onto the highway at any time to utilise the existing parking spaces on the front forecourt. This is considered to be a poor arrangement. The level of trips associated with a public house is also greater than those associated with the proposed residential use. The proposed scheme would improve this arrangement by providing turning room on site and establishing formal access and egress points for use by future occupiers. If a recommendation for conditional approval was made, a condition securing sightlines would be imposed.
- 6.6.2 According to the Parking Standards SPD, a maximum parking requirement of 12 spaces would be required for this development. 7 spaces have been proposed and a car parking survey has been submitted to examine the availability of on road parking in the surrounding area. This survey was undertaken at 01:00 on the 30th July 2015 and indicates the following:

(a) A total number of 227 on road parking spaces were identified in the study

area.

(b) 74 spaces were available at the time of the survey.

6.6.3 According to the Parking Standards SPD, a total of 6 parking spaces is acceptable. The submitted documents indicate that 12 cycle parking spaces would be provided within a secure cycle store in the rear garden of each unit. This would provide the required amount of cycle parking. A condition could be imposed to secure further details of this in order to ensure that the cycle parking provided is in accordance with the standards in the Parking Standards SPD.

6.6.4 With regards to refuse storage, the submitted plans indicate that space for 2 bins would be provided within a bin storage area in the recessed front porch for each dwelling. The Highways team have noted that space for glass storage would also be required and this could be addressed through a planning condition. Further details of refuse storage facilities would be secured by planning condition is a recommendation for conditional approval was made.

6.6.5 It is noted that the Ward Councillor and local residents see highways safety to be an issue with the scheme. It is not recommended that this issue forms a separate reason for refusal for the reasons given above and the lack of support for doing so from SCC Highways

6.7 Planning Obligations

6.1 The scale of this development triggered a number of requirements to be secured through a S106 agreement in order to mitigate the impact of the scheme. These are as follows:

- (a) Site specific transport works.
- (b) Solent Disturbance Mitigation Project.
- (c) Highways condition survey.
- (d) Affordable housing.

Given the recommendation is to refuse, these planning obligations have not been secured and this will constitute an additional reason for refusal.

7.0 Summary

7.1 In light of the issues discussed in this report, this proposal has failed to address issues relating to: (a) The loss of a community facility and (b) design. Furthermore, it has not been possible to secure planning obligations through the completion of a section 106 agreement. The proposed development would therefore, be inappropriate in relation to the character of the surrounding area and is recommended for refusal.

7.2 Having reviewed the scheme, the City Council's Highways department have not objected on the grounds of highways safety. As such, the scheme is considered to constitute an improvement on the existing access and parking arrangement.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 The application is recommended for refusal on the grounds of the loss of a community facility, inappropriate design and lack of a S106 agreement.

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
Documents used in the preparation of this report Background Papers

1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 2(b), 2(d), 4(f), 4(g), 4(vv), 7(a), 9(a) and 9(b).

LAUGRI for 17/11/15 PROW Panel

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

POLICY CONTEXT

Core Strategy - (as amended 2015)

CS4	Housing Delivery
CS5	Housing Density
CS13	Fundamentals of Design
CS16	Housing Mix and Type
CS18	Transport: Reduce-Manage-Invest
CS19	Car & Cycle Parking
CS20	Tackling and Adapting to Climate Change
CS22	Promoting Biodiversity and Protecting Habitats

City of Southampton Local Plan Review – (as amended 2015)

SDP1	Quality of Development
SDP4	Development Access
SDP5	Parking
SDP6	Urban Design Principles
SDP7	Urban Design Context
SDP8	Urban Form and Public Space
SDP9	Scale, Massing & Appearance
SDP10	Safety & Security
SDP11	Accessibility & Movement
SDP12	Landscape & Biodiversity
H1	Housing Supply
H7	The Residential Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Residential Design Guide (Approved - September 2006)

Parking Standards SPD (September 2011)

Other Relevant Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The Southampton Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (September 2013)