



**Vale
of White Horse**
District Council



Help us Shape the Future

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS Submission Version

Your Vale - Your Future

March 2021

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Summary of the consultation process	3
3.	Main issues raised during consultation	5
4.	Modifications to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule	11
5.	Next steps	12

Appendices

1.	List of respondents	13
2.	Schedule of consultation responses	14

1. Introduction

What is the Community Infrastructure Levy?

- 1.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into force in April 2010 and is a levy that local authorities can choose to charge on new development, in order to fund a wide range of infrastructure to support planned growth in their area.
- 1.2 Vale of White Horse District Council, as the local planning authority, is classed as a charging authority and may therefore charge CIL in respect of development that takes place in the District. CIL is a fixed, transparent charge which means developers have more certainty from the start of the development process regarding the financial contributions they are required to make.
- 1.3 Under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) (as amended), every charging authority must produce a CIL Charging Schedule, which sets out the rates of CIL to be paid for different development typologies across their administrative area.
- 1.4 The current CIL Charging Schedule covering the Vale of White Horse District came into effect in November 2017.

Review of our CIL Charging Schedule

- 1.5 The Council has decided to review its current CIL Charging Schedule to reflect the adoption of Part 2 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 in October 2019 and the changes to the CIL Regulations in September 2019.
- 1.6 This review must be carried out in accordance with the CIL Regulations, which include the requirement for the draft Charging Schedule to be supported by evidence on development viability across the District and a broad understanding of the area's infrastructure needs and the funding currently available to deliver the necessary infrastructure to support planned growth in the Vale.

2. Summary of the consultation process

- 2.1 The CIL Regulations require the Council to carry out public consultation on its draft CIL Charging Schedule, before it can submit the draft document for independent Examination.
- 2.2 Public consultation was conducted from 11 January to 8 February 2021. During this consultation period, comments were welcomed on the following documents:
- A **Draft CIL Charging Schedule** (setting out revised levy rates for different development typologies across three defined zones in the District)
 - The Council's **Viability Assessment 2019, Viability Addendum 2020** and **Viability Executive Summary 2020** (providing the development viability evidence on which the proposed CIL rates are based)
 - An **Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement** (The CIL Regulations require that, in order to justify charging CIL, the Council must demonstrate that there is a 'gap' between the infrastructure needs of the District and the funding that is available, including anticipated CIL income).
- 2.3 The Council made all consultation documentation available on its website and in hard copy at its offices¹. A notification email or letter was sent to around 2,200 consultees on the Council's consultation database, which incorporates all the consultation bodies set out in Regulations 16(1A) and 16(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). This email/letter provided background to the CIL consultation and explained where people could view the documents and the various ways in which they could provide comments.
- 2.4 The Council also used its social media platforms to advertise the consultation and circulated a poster via email for each of the town and parish councils to display, where appropriate.
- 2.5 In total there were **31 respondents** to the consultation, including landowners, developers, community groups, parish and town councils, statutory consultees and individuals. The respondents were asked to specify to which document(s) their comments related and the breakdown is shown in Table 1 overleaf:

¹ Due to COVID restrictions, the Council offices were closed to the public. Respondents were asked to contact the Council if they wished to view hard copies, so appropriate options could be discussed.

Table 1		
Document	No. of respondents	No. of individual comments on the document
Draft CIL Charging Schedule	21	37
Viability Assessment 2019	2	2
Viability Addendum 2020	3	4
Viability Executive Summary 2020	4	36
Viability/General	1	1
Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement	4	6
All documents/ General response	6	7

- 2.6 Of the 31 respondents, 7 were representatives from the development industry (including agents), 8 were town or parish councils, 11 were statutory consultees or local community groups/organisations and 5 were individuals. A full list of respondents can be found in Appendix 1.

Developer Engagement

- 2.7 Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises charging authorities to engage with developers in preparing their draft CIL Charging Schedules. The Council did this by providing a number of opportunities for developers to get involved during the preparation stage. A 'Call for Evidence' in 2019 generated no response. The Council also arranged workshops with the Council's viability consultants (Aspinall Verdi) to explore the assumptions that were used in their viability assessments. These events took place in February 2019 and more recently in October 2020. In excess of 200 agents and developers were invited to both events, with twenty representatives attending in 2019 and three representatives attending in 2020.

3. Main issues raised during consultation

- 3.1 This section provides a summary of the main issues raised by respondents to the consultation and details the Council's response on each of these issues, including an indication of whether we have made minor modifications to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule as a result of the comments made.
- 3.2 A detailed schedule of all comments received during the public consultation period, including summaries, the Council's responses and any modifications to the draft Charging Schedule is attached as Appendix 2.

Viability Issues

- 3.3 A range of comments were submitted relating to the viability assessments, particularly regarding the assumptions underpinning the work undertaken by the Council's consultants. These comments were mainly, but not exclusively, made by respondents from the development industry.
- 3.4 A number of comments related to the assumptions used in the viability assessments. Several respondents expressed the view that the professional fees and contingency costs used in the viability modelling were too low. Some also felt that the assessments should have factored in costs for the provision of garages. Three respondents queried why the build costs applied for estate housing were based on BCIS lower quartile, instead of median quartile which was considered more appropriate for the Vale. Several agents representing developers felt that residential value assumptions for different housing typologies would have been more accurate if based on an analysis of recent new build transactions, rather than calculated using an indexing approach. Similarly, concerns were raised regarding what was deemed a 'business as usual' approach to assessing market conditions and trends during the Covid-19 Pandemic.
- 3.5 Catesby Estates, Bloor Homes and Herridge Property Consulting all put forward the point that it was not possible to determine whether the assumed S106/S278 costs were appropriate and represented a realistic set of costs. It was, therefore, requested that a full and transparent account of costs be provided.
- 3.6 Several respondents questioned why the proposed CIL rates for Zone 1 (the eastern parishes) were not higher, when the viability evidence suggested they could support higher rates without compromising viability and the Council had demonstrated that there was still a large infrastructure funding gap, even once CIL income had been taken into account.
- 3.7 Conversely, others made reference to the need for greater clarity over the level of viability 'buffer' that the Council's consultants had applied, which the respondents agreed was needed to ensure that the proposed CIL rates did not render future development unviable if local economic circumstances were to change. Several respondents cited 50% as a suitable buffer for all zones/development typologies in the District and claimed that this was endorsed by CIL Examiners elsewhere in the country.

- 3.8 Bloor Homes and Catesby Estates both considered that the affordable housing transfer values for affordable rent and intermediate tenure units used in the viability assessments were too high for the South East region. They noted that this data was provided by the District Council but were of the opinion that Aspinall Verdi should have liaised with Registered Providers to collect this information and that, consequently, it was not possible to determine whether the values were robust.

Council's response

- 3.9 Taking these viability points in order, the Council's response is as follows: Aspinall Verdi consulted on the baseline assumptions underpinning its viability assessment work in 2019 and 2020 and no feedback was received to suggest that any adjustments to the assumptions were necessary. The professional fee and contingency costs are considered appropriate allowances and are consistent with allowances in other local plan and CIL viability studies. With regard to build costs for estate housing, it is not agreed that BICS Median costs should be assumed, as it is well documented that volume housebuilders build at rates well below median quartile.
- 3.10 On garages, Land Registry and Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Data are the only sources of bulk housing market data and it is not possible for an area-wide study to take into consideration the detail of individual units, for example in relation to garage provision. However, where garages are to be provided, one would anticipate a corresponding increase in property value.
- 3.11 Taking an Indexing Approach to assessing current market conditions is considered appropriate, given the uncertainties arising from Brexit and Covid-19. Whilst it is acknowledged that taking this approach is a simplification, it is well documented that housing values have in fact remained strong during the pandemic and there has also been some growth in the housing sector, helped by both the Stamp Duty holiday and a likely increase in demand for property in areas like Vale of White Horse, from residents moving out of London.
- 3.12 The S106/S278 assumptions are set out in Appendix 1 (Updated Typologies Matrix) of the Viability Addendum (Aug 2020) and are based on recent examples of development sites in the District. It is assumed that S106 costs will include education and transport infrastructure and Aspinall Verdi considered the assumptions appropriate for the various typologies tested.
- 3.13 Paragraph 8.6 of the Viability Addendum (Aug 2020) states that the recommended CIL rates are below the top of the possible ranges identified, as it is important to maintain a contingency or buffer, in order to ensure that development is viable overall and can come forward with its requisite policy requirements for infrastructure and affordable housing. This is particularly the case currently where there are material risks to the economy associated with Covid-19 and Brexit.
- 3.14 The level of viability 'buffer' in the real world will vary from site-to-site. The viability buffer for the various typologies can be seen on the sensitivity tables for each of the appraisals (included as appendices to the 2019 and 2020 Viability Assessments).

One has to look at the appraisals in the round (e.g. including the 20% profit margin) when considering the appropriate level of 'buffer' to apply.

- 3.15 The affordable housing transfer values for affordable rent and intermediate tenure units are monitored by the Council's housing team and were and continue to be considered robust. As with all the viability assumptions, transfer values were consulted on in February 2019 and October 2020, with no feedback received.

Applying Differential Rates and Defining Zones

- 3.16 Consultants West Waddy suggested that the justification for not setting differential brownfield/greenfield rates did not address the fact that there are substantial amounts of brownfield land around Didcot and in Abingdon where proposed CIL rates would be particularly high. Nor was there any acknowledgement that there are substantial differences in costs of decontaminating brownfield land on different sites. It was therefore recommended that, in the interests of flexibility, CIL should not be applied uniformly over all brownfield sites.
- 3.17 Concern was expressed by several respondents that Faringdon would be disadvantaged in some way through the introduction of lower CIL rates for the newly defined Zone 2. Wantage Town Council also questioned why there was no proposed uplift in CIL for supermarkets.
- 3.18 Friends of Abingdon Society support the proposed higher CIL charge for residential development in Zone 1 (Eastern Parishes), especially on sites of more than 10 dwellings. However, they felt that within Zone 1, Abingdon needed to be treated differently to the other eastern parishes and have its own charging rates for housing development.
- 3.19 Whilst only a few comments were made about the proposed differential rates for major and minor schemes, those who responded were supportive of the approach to charge higher rates for minor schemes (9 dwellings and fewer net).

Council's Response

- 3.20 The Council concluded that setting differential brownfield/greenfield rates would not be appropriate for the District because the administration associated with implementing separate rates would be complex and require significant staff resources.
- 3.21 As an alternative, a specific CIL charging zone (Zone 2) around Wantage, Grove and Faringdon has been defined (which is where the majority of the District's brownfield development is likely to come forward) and applying lower rates here allows higher rates to be set for the rest of the District, without prejudicing overall development viability. Separate treatment for Abingdon in Zone 1 would add unnecessary complication and no need for this is indicated in the viability assessments.
- 3.22 The proposed rates in the two zones are based on the findings of viability evidence. New residential development in Zone 2, where land values are lower, cannot sustain higher CIL rates without an adverse impact on overall development viability.

Similarly, evidence suggests that supermarkets cannot sustain a higher rate across the District than that proposed in Table 1 of the Draft Charging Schedule.

Proposed CIL Rates (Table 1 of the Draft Charging Schedule)

- 3.23 The town and parish councils which responded to the consultation were generally supportive of the Draft CIL Charging Schedule, as was neighbouring South Oxfordshire District Council. Oxfordshire County Council also offered support for the proposed rates and was supportive of carrying forward the zero-rated strategic site allocations from the current Charging Schedule. The town and parish councils did, however, seek clarification on some detailed points including: the apportionment of CIL receipts to the towns/parish councils; how proposed CIL funded projects were vetted; and justification for the 5% of CIL income allocated to cover the Council's administration costs.
- 3.24 Edgars Consultancy queried what constituted student accommodation and sought clarification as to whether student accommodation which is C3 (self-contained units) would be charged differently to student accommodation classified as C2 (i.e. a residential institution).
- 3.25 East Hendred Parish Council and Friends of Abingdon Society expressed concern that no CIL contributions were sought from the development of identified Strategic Sites, despite the fact that such development placed additional burdens on facilities and community infrastructure in neighbouring settlements.

Council's Response

- 3.26 The 25% or 15% apportioned to town and parish councils (dependent on whether or not they have a made Neighbourhood Plan in place) is based on gross CIL receipts.
- 3.27 All projects brought forward for delivery using CIL funds are determined by the district council to ensure that they meet CIL spend criteria with the exception of spend of the neighbourhood proportion by town and parish councils. Town and parish councils must provide an annual report to the district council which details how their allocation of funding has been spent and officers in the Infrastructure and Development team or the Oxfordshire Association for Local Councils can provide advice on CIL spending guidelines for these authorities.
- 3.28 Regulation 61 (1) to (4) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) governs the percentage of gross CIL receipts that a charging authority can attribute to administrative costs (up to 5%). The Council's functions in preparing CIL policy, administering, collecting, monitoring and spending CIL warrant the retention of 5% of CIL receipts.
- 3.29 It is agreed that clarification on what constitutes 'student accommodation' would be helpful. Consequently, we are recommending that a footnote be added to Table 1 as follows:

'Student accommodation which is self-contained (e.g. studio flats) will be charged CIL at the relevant residential rate.'

Student accommodation of a communal nature (e.g. shared living areas and/or kitchens) will be nil rated.'

- 3.30 For Strategic Sites, charging CIL as well as S106 contributions would render delivery of development unviable. Nevertheless, S106 contributions from these sites can still be directed towards recreational/community facilities in neighbouring areas, where appropriate.

Exceptional Circumstances Relief

- 3.31 West Waddy stated that the Council should offer exceptional circumstances relief, so that in circumstances where the development of a heavily contaminated site would only be viable if relief was obtained from the payment of CIL, then the Council would have the discretion to allow this to happen. They cited a specific site in Faringdon where this was considered applicable and went on to say that offering exceptional circumstances relief would have important planning benefits (for example: promoting development on previously developed land; reducing pressure for greenfield sites; enabling removal of pollutants on contaminated land; and increasing vitality of services and facilities).

Council's Response

- 3.32 The proposed CIL rates have been prepared in relation to the general viability of the District, taking account of lower land values in Wantage, Grove and Faringdon. It is not evident that there are sufficient examples to introduce a policy for exceptional circumstances relief where it would be beneficial in bringing forward development. It would add complication and delay when one of the strengths of CIL is its universality and certainty. We do, however, recognise that brownfield sites may have grounds for site specific viability assessments and compromises may need to be found in respect of affordable housing / S106 contributions.

Distribution of CIL Funds

- 3.33 A number of representations were made in relation to how CIL receipts should be distributed. Respondents specifically asked:
- Why should CIL funds collected in the Vale of White Horse District be spent in the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Area?
 - Should a percentage of CIL receipts be provided to communities affected by increased volumes of traffic towards transport infrastructure?
 - Could more CIL be directed towards primary healthcare provision?

Council's Response

- 3.34 The expenditure of CIL is not determined through the CIL Charging Schedule. The spending of CIL is undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations and the District Council's non-statutory CIL Spending Strategy, which is reviewed annually in line with Council priorities.

- 3.35 Nevertheless, development within the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Area will have direct impacts on the Vale of White Horse District and it is currently appropriate that a proportion of the funds levied in the Vale District contribute towards wider Oxfordshire infrastructure.
- 3.36 The Council's CIL Spending Strategy sets out how all CIL funding receipts are allocated, including how much is allocated to Oxfordshire County Council to fund, amongst other things, transport projects. The County Council also produces an annual statement setting out how it has used this funding.
- 3.37 The Council's CIL Spending Strategy allocates 20% of the funding received (following the allocation of the neighbourhood proportions and administration costs) to health care. The Council is in regular contact with the Oxfordshire NHS Clinical Commissioning Group to bring forward projects supported by CIL funding.

Conversion from Business to Residential Uses

- 3.38 Watchfield Parish Council has sought assurance that, in circumstances where an approved business use benefits from lower CIL rates (as set out in Table 1 of the Draft Charging Schedule), the same premises cannot subsequently be converted to residential use, without paying the appropriate uplift in CIL rate, dependent on location within the District.

Council's Response

- 3.39 If a planning application was approved for a commercial or business use this would need to be implemented and the property be in use for at least 6 months of the previous 3 years to be able to offset the floorspace for a change of use to residential. Furthermore, change of use of a commercial property to residential use will, in some circumstances, require planning approval from the local planning authority, which will ensure that the impact of the development is taken into account and that appropriate mitigation measures are undertaken as required.

4. Modifications to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule

- 4.1 In response to a small number of representations made, primarily from Oxfordshire County Council, we have made some minor modifications to the Draft CIL Charging Schedule.
- 4.2 A Statement of Modifications has been prepared, which includes commentary explaining how the changes relate to the comments made and who made them.
- 4.3 Under Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended), the Council is required to send a copy of its Statement of Modifications to everyone who was previously invited to make representations during public consultation on our Draft Charging Schedule and its associated evidence documents. We will also publish this Statement on our website.
- 4.4. Anyone can request to be heard by the Examiner (who is responsible for carrying out the independent Examination of the draft Charging Schedule) in relation to any of the modifications. To do so, your request must be submitted to the Council within four weeks from the date on which we formally submit all our documentation to the Examiner. Your request must include details of the modification(s) on which you wish to be heard.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 Now that we have consulted on our Draft Charging Schedule and produced this Statement of Representations (together with a full schedule of all the comments received and the Council's response to each – see Appendix 2), we are now ready to submit the Draft Charging Schedule for independent examination.
- 5.2 Key milestones for the review of our CIL Charging Schedule are set out in Table 2 below:

Table 2	
Milestone	Anticipated Date
Public consultation on the Draft CIL Charging Schedule	11 January to 8 February 2021 (completed)
Submission of Draft CIL Charging Schedule to the appointed Examiner	19 March 2021
Examination – either by virtual hearing session/s or by consideration of written representations	Provisionally June 2021
Receive Examiner's report	Late Summer/Early Autumn 2021
Adoption by the Council	Late Summer/Early Autumn 2021

- 5.3 Once the Council has adopted the Charging Schedule, it will sit alongside the Adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 (Parts 1 and 2) and will help us deliver our development objectives.

Where to get more information

- 5.4 The Draft CIL Charging Schedule and all the supporting evidence documents can be viewed on the Council's website at: www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/draftcilchargingschedule
- 5.5 If you have difficulty accessing the documents please contact the planning policy team:

By Email: planning.policy@whitehorsedc.gov.uk
By Telephone: call 01235 422600

Appendix 1: List of respondents

	Respondent
1	Attree, John
2	Bloor Homes
3	Catesby Estates
4	Charney Bassett Parish Council
5	Crawford, Andy Cllr
6	East Hendred Parish Council
7	Edgars Consultancy
8	Friends of Abingdon Society
9	Gore, Peter
10	Herridge Property Consulting
11	Highways England
12	Historic England
13	Milton Parish Council
14	Natural England
15	NHS Oxfordshire CCG
16	North Hinksey Parish Council
17	Oxfordshire County Council
18	Ptarmigan Land
19	Roberts, Judy Cllr
20	Roebuck Land & Planning
21	Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks
22	Shrivenham Parish Council
23	South Oxfordshire District Council
24	Uffington Parish Council
25	VOWH Infrastructure & Development Team
26	Wantage Town Council
27	Watchfield Parish Council
28	West Waddy
29	Wilts & Berks Canal Trust
30	Wise, Michael Dr
31	Woodlands Medical Centre PPG

Appendix 2 – Schedule of Consultation Responses

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
1	Highways England	2019 Viability Assessment	Appendix 1 - Policy Review	Impact of development on the A34	<p>Note reference to development at Harwell Campus and are supportive of master planning for this site, noting that key objectives are to identify necessary development mitigation and to investigate access arrangements. This will only be possible if the infrastructure requirements are considered from the outset, as opposed to taking a piecemeal approach. Highways England are specifically interested in understanding traffic impact of the whole Harwell Campus Site on the A34 Chilton Interchange, including the impact that users of the local road network may have on its safe and efficient operation.</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of objectives towards more sustainable means of transport, namely contribution towards improved bus services and associated infrastructure for the area and integrating walking and cycling routes into the rest of the Harwell Campus site.</p> <p>Note that all new development at Dalton Barracks will be guided by a comprehensive development framework. Keen to understand what the Council's strategy is for local road network improvements and how these will be funded, to facilitate the delivery of local plan allocations and any windfall development sites. Sites such as Kingston Bagpuize and Dalton Barracks will need local road network improvements to ensure suitable access to the Strategic Road Network.</p>	We will continue to consult Highways England on matters affecting the Strategic Road Network as we work on the next Vale Local Plan.	None required.
2	Edgars Planning Consultancy	2019 Viability Assessment	Para 6.2	Student Accommodation and Communal Space	<p>The viability assessment refers to 1 bed units and a 'non-chargeable communal space' (with a net-gross) at 85%. Can you please confirm whether communal space is excluded from CIL liability? This also infers that student accommodation is to be regarded as self-contained residential units (C3), which links to our other query on what use class you are defining student accommodation as.</p>	Table 1 requires a footnote for clarity on this point.	<p>Add footnote to Table 1 as follows: <i>'Student accommodation which is self-contained (e.g. studio flats) will be charged CIL at the relevant residential rate.</i></p> <p><i>Student accommodation of a communal nature (e.g. shared living areas and/or kitchens) will be nil rated.'</i></p>

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
3	Friends of Abingdon Society	2020 Viability Addendum		Analysis of applying Sub Division and Higher Charging Rates within the Eastern Zone	The Vale has more than sufficient housing to meet its planned housing requirement of 22,760 dwellings, with an excess supply of around 4,500 dwellings. The Infrastructure Funding Analysis shows that on this basis of meeting the planned housing requirement and the revised CIL charges raised to meet the cost of infrastructure needed to support that amount of development, the proposed CIL charge would still leave a funding gap of over £250 million for the Council to find. Yet the CIL Viability Assessment states that housing development across the Eastern Zone of the Vale could easily support much higher charges without compromising the viability of that development. Consequently, a more transparent and clearly argued analysis of the housing proposals in the development plan and other relevant plans, and their relationship to the necessary related infrastructure needs to be undertaken. The findings should then inform the viability of increasing CIL charges (including variations by sub-areas and the planning considerations underlying the development plan) and any conclusions should be made publicly available before any changes are made to the CIL charges for the District.	Point noted. Para 8.6 of the 2020 Addendum states that the recommended rates are below the top of the possible ranges identified, as it is important to maintain a contingency or buffer, in order to ensure that development is viable overall and can come forward with its requisite policy requirements for infrastructure and affordable housing. This is particularly the case currently where there are material risks to the economy associated with Covid and Brexit.	None required.
4	West Waddy	2020 Viability Addendum	5.5-5.59, 5.68-5.76, 5.77-5.82, and 8.2	Differential Rates - Brownfield and Greenfield	(Also applies to para 9.4 of Executive Summary) The reasoning for not setting differential rates does not address two factors, firstly there are substantial amounts of brownfield land around Didcot and in Abingdon where rates are particularly high and secondly there are very substantial differences in costs of decontaminating brownfield land. Need for flexibility so that CIL is not applied uniformly over all brownfield sites. Vital that the Council offers exceptional circumstances relief.	<p>The Council concluded that setting differential brownfield/greenfield rates would not be appropriate for the District because the administration associated with implementing separate rates would be complex and require significant staff resources. As an alternative, a specific CIL charging zone (Zone 2) around Wantage, Grove and Faringdon has been defined (which is where the majority of the District's brownfield development is likely to come forward) and applying lower rates here allows higher rates to be set for the rest of the District, without prejudicing overall development viability.</p> <p>Regarding exceptional circumstances relief, the proposed CIL rates have been prepared in relation to the general viability of the District, taking account of the lower land values in Wantage, Grove and Faringdon. It is not evident that there are sufficient examples to introduce a policy for exceptional circumstances relief where it would be beneficial in bringing forward development. It would add complication and delay when one of the strengths of CIL is its universality and certainty. We do, however, recognise that brownfield sites may have grounds for site specific viability assessments and compromises may need to be found in respect of affordable housing / S106 contributions.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
5	Wise, Michael Dr	2020 Viability Addendum	P iii, ES 17 bullet 2; P6 para 3.6	Lack of justification for lower rate for Faringdon	Faringdon is subsidising higher rates of CIL to be charged elsewhere. This is discriminatory and stigmatising. Faringdon is a rural community and is not like Wantage or Grove or Abingdon. There is only one brownfield site in Faringdon, the rest of the developments are all on greenfield sites. To classify Faringdon as urban and brownfield as on P6 shows that the authors have never been to Faringdon and the neglect of Faringdon by Vale of White Horse District Council.	Agree that P6 of the Viability Addendum could be misinterpreted as suggesting that Faringdon is urban and brownfield. However, the proposed rates are based on the findings of viability evidence. New residential development in Zone 2, where land values are lower, cannot sustain higher CIL rates without an adverse impact on overall development viability.	None required.
6	Friends of Abingdon Society	2020 Viability Addendum		Sub Division and Higher Charging Rates within the Eastern Zone	The proposed subdivision of the District for CIL charging purposes fails to recognise and take account of considerable variations in geography, development costs and probable sales returns across the District and also variations within each subdivision. A higher CIL charge for residential development in the Eastern Zone, especially on sites of more than 10 dwellings, is warranted. CIL is based on average costs and returns across areas as no two sites will be the same. But given the very conservative increases proposed, there will undoubtedly be a considerable loss of potential infrastructure contributions on sites in the Eastern Zone. The Viability Assessment says there is insufficient evidence of these variations from the market for new housing in Abingdon, but the evidence from the "second-hand" housing market shows that prices are lower in the villages in the Eastern Parishes than in Abingdon (by around £1000/m2). Nevertheless, the proximity of Oxford City, the size of Abingdon and its strong employment base, and the fact that the Local Plan has had to make allowance for substantial additional housing demand which cannot be accommodated within Oxford, suggest strongly that Abingdon should be treated differently to the other Eastern Parishes and have its own charging rates for housing development. Proposes CIL charges in Abingdon should therefore be re-analysed.	The Eastern Parishes do have higher sales values for houses, but also the land values are higher as a consequence. The appraisals must, therefore, be taken 'in the round'. Also, the Council has sought to minimise the number of CIL charging zones for simplicity, transparency and ease of administration and no need for the separate treatment of Abingdon in Zone 1 was indicated in the Viability Assessments.	None required.
7	Roebuck Land & Planning	2020 Viability Summary	Page 29, Table 8.1	Baseline Land Values too low	The Baseline Land Values (BLV) in Table 8.1 are unrealistically low and are not an accurate reflection of current market conditions. It is critical that a realistic assumption is taken of BLV as this is the price at which a landowner will be willing to sell their land for development. We feel that setting this value too low gives an unrealistic view of the amount of CIL that could be charged whilst maintaining a positive viability. The obvious effect of setting CIL levels too high is that the Residual Land Value will be far below BLV and landowners will not be inclined to sell their land. The statement is made that CIL levels could be raised to £570 psm without prejudicing viability. This is simply not correct. We consider that as unrealistic assumptions have been made on BLV the viability of the proposed CIL increases have not been properly assessed.	The BLV is based upon the Existing Use Value (EUV) as the starting point. The Premium is 20-30 times, which is substantial. The respondent has not stated what would be an appropriate alternative BLV and did not respond to our consultants' <i>call for evidence</i> .	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
8	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	March 2020 housing indices and value assumptions	Open Market Value sales	Open Market Sales Values - Tables 5.3 and 5.4 set out the residential value assumptions for different housing typologies. A 2% increase was applied on the most recent house price index data after sense checking this against a number of new build developments and asking prices. We consider that, rather than this indexing approach, an analysis of new build transactions should have been completed. We demonstrate our proposed approach and the effect this has on the residential value assumptions, with 1 bed houses being undervalued and 2 and 3 bed homes overvalued.	We consider the values to be realistic for current purposes and give the viability 'headroom' to increase CIL (see the sensitivity tables). Values have continued to rise during the Pandemic and the Stamp Duty holiday has now been extended, which will drive values up further. Bloor Homes has not proposed any alternative values.	None required.
9	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Paragraph 5.16.	Affordable housing values	Consider the affordable housing transfer values for affordable rent and intermediate tenure units to be too high for the South East region. The Viability Summary states the data was provided by the Council. Aspinall Verdi should have liaised with Registered Providers to collect this information - it is not possible to determine whether these values are robust.	The transfer values are monitored by the Council's housing team and were consulted upon in February 2019 and October 2020. They were, and continue to be, considered robust.	None required.
10	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	BCIS build costs	Construction costs (residential)	<p>The RICS BCIS construction costs have been rebased for Oxfordshire and revised upwards. Consequently, viability should be completed to determine the implications on the CIL rate setting. In addition, the Viability Assessment adopts lower quartile, rather than median, BCIS costs for typologies sized at 100+ units, which is deemed unusual practice. Building costs in the Southern Regions are typically higher than other areas and there is no justification for using the lower quartile rather than median costs. Aspinall Verdi have used the median rates for a viability assessment for Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Local Plan and CIL review, with the Viability Assessment published in October 2020. There is not sufficient justification for the Vale approach and it may have caused artificial headroom in the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The Viability Assessment does not make any allowance for site servicing/infrastructure costs within the assessment of site typologies, with costs restricted to base unit costs. Failure to recognise costs for beyond 'on-plot' costs will underestimate construction costs required to deliver the site typologies.</p>	<p>BCIS build rates and approach were consulted upon in 2019 and 2020. It is well documented that volume housebuilders build at or below lower quarter BCIS. The respondent has not provided any evidence of what they actually build for. Aspinall Verdi's approach is to apply BCIS lower quartile rates to volume-house builder typologies. This has been accepted in many other areas (e.g. inter alia Selby, South Oxfordshire, Kettering, Central Beds) Babergh and Mid Suffolk is an exception due to specific local evidence. In the case of VOWH, this is a very attractive market to volume housebuilders and hence Aspinall Verdi are content with the lower quartile rates. In any event, if one were to look at the cost sensitivity tables attached to the appraisals, the difference in costs (c 12% difference £1,104 to 1,238 psm) can be accommodated without making schemes unviable.</p> <p>Site servicing and infrastructure cost are included within external works costs for the generic typologies. Site with specific abnormal costs (e.g. utilities capacity upgrades) should take this cost into account within the price of the land.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
11	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary		Unit sizes and garage provision	The Viability Assessment adopts unit floor areas compliant with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). This is informed by cross reference of EPC records with land registry transactions. EPC records do not include allowance for integral or attached/detached garages unless they are liveable spaces. In practice, new residential developments do not deliver garages to this specification. Equally, NDSS do not include an allowance for attached / detached garages. It is necessary for developers to provide garages with certain unit types. Garages will result in an additional cost on the development in the construction of dwellings and calculation of CIL liability (due to additional floorspace) This means that viability will have been overstated in the Viability Assessment. We have provided analysis to show the number of garages provided on certain housing typologies.	Point noted. However, it is impossible for an area-wide study to take into consideration the detail of individual unit types vis-à-vis garages. Land Registry and EPC is the only basis of bulk housing market data. Where garages are to be provided, one would anticipate a corresponding increase in value. Aspinall Verdi would like housebuilders to be more transparent about the floor areas of their units which would facilitate this fined-grained approach in the future.	None required.
12	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3) costs	A consistent approach is required if residential sales values are to be indexed, as set out in paragraph 5.13 and table 5.3. As a result, the costs M4(2) and M4(3) should be indexed from March 2015 (Q1) to April 2020 (Q1) using the RICS BCIS all in Tender Price Index. This would equate to an uplift from the March 2015 costs of 25.9%.	Noted. Build costs have been updated generally. The cost of M4(2) M4(3) have not been updated / researched since these costs were produced by Government and Aspinall Verdi are content that they are still relevant. As time goes by these costs, in terms of policy and design enhancement, will become embedded into BCIS.	None required.
13	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Professional costs	The Viability Assessment underestimates the cost of professional fees, arriving at a figure of 7% development costs whereas the Harman Guidance advocates the use of 10-12% for less complex sites.	Aspinall Verdi consulted on the professional fee assumptions in 2019 and 2020 and no feedback was received. This level is considered adequate, especially for larger housing schemes where there are multiple house types.	None required.
14	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	S106 / S278 costs	Not possible to determine whether the S106 / S278 costs are appropriate and represent a realistic set of costs. It is requested that a full and transparent build-up of costs is provided.	The S106 assumptions are set out in Appendix 1 (Updated Typologies Matrix) of the Viability Addendum 2020 and are based on recent examples of development sites in the District. It is assumed that S106 costs will include education and transport infrastructure and Aspinall Verdi considered the assumptions appropriate for the various typologies tested.	None required.
15	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Finance rates	The Viability Summary states that the finance interest rate applied in viability testing is 6.5%, however viability appraisals attached to the 2020 Viability Addendum show a rate of 6.25%. If this is an error, it will necessitate the viability testing to be re-run.	6.25% was actually used in the earlier appraisals and there is a typing error in the 2019 report. In any event, Aspinall Verdi consulted on 6.25% in 2020. 0.25% makes negligible difference to the cashflow interest on these high-level appraisals where the detailed cashflow (e.g. upfront abnormal costs) is not known.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
16	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary		Residential development and sales programme	The Viability Assessment does not transparently set out the development periods and sales rate / programme for open market sales and affordable housing for each of the site typologies. It is therefore not possible to discern whether the development and sales programmes are adopting appropriate market facing time periods. This is particularly important as this will dictate the cashflow and the incurring of finance (interest) costs. This information should be disclosed in full.	Whilst Aspinall Verdi produces a cashflow for each typology, these are not generally shared (by Aspinall Verdi and/or other consultants and area-wide reports). The appraisals are by definition 'high-level' and the cashflows are too detailed and would be over-burdensome for an area-wide study. The cashflows are built up of a suitable 'lead-in period', construction period and sales period commensurate with the scale of the typology (usually c.4 sales per month).	None required.
17	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary	Table 8.1	Benchmark Land Values	Appendix 3 – Land Value Paper within the Vale of White Horse District Council CIL Viability Study (January 2019), which forms the basis of the Baseline Land Values (BLV) setting within the Viability Assessment - it is unclear as to why the BLVs set do not reflect market evidence of planning policy compliant greenfield land transactions, with appropriate reweighting, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Viability. It would have been expected that Aspinall Verdi conduct further, up to date, research into residential land transactions in order to develop a more substantial evidence base to inform the setting of BLVs.	Aspinall Verdi did not receive information relating to policy compliant greenfield land transactions during their 'call for evidence' period. Furthermore, the PPG requires that BLV be set by reference to Existing Use Value Plus (EUV+). Land transactions are only to be used as a cross-check.	None required.
18	Bloor Homes	2020 Viability Summary		Interpretation of Results and Viability Buffer in CIL Rate Setting	The level of buffer that has been applied to the different typologies is not clear. It would be appropriate for a 50% buffer to be applied, as this would be consistent with practice and the approach taken by other local planning authorities recently.	The level of viability buffer in the real world will vary from site-to-site. The viability buffer for the various typologies can be seen on the sensitivity tables for each of the appraisals appended. One must look at the appraisals in the round (e.g. including the 20% profit margin) when considering the 'buffer'.	None required.
19	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	March 2020 housing indices and value assumptions	Open Market Value sales	Open Market Sales Values - Table 5.3 and 5.4 set out the residential value assumptions for different housing typologies. A 2% increase was applied on the most recent house price index data after sense checking this against a number of new build developments and asking prices. We consider that, rather than this indexing approach, an analysis of new build transactions should have been completed. We demonstrate our proposed approach and the effect this has on the residential value assumptions, with 1 bed houses being undervalued and 2 and 3 bed homes overvalued accordingly.	We consider the values to be realistic for current purposes and give the viability 'headroom' to increase CIL (see the sensitivity tables). Values have continued to rise during the Pandemic and the Stamp Duty holiday has now been extended, which will drive values up further. Catesby Estates has not proposed any alternative values.	None required.
20	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Paragraph 5.16.	Affordable housing values	Consider the affordable housing transfer values for affordable rent and intermediate tenure units to be too high for the South East region. The Viability Summary states the data was provided by the Council. Aspinall Verdi should have liaised with Registered Providers to collect this information - it is not possible to determine whether these values are robust.	The transfer values are monitored by the Council's housing team and were consulted upon in February 2019 and October 2020. They were, and continue to be, considered robust.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
21	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	BCIS build costs	Construction costs (residential)	<p>The RICS BCIS construction costs have been rebased for Oxfordshire and revised upwards. Consequently, retesting of viability should be completed to determine the implications on the CIL rate setting. In addition, the VA adopts lower quartile, rather than median, BCIS costs for typologies sized at 100+ units, which is deemed unusual practice. Building costs in the Southern Regions are typically higher than other areas and there is no justification for using the lower quartile rather than median costs. Aspinall Verdi have used the median rates for a viability assessment for Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Local Plan and CIL review, with the Viability Assessment published in October 2020. There is not sufficient justification for the Vale approach and it may have caused artificial headroom in the Viability Assessment.</p> <p>The Viability Assessment does not make any allowance for site servicing / infrastructure costs within the assessment of site typologies, with costs restricted to base unit costs. Failure to recognise costs for beyond 'on-plot' costs will underestimate construction costs required to deliver the site typologies.</p>	<p>BCIS build rates and approach were consulted upon in 2019 and 2020. It is well documented that volume housebuilders build at or below lower quarter BCIS. The respondent has not provided any evidence of what they actually build for. Aspinall Verdi's approach is to apply BCIS lower quartile rates to volume-house builder typologies. This has been accepted in many other areas (e.g. inter alia Selby, South Oxfordshire, Kettering, Central Beds). Babergh and Mid Suffolk is an exception due to specific local evidence. In the case of VOWH, this is a very attractive market to volume housebuilders and hence Aspinall Verdi are content with the lower quartile rates. In any event, if one were to look at the cost sensitivity tables attached to the appraisals, the difference in costs (c 12% difference £1,104 to 1,238 psm) can be accommodated without making schemes unviable.</p> <p>Site servicing and infrastructure cost are included within external works costs for the generic typologies. Site with specific abnormal costs (e.g. utilities capacity upgrades) should take this cost into account within the price of the land.</p>	None required.
22	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary		Unit sizes and garage provision	<p>The Viability Assessment adopts unit floor areas compliant with Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). This is informed by cross reference of Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) records with land registry transactions. EPC records do not include allowance for integral or attached/detached garages unless they are liveable spaces. In practice, new residential developments do not deliver garages to this specification. Equally, NDSS do not include an allowance for attached / detached garages. It is necessary for developers to provide garages with certain unit types. Garages will result in an additional cost on the development in the construction of dwellings and calculation of CIL liability (due to additional floorspace) This means that viability will have been overstated in the Viability Assessment. We have provided analysis to show the number of garages provided on certain housing typologies.</p>	<p>Point noted. However, it is impossible for an area-wide study to take into consideration the detail of individual unit types vis-à-vis garages. Land Registry and EPC is the only basis of bulk housing market data. Where garages are to be provided, one would anticipate a corresponding increase in value. Aspinall Verdi would like housebuilders to be more transparent about the floor areas of their units which would facilitate this fined-grained approach in the future.</p>	None required.
23	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Building Regulations M4(2) and M4(3) costs	<p>A consistent approach is required if residential sales values are to be indexed, as set out in paragraph 5.13 and table 5.3. As a result, the costs M4(2) and M4(3) should be indexed from March 2015 (Q1) to April 2020 (Q1) using the RICS BCIS all in Tender Price Index. This would equate to an uplift from the March 2015 costs of 25.9%.</p>	<p>Noted. Build costs have been updated generally. The cost of M4(2) M4(3) have not been updated / researched since these costs were produced by Government and Aspinall Verdi are content that they are still relevant. As time goes by these costs, in terms of policy and design enhancement, will become embedded into BCIS.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
24	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Professional costs	The Viability Assessment underestimates the cost of professional fees, arriving at a figure of 7% development costs whereas the Harman Guidance advocates the use of 10-12% for less complex sites.	Aspinall Verdi consulted on the professional fee assumptions in 2019 and 2020 and no feedback was received. This level is considered adequate, especially for larger housing schemes where there are multiple house types.	None required.
25	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	S106 / S278 costs	Not possible to determine whether the S106 / S278 costs are appropriate and represent a realistic set of costs. It is requested that a full and transparent build-up of costs is provided.	The S106 assumptions are set out in Appendix 1 (Updated Typologies Matrix) of the Viability Addendum 2020 and are based on recent examples of development sites in the District. It is assumed that S106 costs will include education and transport infrastructure and Aspinall Verdi considered the assumptions appropriate for the various typologies tested.	None required.
26	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Table 5.7	Finance rates	The Viability Summary states that the finance interest rate applied in viability testing is 6.5%, however viability appraisals attached to the 2020 Viability Addendum show a rate of 6.25%. If this is an error, it will necessitate the viability testing to be re-run.	6.25% was actually used in the earlier appraisals and there is a typing error in the 2019 report. In any event, Aspinall Verdi consulted on 6.25% in 2020. 0.25% makes negligible difference to the cashflow interest on these high-level appraisals where the detailed cashflow (e.g. upfront abnormal costs) is not known.	None required.
27	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary		Residential development and sales programme	The Viability Assessment does not transparently set out the development periods and sales rate / programme for open market sales and affordable housing for each of the site typologies. It is, therefore, not possible to discern whether the development and sales programmes are adopting appropriate market facing time periods. This is particularly important as this will dictate the cashflow and the incurring of finance (interest) costs. This information should be disclosed in full.	Whilst Aspinall Verdi produces a cashflow for each typology, these are not generally shared (by Aspinall Verdi and/or other consultants and area-wide reports). The appraisals are by definition 'high-level' and the cashflows are too detailed and would be over-burdensome for an area-wide study. The cashflows are built up of a suitable 'lead-in period', construction period and sales period commensurate with the scale of the typology (usually c.4 sales per month).	None required.
28	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary	Table 8.1	Benchmark Land Values	Appendix 3 – Land Value Paper within the Vale of White Horse District Council CIL Viability Study (January 2019), which forms the basis of the Baseline Land Values (BLV) setting within the Viability Assessment - it is unclear as to why the BLVs set do not reflect market evidence of planning policy compliant greenfield land transactions, with appropriate reweighting, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Viability. It would have been expected that Aspinall Verdi conduct further, up to date, research into residential land transactions in order to develop a more substantial evidence base to inform the setting of BLVs.	Aspinall Verdi did not receive information relating to policy compliant greenfield land transactions during their 'call for evidence' period. Furthermore, the PPG requires that BLV be set by reference to Existing Use Value Plus (EUV+). Land transactions are only to be used as a cross-check.	None required.
29	Catesby Estates	2020 Viability Summary		Interpretation of Results and Viability Buffer in CIL Rate Setting	The level of buffer that has been applied to the different typologies is not clear. It would be appropriate for a 50% buffer to be applied as this would be consistent with practice and the approach taken by other local planning authorities recently.	The level of viability buffer in the real world will vary from site-to-site. The viability buffer for our various typologies can be seen on the sensitivity tables for each of the appraisals appended. One must look at the appraisals in	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
						the round (e.g. including 20% profit margin) when considering the 'buffer'.	
30	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	N/A	Development Appraisal Assumptions - Project Timescales	Assumptions have been made for the various input variables to the viabilities, however the assumptions used for the project timescales for the various site typologies which have been modelled are not clear. If the project timescales used are consistently significantly over optimistic or assume a 'best-case' scenario at all times, the results and draft charging rates produced will be unreliable and should be reviewed. Full details of this information should be provided to enable the viability modelling results to be fully assessed against all relevant information and a fully informed judgement made as to whether this is robust and sufficiently reliable evidence for CIL rate setting.	Whilst Aspinall Verdi produces a cashflow for each typology, these are not generally shared (by Aspinall Verdi and/or other consultants and area-wide reports). The appraisals are by definition 'high-level' and the cashflows are too detailed and would be over-burdensome for an area-wide study. The cashflows are built up of a suitable 'lead-in period', construction period and sales period commensurate with the scale of the typology (usually c.4 sales per month).	None required.
31	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Section 5, Page 9	Residential Assumptions	Aspinall Verdi have adopted (paras 5.2/3) what they describe as a 'business as normal approach' both in terms of the economic consequences for the housing market following Covid-19 and any potential consequences for the market following Brexit. This is an optimistic and bullish approach under the circumstances, which carries a high degree of risk. Rather than simply indexing previous data or looking at 'asking prices' which is not sales price evidence and therefore unreliable, it would have been more realistic to have obtained and maintained for the whole assessment period 2019-October 2020 a comprehensive ongoing database comprising a detailed comparable analysis of all new build dwelling sales in the area. This could have been obtained direct from market research with housebuilders and supplemented/cross referenced with Land Registry data for actual new dwelling sales over the relevant period, rather using an index to uplift the figures. This would represent the most recently available and therefore reliable sales evidence for use in the appraisals and CIL charging rate setting.	Taking an Indexing Approach to assessing current market conditions is considered appropriate given the uncertainties arising from Brexit and Covid-19. Whilst it is acknowledged that taking this approach is a simplification, it is well documented that housing values have in fact remained strong during the Pandemic and there has also been some growth in the housing sector, helped by both the Stamp Duty holiday and a likely increase in demand for property in areas like Vale of White Horse, from residents moving out of London.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
32	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Paragraph 5.16	Residential Values - Affordable Housing	<p>The Council provided Aspinall Verdi with affordable housing mix and transfer values for the viability assessment modelling. These figures are represented as percentages of open market sales values, 60% for Affordable Rent dwellings and 76% for Intermediate Tenure dwellings. The figures produced by these percentages are higher than current affordable housing sales premiums being achieved. These would be realistically represented at c.45-50% of open market sales value for Affordable Rent and c.65-70% of open market sales value for intermediate tenure dwellings. Viability testing, as set out in the PPG on CIL, states that affordable house values used to underpin the Draft Charging Schedule should be based on appropriate available evidence. There does not appear to be any available evidence which has been used in the Viability Assessment Executive Summary to justify this. Appropriate comparable evidence of affordable housing premiums/transfer values would have been available for use from several sources including housebuilders, Registered Providers and specialist agents/surveyors advising on the sale and acquisition of S106 affordable housing for housebuilders and RPs. Consequently, the values used are generalised percentage assumptions and cannot be considered reliable for use in CIL viability modelling. The different site typology viabilities should be reappraised based on reliable evidence as described.</p>	<p>The transfer values are monitored by the Council's housing team and were consulted upon in February 2019 and October 2020. They were, and continue to be, considered robust.</p>	None required.
33	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Paragraph 5.23	Build Costs – Estate Housing	<p>The build costs used in the Viability Assessment Executive Summary for estate housing for appraising the two site typologies of 100 units or over is BCIS lower quartile (rather than median). This is not usual best practice for assessing scheme viability, for CIL rate setting. We would have expected BCIS median quartile cost figures to have been used to reflect the geographical location where build costs are generally higher than in other parts of the country. The residential cost assumptions section at paragraph 5.23 does not provide any explanation or evidence to justify using lower costs figures on sites of over 100 units. This is a low unit number threshold to apply the reduced lower quartile rate which will have the effect of overstating the viability results which is being used to support significantly higher proposed CIL charging rates. All the viability modelling should be re-appraised based on BCIS median build cost rates to correct this issue.</p>	<p>This approach was consulted upon in 2020. It is well documented that volume housebuilders build at rates well below BICS Median costs.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
34	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Table at Para 5.23	Provision of Services and Infrastructure	<p>The viability modelling provides allowances for strategic infrastructure based on costs which Aspinall Verdi have prior agreed with the Council. However, this allowance is restricted only to the strategic sites.</p> <p>No allowance is made for the provision of site servicing or other infrastructure costs in the site typology appraisals. The costs used are limited to base unit construction costs for estate type housing (lower quartile for larger sites when it should be mean) and external works at 15% (which is agreed), which are described as generic on-plot costs, including estate roads, pavements, street-lights, utilities, drainage etc. A contingency of 3% in our view is insufficient, particularly for larger sites with more than a year's construction period.</p> <p>We would have expected an allowance for all sites for servicing and infrastructure costs in addition to the 'on-plot' base build and externals costs (as described in the Executive Summary) where the total site area (gross area) is greater than the area on which the residential development is constructed i.e. the 'on-plot' area and external estate roads, pavements etc which is known as the net developable area.</p> <p>These costs include site wide engineering and regrading works (cut and fill), utility and drainage upgrades, distributor roads etc. and are in addition to 'on plot build' abnormal costs for items such as specific foundation design costs. These costs will increase in the coming years because of requirements such as bio-diversity net gain, phosphates mitigation etc. The Viability Assessment allows for contribution estimates of less than £1,000 per unit based on a DEFRA report from 2019 which is inadequate. The individual site typologies which have been modelled assuming a gross to net ratio. This has serious limitations as a generalised deduction. However, it is acknowledged that assumptions must be made for a district-wide assessment. Using recent trends and development currently under construction in setting future rates/policy is problematic and the impact is exacerbated during periods of significant change.</p> <p>The planning system and its requirements with the consequent costs for residential development changes regularly. However, the forthcoming period will experience unprecedented change by comparison with recent years, with focus on the environment, climate change, construction methods, design standards etc. For example: the amount of greenfield land necessary to deliver the same number of houses per hectare as today will increase substantially during the period within which the new Charging Schedule will apply.</p> <p>It is imperative that sufficient cost allowances for these items are included in the viability modelling. Otherwise, the construction costs assumed in the appraisals will be significantly underestimated and the modelling results (particularly for the larger sites over 50 dwellings) will be unreliable as a basis for recommending new CIL charging rates. The viability modelling should, therefore, be re-tested and any necessary changes made.</p>	<p>It is noted that the respondent agrees with the external works allowance.</p> <p>Abnormal infrastructure costs (e.g. cut and fill) should be deducted from the price of the land. One cannot pay a landowner the same price for a sloping site compared to a level site.</p> <p>Contingency was consulted upon in 2019 and 2020 and considered an appropriate allowance. It is the same percentage that has been allowed in other local plan and CIL viability studies.</p> <p>New policy costs (e.g. biodiversity net gain) will need to be taken into account at future CIL reviews.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
35	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary		Assessment of Dwelling Unit Sizes	<p>The viability reports confirm that National Described Space Standards (NDSS) floor areas were used for the viability modelling which were cross referenced with the EPC records from Land Registry property transactions. We are not convinced of the relevance of cross referencing with EPC's as we understand these are not assessed on the same basis.</p> <p>NDSS do not include garages which are provided with all 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings some with double garages, (a percentage allowance should be included based on a review of current schemes) and a significant proportion (50-60%) of 3 bedroom dwellings. It is necessary for developers to provide garages with these unit types to meet purchaser expectations and achieve expected sales revenues. However, the cost of these over base BCIS has not been accounted for in the viability modelling. Also, it has not been considered in an assessment of the impact of the liability of CIL on future new housing development as garages are included in the calculation of gross internal Area for the CIL liability calculations of a scheme.</p> <p>This needs to be corrected and the viability modelling should be retested to establish the financial implications for CIL rate setting.</p>	Point noted. However, it is impossible for an area-wide study to take into consideration the detail of individual unit types vis-à-vis garages. Land Registry and EPC is the only basis of bulk housing market data. Where garages are to be provided, one would anticipate a corresponding increase in value. Aspinall Verdi would like housebuilders to be more transparent about the floor areas of their units which would facilitate this fined-grained approach in the future.	None required.
36	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Table at Para 5.23	Contingency	<p>The Executive Summary confirms that a contingency has been applied of 3%. This is insufficient and is not an accurate reflection of the risks associated with build costs. It is imperative to allow an appropriate level of contingency especially for site typologies with construction period of 12 month or more.</p> <p>We would have expected to see 5% used for all site typologies with over 12 month construction periods. A realistic understanding of costs is essential to the proper assessment of viability in an area. Therefore, all site typologies should re-appraised at 5% contingency to establish the implications of applying this realistic contingency for setting CIL charge rates.</p>	Contingency was consulted upon in 2019 and 2020 and considered an appropriate allowance. It is the same percentage that has been used in other local plan and CIL viability studies, which have been found sound.	None required.
37	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Table at Para 5.23	Professional Fees	<p>The Executive Summary uses a rate of 6.5% for construction related professional fees, plus statutory planning application fee and 3 times the application fee for the costs associated with the cost of planning application professional fees, surveys, and reports. This significantly underestimates the costs associated with construction professional fees which should be a minimum of 10% and greater than that for the larger site typologies used. Similarly, 3 times the application fee for planning costs is again a significant underestimate for these costs particularly for the larger site typologies tested. Professional fees rates should be increased to a minimum of 10% of development costs and all site typologies should re-appraised on this basis to establish the implications of applying a realistic allowance for construction professional fees for setting CIL charge rates.</p>	Aspinall Verdi consulted on the professional fee assumptions in 2019 and 2020 and no feedback was received. This level is considered adequate, especially for larger housing schemes where there are multiple house types.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
38	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Table at Para 5.23 and 5.27	Site Specific S106/S728 Costs	<p>Paragraph 5.27 states that the S106/S278 cost allowances have been updated and adjusted to include education contributions. It does not provide a calculation to explain the cost increase. The Draft Developer Contributions SPD (Jan 2021) makes it clear that residential schemes will now be liable for a wide range of additional highway, education and other S106 in addition to the liability for payment of a significantly increased CIL.</p> <p>It is important that there is clarity as to how these costs will be calculated and applied which is not currently the case. It is not therefore possible to establish whether the additional S106 costs used in the viability modelling represent a realistic set of costs, when applied to individual schemes when planning applications are made. As indicated above, a clear explanation should be provided to demonstrate how these costs for each item have been calculated and then applied to the viability modelling so it can be established whether these costs are justified and based on the most appropriate available evidence.</p>	The S106 assumptions are set out in Appendix 1 (Updated Typologies Matrix) of the Viability Addendum 2020 and are based on recent examples of development sites in the District. It is assumed that S106 costs will include education and transport infrastructure and Aspinall Verdi considered the assumptions appropriate for the various typologies tested.	None required.
39	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary	Table at Para 5.23 and 5.27	Finance Costs - Residential Cost Assumptions	<p>Table 5.7 states that a 6.5% debit interest rate was used in the viability appraisals. Paragraph 1.1 confirms that this is the Executive Summary to the original 2019 CIL Viability and the 2020 Addendum, with the latter including viability appraisals as appendices.</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the finance interest rate noted at table 5.7 in the Executive Summary (6.5%) and the finance interest rate applied to the viability appraisals which is 0.25% lower at 6.25%. This difference between the Executive Summary and the appraisals will have a detrimental impact on the viability modelling results for the different site typologies selected, which at the lower finance rate will have produced inflated results.</p> <p>We agree that 6.5% or more for the larger projects (not an average as stated in the Executive Summary) is an acceptable rate for this purpose and is routinely used in current independent financial viability assessments for planning application purposes.</p>	6.25% was actually used in the earlier appraisals and there is a typing error in the 2019 report. In any event, Aspinall Verdi consulted on 6.25% in 2020. 0.25% makes negligible difference to the cashflow interest on these high level appraisals where the detailed cashflow (e.g. upfront abnormal costs) is not known.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
40	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary		Viability Buffer in CIL Rate Setting	<p>It is important that CIL Charging rates are not set at the maximum level which viability modelling can demonstrate, there should be a 'buffer' or margin applied when setting rates to ensure the levy rate can support development when economic circumstances change.</p> <p>The Executive Summary indicates that the 'buffer' from the maximum demonstrable CIL rate is variable across the different selected site typologies. However, contrary to the requirement of the PPG to explain the approach to the 'buffer' clearly, it is not clear from the viability reports what 'buffer' has been applied. This undermines the reliability of the viability modelling as a robust evidence base for CIL rate setting and the consequent reliability of the CIL charging rates proposed.</p> <p>The CIL Examiner for the East Devon Council Draft CIL Charging Schedule endorsed in June 2020 the 50% buffer adopted by the Council's consultants, Three Dragons, across all the different areas and site typologies in the District. The examiner confirmed this level of buffer is likely to ensure that a range of new residential development remains viable across the Authority area. This is consistent with the reports of other CIL Examiners in the last 12 month period in other areas.</p>	<p>The buffer is explained at paras 2.10, 2.14, 2.17, 2.33, 4.70, 4.87, 4.88 and 5.38 of the Viability Assessment Executive Summary.</p> <p>The 'buffer' is unique to the various scheme typologies in the Viability Assessment and as it will be to particular actual development sites that are brought forward. The headroom / 'buffer' for CIL depends on a range of appraisal inputs including BLV, Profit as well as value and cost assumptions. This is shown on the sensitivity tables appended to the various typology appraisals.</p>	None required.
41	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary		General Comment	<p>The impression is that a general 'best case, business as usual scenario' has been taken, maximising revenue projections and making insufficient allowance for the full burden of development costs which will be incurred in residential development. The substantial increase is compounded by the expectation that S106 obligations will also increase substantially to include education, highways, and other obligations in addition to the doubling of CIL. Therefore, we recommend the Council with their consultants consider our comments and review the viability appraisal modelling, including the different individual site typologies adopted to address the issues raised. Following this, the revised appraisal evidence should be published for further consultation together with a revised schedule of proposed CIL charging rates reflecting the results of the reappraisal work.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that S106 costs will increase (e.g. to include education), and therefore the Council has taken a cautious approach to raising its CIL rates. The new rates will be monitored and kept under review.</p>	None required.
42	Herridge Property Consulting	2020 Viability Summary		COVID-19	<p>The Council has made the decision to continue with a review which commenced in 2019 during a period of unprecedented economic uncertainty caused by the Covid 19 pandemic. The future economic impact of this on the economy and the residential housing market, and consequently new development and site viability, could be significant and currently difficult to predict based on the historic input data to the evidence base of recent years.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the Council cannot simply 'stop' due to the Pandemic and the development industry would not want this. Values and costs will be kept under review and it is noted that values have held up very well so far during the Pandemic, with demand for new housing in the Vale boosted by people moving out of London.</p>	None required.
43	Natural England	All		General Comment	<p>Natural England does not consider that this Draft CIL Charging Schedule poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to their statutory purpose and so does not wish to comment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
44	Crawford, Andrew Cllr	All		S106 agreements and CIL for Strategic Sites	<p>Strategic sites are understandably excluded from CIL where infrastructure is provided by way of S106 agreements, negotiated at outline planning stage and in greater detail through executed agreements approved by Chair of Planning. However, it is not unusual for the number/size of dwellings to change after those agreements are executed and extra units or larger footprints may have resulted in higher S106 payments if disclosed earlier. I would be interested to understand what course of action the Council feels it best to follow in such circumstances:</p> <p>a) Do not amend S106 agreements and therefore forego potential infrastructure income;</p> <p>b) Amend S106 agreements to reflect the additional infrastructural demand. But this may be costly and administratively burdensome unless this flexibility is built into the S106 at the outset; or</p> <p>c) Choose to charge CIL on these sites which are otherwise exempt for any increases in units/footprint over and above the already negotiated S106 level.</p>	In such instances, where there is an uplift in numbers within an application site, the Council would be likely to follow Option B (i.e. amend the S106 agreement to reflect the additional infrastructure/ affordable housing demand resulting from the additional number of units/development footprint etc).	None required.
45	Woodlands Medical Centre PPG (on behalf of Didcot Health Centre & The Oak Tree Medical Centre)	All		Securing developer contributions towards medical infrastructure	Council's consideration of housing growth has failed to consider primary care needs. Comments relate to the need for securing developer contributions towards medical infrastructure. Full details have been recorded as a response to the public consultation on the Draft Developer Contributions SPD.	<p>Comments made are relevant to the Developer Contributions SPD and will be considered as it is finalised.</p> <p>During the process of preparing the Local Plan the Council consults with the Clinical Commissioning Group to seek to ensure that health needs are identified and planned for. Additional primary care needs to support growth are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and set out in site-specific Local Plan policies where relevant.</p>	None required.
46	The Ptarmigan Group	All	N/A	Impact of Covid-19	Covid-19 pandemic is having a significant impact on financial and housing markets and is likely to have long term implications. It is clear that Government sees the housing market and construction industry as key to the recovery and is seeking to support these as much as possible. Therefore, the general principle of seeking to increase developer contributions is questioned. A higher degree of caution should be applied to the Viability Assessments and a greater level of pragmatism taken, given the current circumstances. Viability assumptions from April 2019 and March 2020, prior to the pandemic, draws into question their validity. Consequently, the revision of the Charging Schedule should be delayed until the implications of the current situation on the housing market are better understood.	<p>The Viability Assessments have adopted a cautious approach and included a significant buffer in viability for the rates proposed. The Council consider that the rates proposed are appropriate based on the evidence and that any delay would fail to recognise the need to update the Charging Schedule to reflect the Adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan Part 2 and changes made to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations in 2019.</p> <p>Whilst the Council recognises that the construction and housing industry are important sectors in the economic recovery post-Covid-19, it is vital that development is supported by required infrastructure improvements and mitigation measures that ensure its longer term sustainability. Furthermore, para 8.6 of the Viability</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
						Addendum 2020 states that the recommended rates are below the top of the possible ranges identified, as it is important to maintain a contingency or buffer, in order to ensure that development is viable overall and can come forward with its requisite policy requirements for infrastructure and affordable housing. This is particularly the case currently where there are material risks to the economy associated with Covid and Brexit.	
47	Attree, John	All	n/a	General Comment	Documents provided are so extensive and bureaucratic	The draft CIL Charging Schedule has been prepared in accordance with national legislation and guidance.	None required.
48	Attree, John	All		General Comment	The fundamental problem is that the current planning system is totally unfit for purpose. Standard of design are poor, unsatisfactory levels of facilities and low levels of sustainable construction. System biased for developers. Council has a duty to local residents to monitor and control sustainable development. However, it appears to have no control over activities of developers. Is this because of external pressures (e.g. from Government)? If so, the Council should lobby for change. All this leads to significant decline in quality of life in the local area.	Points noted. The draft CIL Charging Schedule is proposing higher rates which will result in increased contributions from developers towards delivering needed infrastructure, including facilities.	None required.
49	Watchfield Parish Council	All		Spending of CIL	The parish share of CIL is to be spent on infrastructure without there being a definition of infrastructure. At what stage will parishes now be involved in the planning of larger infrastructure projects that they are now being asked to partially finance?	The expenditure of CIL is not determined through the CIL Charging Schedule. The spending of CIL is undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations and the District Council's non-statutory CIL Spending Strategy, which is reviewed annually in line with Council priorities. The Council's Infrastructure and Development Team liaise with town/parish councils on CIL spending.	None required.
50	Infrastructure & Development Team, Vale of White Horse District Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1	Clarity of information	The proposed CIL rates should make it clearer that these charges are per square metre	Agreed, add text to make it clear that the charges are £ per square metre.	In Table 1, under the heading Proposed CIL Rates add '(£ per sq m)'. '

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
51	Edgars Planning Consultancy	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1	Charge for Student Accommodation	What constitutes student accommodation? Would student accommodation which is C3 (self-contained units) be charged differently to student accommodation as C2 (residential institution)?	Table 1 requires a footnote for clarity on this point.	Add footnote to Table 1 as follows: <i>'Student accommodation which is self-contained (e.g. studio flats) will be charged CIL at the relevant residential rate. Student accommodation of a communal nature (e.g. shared living areas and/or kitchens) will be nil rated.'</i>
52	South Oxfordshire District Council	CIL Charging Schedule	All	Support for rates	South Oxfordshire DC supports the CIL rates set out in the draft Charging Schedule. The Schedule is based on robust viability evidence and reflects the balance between securing funding for vital infrastructure without compromising the viability of schemes, allowing development and its supporting infrastructure to come forward.	Support welcomed.	None required.
53	Gore, Peter	CIL Charging Schedule	General	CIL rates incentivising development in high value/ Green Belt areas.	The proposed calculation fails to take into account variation in property values, thereby incentivising development in high value/Green Belt areas rather than more sustainable regions (i.e. a developer would pay the same CIL/S106 whether the property is in Shrivenham or Tubney). All developers will have business plans that define the mix and sales price of each property in the development. Using the anticipated sale price (or maybe using the Council Tax band) would ensure developers are incentivised to build in areas where profit margins are currently limited by CIL/S106. The higher contribution from high value/high profit developments can therefore incentivise truly affordable housing elsewhere.	CIL rates are based on viability and are higher in the eastern parishes where land values are higher. CIL costs represent a small proportion of overall development costs including land and should not have a discernible effect on incentivising development in specific locations.	None required.
54	Roberts, Judy Cllr	CIL Charging Schedule	Page 7	Major/minor development differentiation	I fully support the introduction of 'minor and major' developments.	Support welcomed.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
55	NHS Oxfordshire CCG	CIL Charging Schedule	Page 7, Table 1	Funding of primary care (GP) premises	CIL should be collected for Zone 3 to reflect the fact that primary care (GP) premises will need funding for extensions and reconfigurations brought about by an increase in capacity due to population growth in Zone 3 areas.	<p>It is proposed to levy CIL in Zone 3 and to zero rate Strategic Sites, as these will secure infrastructure via S106 agreements. The Council's CIL spending strategy allocates 20% of the funding received (following the allocation of the neighbourhood and admin proportions) to health care. The Council is in regular contact with the clinical commissioning group to bring forward projects supported by CIL funding.</p> <p>During the process of preparing the Local Plan the Council consults with the Clinical Commissioning Group to seek to ensure that health needs are identified and planned for. Additional primary care needs to support growth are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and set out in site-specific Local Plan policies where relevant.</p>	None required.
56	East Hendred Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1	CIL charging - Strategic Sites	East Hendred Parish Council welcomes the increased charges on new houses in general, but has concerns that very limited funds have been received so far, despite permissions for some 150 new dwellings and concerns that inflexible guidelines seem to be designed to prevent adequate recreation facilities being provided for 150 new houses. There are also concerns that the Strategic Sites make no CIL contributions at all, so no funding is passed on to the Parishes. It is clear that the villages within 15 minutes' drive time of the Strategic Sites are seeing increasing numbers of residents from these new houses seeking recreation facilities (e.g. walkers & cyclists, cricketers, footballers, bowling green users). The Charging Schedule should be amended to require, say, £100 per sq.m. of new homes on Strategic Sites to contribute towards recreation & other requirements within 15 mins drive time. The justification is that the Developers Contributions SPD sets out out-dated standards which do not reflect the greater awareness of the need for a healthy lifestyle & wellbeing, which increases the use of footpaths/cycleways & recreation facilities within 15 mins drive-time of the Strategic Sites.	Charging CIL as well as S106 contributions on the strategic sites would render them unviable. Section 106 contributions from these sites can, however, be directed towards recreational facilities, where appropriate.	None required.
57	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	General	Support	Experience in our village is that development-led funding (S106 to date) is a valuable source of funding for providing limited additional infrastructure without impacting the precept.	Support welcomed.	None required.
58	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Para 5.8	Minor development rate	Agree that small developments could be charged a (slightly) higher rate.	Support welcomed.	None required.
59	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1	Zone 3 rate	Content with the proposed rates for Zone 3 (which includes Uffington).	Support welcomed.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
60	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Para 7.1	Apportionment to parish/town councils	Strongly support the split of 15 or 25% for parishes without/with Neighbourhood Plans. It is assumed that this is the percentage of the gross amount of CIL receipts and not the net amount after any administrative or pooling amounts have been deducted.	Support welcomed. Yes, the 25% or 15% apportioned to town and parish councils (dependent on whether or not they have a made Neighbourhood Plan in place) is based on gross CIL receipts.	None required.
61	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Para 10.1	Query	Is it intended that proposed projects will be 'vetted' to ensure they are in scope before funding is expended (in order to avoid rejection after completion/reporting)?	All projects brought forward for delivery using CIL funds are determined by the district council to ensure that they meet CIL spend criteria with the exception of spend of the neighbourhood proportion by town and parish councils. Town and parish councils must provide an annual report to the district council which details how their allocation of funding has been spent and officers in the Infrastructure and Development team or the Oxfordshire Association for Local Councils can provide advice on CIL spending guidelines for these authorities.	None required.
62	Uffington Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Para 10.2	Administration costs	5% seems a high percentage for administrative charges. How is this justified?	Regulation 61 (1) to (4) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) governs the percentage of gross CIL receipts that a charging authority can attribute to administrative costs (up to 5%). The Council's functions in preparing CIL policy, administering, collecting, monitoring and spending CIL warrant the retention of 5% of CIL receipts.	None required.
63	Shrivenham Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	7.1	Pooling of CIL funds	We require clarification that any pooling of CIL funds will not affect the town/parish portion.	Yes, any pooling of CIL funds will not affect the proportions attributed to town or parish councils.	None required.
64	Shrivenham Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	All	Support	Shrivenham Parish Council supports the charging proposals outlined in the Charging Schedule, subject to clarification on the apportionment of CIL funds to town/parish councils.	Support welcomed.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
65	Wantage Town Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1	Uplift in CIL across the 3 zones not fairly distributed.	There seems to be considerable uplift in CIL Charges for new Zone 1 and Zone 3 from the previous charges of 99.8% and 42.71% respectively, whereas Zone 2 and Supermarkets have only been raised 0.74% and 0.19% respectively. The creation of a new Zone 1 (Eastern Parishes) has skewed the figures considerably when there is a reported difference in purchase between Eastern Parishes and Rest of District of only 17.97% average. There is effectively no increase for Zone 2 or supermarkets at all. Do not see why Wantage, Grove and Faringdon should be penalised with no increase, given the massive increases across the rest of the District and the newly formed and basically divisive Eastern Parishes. If one accepts the Eastern Parishes concept, then it would be more appropriate to have the following Charges: Zone 1 (major schemes £280/minor schemes £340); Zone 2 (major schemes £140/minor schemes £200); Zone 3 (major schemes £200/minor schemes £260); and Supermarkets £167 across all zones.	Proposed rates are based on the findings of viability evidence. New residential development in Zone 2, where land values are lower, cannot sustain higher CIL rates without an adverse impact on overall development viability. Similarly, evidence suggests that supermarkets cannot sustain a higher rate across the District than that proposed in Table 1.	None required.
66	Scottish and Southern Electric	CIL Charging Schedule		No comment	Scottish and Southern Electric have no comment to make at this time.	Noted.	None required.
67	North Hinksey Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule		Supportive, grammar	North Hinksey Parish Council fully supports the draft CIL Charging Schedule. NHPC notes that the first bullet point of section 9.1 (Exemptions) is confusing and needs rewriting or punctuating. It currently reads 'New buildings or extensions under 100 sqm of gross internal floor space which do not involve the creation of a new dwelling'.	Agree, sentence would benefit from additional punctuation for clarity.	Comma required after 'space' in first bullet point of Section 9.1 to read: ' <i>New buildings or extensions under 100 sqm of gross internal floor space, which do not involve the creation of a new dwelling</i> '.
68	Historic England	CIL Charging Schedule		No comment	No comment.	Noted.	None required.
69	Charney Barrett Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule		Securing developer contributions towards road infrastructure	Concerns regarding development in neighbouring areas increasing the volume of traffic in other areas which may not benefit from the CIL charged on the development. In particular, the resulting impact development has on road safety for pedestrians and other non-motorised users. Suggest that 3% of CIL funding should be provided to communities who are unlikely to benefit from CIL funding or, alternatively, increased funding should be provided to the County Council to direct towards transport infrastructure. Query as to what happened with previous Memorandum of Understanding that was being sought with the County Council regarding CIL funding. Main priority is for road safety.	The CIL Charging Schedule determines the amount of money that will be sought from developments in the district rather than how this will be spent. How CIL income is spent is determined by national policy and the District and County Council spending strategies, which are published annually. With regard to development impact on the road network, assessing the impact of development on the District's transport network is the responsibility of the County Council and the District relies on their expertise when determining applications. When assessing a development proposal, the County Council will look at the transport impact of the proposal on the transport network as a whole and object if impact is likely to be harmful. The Council has produced a CIL Spending Strategy that sets out how CIL funding receipts are allocated, including how much is allocated to Oxfordshire County Council to	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
						fund, amongst other things, transport projects. The County Council also produces an annual statement setting out how it has used this funding.	
70	The Ptarmigan Group	CIL Charging Schedule	1.2	Relationship to Local plan process.	It is not clear how the revised Charging Schedule relates to the Local Plan. Recommend that the revised Charging Schedule should be progressed in parallel with the emerging Local Plan 2041.	The revised Charging Schedule is being progressed to reflect the adoption of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 and changes to the CIL regulations in 2019. As the Local Plan 2041 progresses, the Council will consider the need to revise its CIL Charging Schedule for consistency.	None required.
71	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	1.4	Infrastructure Delivery Plans	Add to the bullet point the following underlined text: 'Two Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs), which set out infrastructure requirements to support the delivery of planned development within the VOWH Local Plan 2031 based on information available <u>at the time they are compiled.</u>	Accept proposed modification.	Add to the bullet point the following underlined text: 'Two Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs), which set out infrastructure requirements to support the delivery of planned development within the VOWH Local Plan 2031 based on information available <u>at the time they are compiled.</u>
72	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	2.2	Regulation 123 lists	Change text to correctly identify that the Regulation 123 list did not state infrastructure projects that would be funded by CIL, but instead was intended to identify infrastructure that S106 could not be secured for. Therefore, amend the text as follows: 'i.e. a list of infrastructure projects to be funded by CIL as opposed to S106 <u>that CIL funding might be spent on.</u> '	Accept proposed modification.	Amend the text as follows: 'i.e. a list of infrastructure projects to be funded by CIL as opposed to S106 <u>that CIL funding might be spent on.</u>
73	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	4.1	S106/S278 funding	Change text to correctly identify that Section 106 agreements and Section 278 highways agreements are not used only to secure 'site specific' mitigation. Agreements will be made to secure necessary mitigation, which may include contributing to mitigating cumulative impacts. Therefore, delete the strikethrough text: 'Section 106 agreements and Section 278 Highways Agreements will continue to be used to secure site-specific mitigation and affordable housing following the CIL review.'	Accept proposed modification.	Amend para 4.1 as follows: 'Section 106 agreements and Section 278 Highways Agreements will continue to be used to secure site-specific mitigation and affordable housing following the CIL review.'
74	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	4.1	Pooling of funds	Change text which incorrectly implies that CIL and S106 funding could not previously be secured towards the same piece of infrastructure. Therefore, amend the text as follows: ' As the amended CIL regulations no longer contain a restriction on the pooling of monies from more than five S106 obligations to fund a single infrastructure project, <u>and both CIL and S106 funding can now be secured towards the same piece of infrastructure without the limitation of pooling.</u> '	Accept proposed modification.	Amend para 4.1 as follows: ' As the amended CIL regulations no longer contain a restriction on the pooling of monies from more than five S106 obligations to fund a single infrastructure project, <u>and both CIL and S106 funding can now be secured towards the same piece of infrastructure without the limitation of pooling.</u> '

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
75	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	5.5 and 5.6, Table 1 and footnote 5	Zero rated strategic allocations	We consider that it is appropriate that the allocated sites at East of Kingston Bagpuize, Dalton Barracks and North West Grove be zero rated for CIL due to the reasons set out i.e. the infrastructure requirements to bring forward these sites are considerable. There have been planning applications on two of the sites: East of Kingston Bagpuize - P18/V2791/O and North West Grove – P20/V3113/O. It is understood that the developer may seek to apply for planning permission on an area of land greater than the allocation size at Dalton Barracks. We recognise that the proposal in this consultation is to exclude only the area allocated from paying CIL. It appears that there is no evidence to support a wider area being identified at the present time.	Comments noted.	None required.
76	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	5.7 and Table 1 footnote 5	Zero rated strategic allocations	Support the carrying forward of zero rated CIL sites as in Adopted Charging Schedule	Support welcomed.	None required.
77	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	10.1	Infrastructure Funding Statements	It may be worth noting that Oxfordshire County Council will also report on our use of CIL in our Infrastructure Funding Statement. Our 2019/20 Infrastructure Funding Statement is available online https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/developer-contributions and reports that we did not have any CIL funds that year, but that will change going forward. Therefore, add the text underlined: 'In addition, the Council will produce an Infrastructure Funding Statement which will be published annually by 31 December. The Infrastructure Funding Statement reports on all funds secured, received and spent in the previous financial year for CIL and S106. <u>Oxfordshire County Council will also produce its own Infrastructure Funding Statement annually in the same way.</u> '	Accept proposed modification.	At 10.1 add the text underlined: 'In addition, the Council will produce an Infrastructure Funding Statement which will be published annually by 31 December. The Infrastructure Funding Statement reports on all funds secured, received and spent in the previous financial year for CIL and S106. <u>Oxfordshire County Council will also produce its own Infrastructure Funding Statement annually in the same way.</u> '
78	Oxfordshire County Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1 and Figure 1	CIL charging rates	We have no objection to the CIL rates as proposed on the basis that they are supported by appropriate evidence. The District Council's CIL Spending Strategy provides for some of the funding being allocated to the County Council to spend on appropriate projects. The increase in CIL funding anticipated by the new rates, will help to achieve the provision of additional infrastructure to benefit the community.	Support welcomed.	None required.
79	Watchfield Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1 and 9.1 to 9.3	Commercial Uses	As outlined in Table 1, business use is afforded a reduction in CIL. What assurances are in place that exempt of reduced rate developments are required to be used as such for a prolonged and defined period? We are aware and have experience of permissions being gained for a defined purpose, used as a 'sweetener' to gain permission for housing, and then the development that has benefited from a reduced scale of charging being converted into housing after viability studies are carried out. The infrastructure needs of housing are very different from commercial, care home etc use. Under clause 9.1 this would be deemed to be a change of use and not chargeable. Does clause 9.3 then apply, as commercial examples are not cited?	If a planning application was approved for a commercial or business use this would need to be implemented and the property be in use for at least 6 months of the previous 3 years to be able to offset the floorspace for a change of use to residential. Furthermore, change of use of a commercial property to residential use will, in some circumstances, require planning approval from the local planning authority, which will ensure that the impact of the development is taken into account and that appropriate mitigation measures are undertaken as required.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
80	Wise, Michael Dr	CIL Charging Schedule	Page 4, Para 5.4 and Table 1, Fig 13	Lack of justification for lower rate for Faringdon	There is only one brownfield site in Faringdon to be developed, the former Tetronics site. This is not a justification for a lower CIL rate in Faringdon. Putting the western Vale into a low CIL area is discriminatory and encourages more development in areas without the infrastructure necessary to support it, reinforcing the view that this is the poor end of the district. Regardless, developers in Faringdon are pleading non-viability and officers have been recommending lower affordable housing or excusing affordable housing contributions. CIL is meant to offset the impact of that development on the community. Instead the impact is being subsidised by existing council tax payers because it overloads existing infrastructure.	The viability assessments show that a lower CIL charging rate can be supported in the 'Rest of District' Zone and built up areas of Wantage, Grove and Faringdon. This is due to land values being lower than they are in the 'Eastern Parishes' Zone. The CIL charging rate needs to strike a balance so that contributions are able to support the delivery of required infrastructure and that the rate is not so high as to make development unviable. The Council considers that, based on the available evidence, an appropriate balance has been struck with the proposed rates.	None required.
81	Friends of Abingdon Society	CIL Charging Schedule		Proposed Rates are too Conservative	The proposed increased CIL charges for residential development in the District are too conservative and the evidence clearly demonstrates that higher charges could be levied without making development unviable.	The CIL charging rate needs to strike an appropriate balance so that contributions are able to support the delivery of required infrastructure, whilst the rates are not so high as to make development unviable. The Council considers that, based on the available viability evidence, this balance has been achieved with the proposed differential rates across the three defined zones.	None required.
82	Friends of Abingdon Society	CIL Charging Schedule		Lower Charging Rates for Smaller Sites	Given the identified discrepancy between the rural areas and Abingdon in terms of build costs and selling prices, the discrepancy between the proposed CIL exemption for the Strategic Sites, and bearing in mind the need for sustainable development, the higher charges for smaller sites in and around Abingdon should be reduced. We are likely to see fewer such sites brought forward by developers, mainly small builders.	As minor development sites do not have the associated S106 costs that major developments will have, the evidence shows that there is the opportunity to introduce a higher CIL levy without impacting their delivery. Based on the viability evidence, the Council is confident that the proposed CIL rates will not impact on the viability or delivery of sites.	None required.
83	Wilts and Berks Canal Trust	CIL Charging Schedule	n/a	Support	There is active engagement with landowners and local authorities along the canal route. It is noted that canal restoration work would not be subject to CIL as we are a charity and certain strategic development would only be liable for S106 contributions. Also noted that the Spending Strategy allocates 30% of CIL towards infrastructure identified in IDPs and/or corporate priorities. The IDP Dec 2016 states that the restoration of the canal will be funded through CIL. WBCT generally supports the CIL Schedule and has no specific comments are made. Willing to work with the district and landowners/agencies regarding the canal's restoration.	Support welcomed.	None required.
84	Milton Parish Council	CIL Charging Schedule	n/a	Support	Milton Parish Council supports the proposals.	Support welcomed.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
85	Wise, Michael Dr	CIL Charging Schedule	Table 1 and Fig 13	Boundary of Strategic Allocation	Page 13 shows a map that still includes the undeveloped part of the Steeds Farm site even though it has met its allocation of 200 houses. This has encouraged the unwanted application for a further 125 houses which has been turned down by the Vale's Planning Committee. Faringdon is now effectively built out.	The boundary of the South of Faringdon strategic allocation reflects the boundary allocated within the Local Plan 2031 Part 1.	None required.
86	West Waddy	CIL Charging Schedule	9.4	Exceptional Circumstances Relief	The Council should offer exceptional circumstances relief, so that should the circumstance arise that the development of a heavily contaminated site would only be viable if relief is obtained from the payment of CIL, that the Council would have the discretion to allow this to happen. They use example of Techtronics Site, 5 Lechlade Road, Faringdon. Having to contribute CIL could prevent development as unviable and not support the development of previously developed land as supported by NPPF. Offering exceptional circumstances relief would have important planning benefits e.g. reduces pressure for greenfield sites, enables removal of pollutants on contaminated land and increases vitality of services and facilities.	The proposed CIL rates have been prepared in relation to the general viability of the District, taking account of the lower land values in Wantage, Grove and Faringdon. It is not evident that there are sufficient examples to introduce a policy for exceptional circumstances relief where it would be beneficial in bringing forward development. It would add complication and delay when one of the strengths of CIL is its universality and certainty. We do, however, recognise that brownfield sites may have grounds for site specific viability assessments and compromises may need to be found in respect of affordable housing / S106 contributions.	None required.
87	Roebuck Land & Planning	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement	Page 6, Table 2	Cost of highways infrastructure	We can find no explanation of how strategic highways infrastructure costs have been derived (£487,173,000). It is important that the elements of infrastructure which contribute to this sum are fully detailed to ensure that S106 monies are not directed toward schemes which are already fully funded. This would amount to double counting and would not be lawful.	The strategic highways infrastructure costs have been derived from the Infrastructure Delivery Plans, specifically from Table 5 in the Local Plan Part 1 IDP, with completed projects removed from the calculation.	None required.
88	NHS Oxfordshire CCG	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement	Page 6, Table 2	Health Infrastructure	Table 2 makes no reference to gaps in health infrastructure and conversations should be held between the Council and the CCG to seek to quantify this.	Funding information in the IFGS has been derived from the two Infrastructure Delivery Plans, produced to support Parts 1 & 2 of the Vale Local Plan. Agree that it would be helpful to discuss future health infrastructure needs with the CCG to inform future IDPs.	None required.
89	Oxfordshire County Council	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement	Overall	Infrastructure Delivery Plan information	We generally support the evidence contained in the Funding Gap Statement, which establishes that there is indeed a funding gap. Table 4 indicates that the gap is approximately £250m. We have not been able to determine whether updated figures have been used where available. We note that some of the figures in the 2016 and 2018 Infrastructure Delivery Plans will now be out of date, but given that the figures will have likely increased, using them would only result in showing a larger funding gap.	Support for the Funding Gap Statement and recognition of the funding gap noted. To calculate the size of the funding gap, the Council relied upon the most up to date available evidence. The Infrastructure Delivery Plans were used to support the previous CIL Charging Schedule examination and the Local Plan Part Two Examination and are, therefore, sufficiently robust.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
90	Oxfordshire County Council	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement	Table 2	Education and transport funding gap	As a general point, we think that the first two lines which indicate that all the Education costs for all the Local Plan allocations and all the Transport costs for those allocations (apart from Strategic Highways and Rail Infrastructure) will come from other sources is overly optimistic and there may instead be a funding gap.	We have taken the costs for Education and Transport from the Infrastructure Delivery Plans. As these costs are expected to be funded by S106 and S278 agreements we have not included them as contributing towards the infrastructure funding gap. As it is not possible to attribute unknown costs towards our funding gap, it is recognised that the Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement is likely to underestimate the actual funding required to deliver all necessary infrastructure in the district.	None required.
91	Friends of Abingdon Society	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement		Use of Infrastructure Funds across Boundary	Extremely concerned at the District Council's announcement that funds raised through CIL and S106 charges 'could also potentially be used across the district boundaries in the Didcot Garden Town area to pay for new infrastructure' (District Council website, 11 January 2021). This means that, despite the substantial infrastructure funding gap identified in the Infrastructure Funding Analysis within the Vale area, the Council is proposing to increase this gap by exporting receipts from development in its area to a separate charging authority (South Oxfordshire District Council) to fund infrastructure there. This is wholly unjust and unacceptable, given the substantial Vale funding gap and also on the basis of the long-established principle of 'no taxation without representation.'	The expenditure of CIL is not determined through the CIL Charging Schedule. The spending of CIL is undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations and the District Council's non-statutory CIL Spending Strategy, which is reviewed annually in line with Council priorities.	None required.
92	Friends of Abingdon Society	Infrastructure Funding Gap Statement		Shortfall in Infrastructure Funds	Open to question where the Council will find the additional funds to pay for the shortfall in infrastructure costs generated by more and more housing and other development (some of which is not charged at all or which pays very little charge). The Public Accounts Committee warned in January 2021 of the increasing and excessive borrowing costs threatening many local authorities with bankruptcy. In that context, a failure to raise CIL charges to a higher realistic level against an acknowledged 'headroom' available in the Vale should be seriously questioned. A clear explanation needs to be given to why Strategic Sites, especially in the Eastern Charging Zone, should not pay CIL, and why residential development in the Didcot Garden Town Masterplan Area(not within the Vale District) should be part-funded by funds levied in the Vale, given the substantial funding gap in the District. Until the answers to these points are available, with supporting evidence, there should be no implementation of the proposed changes to the Vale CIL Charging Schedule and a further public consultation should be undertaken.	Strategic sites mitigate their own infrastructure costs through S106 payments. Charging CIL as well could undermine the S106 tests, as set out in the NPPF. Didcot Garden Town impacts the Vale of White Horse District and it is currently appropriate that the funds levied in the Vale District contribute towards wider Oxfordshire infrastructure.	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
93	The Ptarmigan Group	Viability Assessments (all)	N/A	Viability assumptions	<p>Assessment appears to assume a net to gross ratio of 100% of all sites which is unrealistic. Sites rarely have a net to gross ratio of 100% due to open public space and other infrastructure requirements. This can have a substantial impact on viability.</p> <p>The appraisals for the site typologies do not appear to allow for abnormal costs. It is essential that some buffer is allowed for these.</p> <p>The level of contingency should be increased to 5% to provide a more robust assessment of viability. This should be applied to take account of unforeseen increases in building costs and due to the high-level nature of the viability assessments.</p> <p>Consider it more appropriate to increase professional fees to 10%.</p> <p>No allowance has been made for the costs of constructing garages. This would form part of the CIL liable floorspace and should be taken account of in viability testing.</p> <p>Given the ever-changing and increasingly rigorous nature of the requirements in respect of sustainability, the costs for Future Homes and sustainability measures should be carefully reviewed prior to the next stage in the preparation of the Charging Schedule. In particular, the analysis of sustainability uplift costs should be more considered, to assess the technical, economic and regulatory issues and risks, which then needs to be tested through viability modelling.</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The viability assessments do take account of the net to gross cost of land (See Table 5.13 - Benchmark Land Value Assumptions).</p> <p>The site typologies do not include for abnormal costs. By definition these are abnormal and therefore cannot take into account every site-specific circumstance for an area-wide CIL study. Where a site has abnormal costs, these should be deducted from the price of the land (i.e. a landowner of a site which is subject to abnormal costs cannot expect to receive the same land payment as a landowner of a site without abnormal costs). The abnormal costs should be taken into consideration as part of the BLV (see PPG Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 10-014-20190509 Revision date: 09 05 201).</p> <p>Contingency was consulted upon in 2019 and 2020 and considered an appropriate allowance. It is the same percentage that has been allowed in other local plan and CIL viability studies.</p> <p>Aspinall Verdi consulted on the professional fee assumptions in 2019 and 2020 and no feedback was received. This level is considered adequate, especially for larger housing schemes where there are multiple house types.</p> <p>It is impossible for an area-wide study to take into consideration the detail of individual unit types vis-à-vis garages. Land Registry and EPC is the only basis of bulk housing market data. Where garages are to be provided, one would anticipate a corresponding increase in value. Aspinall Verdi would like housebuilders to be more transparent about the floor areas of their units which would facilitate this fined-grained approach in the future.</p> <p>The current CIL review reflects the cumulative impact of all the relevant Local Plan policies. There is also sufficient 'buffer' / headroom in the appraisals to act as contingency. It is acknowledged that national and local government are likely to require design enhancements in respect of climate change mitigation (e.g. the costs for Future Homes and sustainability measures etc.) The Council will monitor these costs and seek to align the</p>	None required.

ID no	Respondent	Document comment relates to	Para or Section	Topic of Summary	Summary	Officer Response	Modification
						Local Plan and CIL Charging Schedule at the next review period.	

Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email, easy read and alternative languages

Please contact Planning on 01235 422600

