Full Name	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Q1 - Do you agree that the assumptions and/or method set out in the viability assessment are robust, and that the report represents an appropriate basis for determining the level of CIL that would be viable in the district?	Officer comments
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence.					
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	We disagree with a number of the assumptions used within the viability study: 4.2 Concerned that the full development appraisals for each development site scenario have not been provided. This does not allow for full disclosure and scrutiny of the inputs to ensure consistency with the assumptions stated to be made within the Viability Study.	4.2 The council held a stakeholder workshop with developers to discuss inputs to the appraisal. Taylor Wimpey and other of the 'Consortium' developers did attend and did not raise significant objections to the inputs. All inputs to the appraisals are disclosed in full in the report.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.i Concerned to see the unit mix adopted is not accurate with the typologies. Within table 4.7.1 development type 7 is for 125 units both houses and flats, however in table 4.7.2. site type 7 shows no provision of flats within the unit mix. Having regard to the general housing mix adopted for the development typologies, there is a general weighing towards 2 bedroom	4.2.i This is a typo in the description of the typology and will be amended. It was never intended that this typology should include flats. There is no prescriptive mix in the Local Plan on the split between 1 and 2 bed properties within the overall 50% provision. While making reference to Housing Needs Surveys, Savills do not
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.ii Expressed concerns regarding assumptions on gross to net site ratios.	4.2.ii Savills quote a study that is now very old, published in 1999. In the intervening 15 years, LPAs have secured higher densities. In any event, only the smallest site typologies (houses with flats and flats) have 100% site coverage, reflecting development in the urban areas within the District. The larger sites have a gross to net of 60%, which is consistent with the District's experience of large development sites.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.iii The Viability Study has applied a base build cost for houses (£979 per sq m / £91 per sq ft) and flats between 3 to 5 storeys (£1,158 per sq m / £108 per sq ft) which has been obtained from RICS BCIS. The adopted build costs are the same for all typologies from developments of 1 dwelling to 500 dwelling sites. It is our opinion that a small developer would not be able to achieve the same economies of scale which a larger volume housebuilder can achieve. We are of the opinion the adopted build costs are only achievable by volume housebuilders and are therefore not achievable across all site typologies. We therefore recommend that the build costs adopted within the appraisals are revisited and differential build costs are adopted to show the variations in the economies of scale which are achievable by different site sizes.	4.2.iii Major housebuilders (including those that Savills represent) have confirmed that they are able to build at costs LOWER than BCIS. Applying these costs to all sites therefore reflects a cautious approach, as the economies of scale achievable on major sites have not been reflected. The inclusion of a 10% contingency adds additional caution to the assessment.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	The Consortium welcomes the inclusion of a 10% contingency and 6% additional cost for achieving Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 on all typologies.	Comments noted
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.iv The Consortium welcomes the inclusion of an additional Section 106 / Section 278 payment of £1,000 per unit and £10,000 per unit for strategic sites (development typologies 8 and 9). However, there is no information or detailed breakdown of the assumptions in respect of the cost of the site specific section 106 and section 278. It is also the Consortium's concern that £10,000 per unit is too low, as this figure is expected to raise to £20,000 per unit on a number of sites which are currently being promoted within the District. We recommend that this is published to allow for scrutiny to ensure suitable allowance for site mitigation section 106s.	4.2.iv Post-CIL adoption S106 will need to be pared back to only those requirements that are compliant with Regulation 122. The Council has analysed the amounts of S106 on sites and this confirms that the £10,000 allowance is sufficient.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.v. The NPPF states that to ensure viability, developments should provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer. A competitive return to a developer is one that provides a sufficient return for the developer to continue a successful business through the economic cycle, taking account of the risk profile of the business. We are therefore concerned that the profit margin included in the Viability Study is 20% on GDV for the private housing and 6% on GDV for the affordable housing. This assumption is too low in respect of affordable housing and does not take account of the minimum returns required by shareholders of quoted Plc housebuilders.	4.2.v. The 20% profit on private housing and 6% on the affordable housing has been widely accepted on live developments in the District and the neighbouring District of Vale of White Horse. This matter has been considered at other examinations and 20% profit has been regarded as "cautious", whereas 17% profit is more reflective of the current risk profile of development. See also the Inspector's decision at the Holsworthy Show Ground appeal which specifically addresses the split profit on private and affordable housing.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.vi The cost of promoting a site through the planning process can be considerable, especially with the larger strategic urban extensions. The viability appraisals provided by BNP Paribas do not seem to recognise or allow for these costs and we would therefore ask that they are considered in setting the CIL rates prior to the Draft Charging Schedule consultation. The Harman Report (June 2012) states professional fees can rise to 20% for more complex mulit – phase sites.	4.2.vi Promotion costs are deducted from market value by site promoters – they are not included in development appraisals.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.viii - The Benchmark Land Values should be uplifted by 25% - 30% to include site promotion costs. Savills are extremely well placed to comment on BLV's having an involvement in a vast number of development deals annually, including deals within SODC. We have therefore researched a number of option agreements and the minimum price provisions set out within these in the local area. This provides a good benchmark for minimum land value for Greenfield land and provides a more robust evidence base than the assumptions used by BNP Paribas.	4.2.viii This is a deduction from market value – it is not a cost in the developer's appraisal. There is no evidence to demonstrate that these option prices are correct. For example, there is no evidence that the sites have delivered equivalent levels of S106 and affordable housing to those ascribed to sites in the hypothetical testing by BNPPRE. BNPPRE have been involved in advising the District and Vale of White Horse Council on major greenfield sites where a land values of £150,000 per gross acre have been accepted as a basis for testing viability.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.ix viability cushion - The Consortium is concerned that in the lower value residential sales areas, the single CIL rate has been set above the CIL rate having applied a 30% viability buffer. This is even before any adjustment is made to address build costs and the density assumptions.	4.2.ix - As set out above, we do not consider the need for adjustments to build costs and density assumptions. We would also point out that the BNPPRE appraisals incorporate a 10% contingency, which is in excess of the standard assumption.

	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	4.2.1 strategic sites - For sites of the scale of the strategic allocations, there will be considerable costs associated with servicing and on-site physical infrastructure required to deliver serviced land parcels. This is a separate cost to community or social infrastructure and relates to the provision of services, highways infrastructure, drainage etc. The Consortium note an allowance of £6,500 per unit for site type 8 (250 units) and £10,000 per unit for site type 9 (500 units) for major on-site infrastructure and associated costs. The Consortium consider this assumption, included without any evidence or justification, to be low and not reflective of the requirements to bring forward sites at the early planning stages. As a rule of thumb, the Harman Guidance indicates that the costs of strategic infrastructure is typically in the order of £17,000 - £23,000 per plot for larger scale schemes.	The Council has considered the amounts of S106 that it will be able to seek from sites following adoption of CIL and the allowances included in BNPPRE's appraisal are reflective of this. In any event, following adoption of CIL, Section 106 will have to be negotiated in the context of the CIL that has been set. The allowances cited by Savills are in addition to external works allowances of 20% of base build costs, which take total allowances of £26,080 per unit (assuming a 100 sqm house) to £34,580, far in excess of the amount quoted in the Harman Guidance (which for the avoidance of doubt is purely advisory and not a statutory guidance note).
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			We note that the viability assessment for the Strategic Sites takes account of the specific costs of infrastructure mitigation required for these three sites and assumes that this will be secured through S106 and S278 agreements; the consultant's work incorporates a £10,000 per unit allowance for on-site Section 106 costs. In accepting this approach we would expect the identified infrastructure needs for all of the three Strategic Sites to be secured. (These requirements may not equate to, or be limited by, the £10,000 per unit assumed in the viability assessment for CIL.)	Any site specific infrastructure requirements/mitigation measures to make the development acceptable in planning terms will still be secured through S106 and trigger points for delivery set out in the legal agreement. The district council is going to continue to liaise with the county council to ensure essential infrastructure can be secured and there is no overlap on the draft Regulation 123 list.
Mr Richard House	Gladman Developments Limited	Mr Gillespie	Carter Jonas LLP	We suggest that the viability study should test lower development densities on schemes of this size, including something in the 20-25 dwellings per gross hectare range. Suggest that to be conservative, the estimated achieved prices (for new build properties) should be set at 10% below the asking price. Support the BNP Paribas assumptions with regard to developers profit. The assumed Benchmark Land Values are considered to be generally too low.	The viability study has tested a range of schemes and densities based on schemes typically encountered in the district. Comments noted with regard to developers profit. No evidence has been provided in regard to Benchmark Land Values.
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	The viability evidence presented does not take adequate account of local characteristics, particularly in terms of land values. If a more realistic land value was to be included in the assessment, it is likely that more of the scenarios would not be viable at the rates of CIL proposed. Unless the supporting evidence is considered robust, it is not possible to support the rates of CIL set out in the PDCS.	No evidence has been provided with regard to Benchmark Land Values to use.
ASDA stores Ltd	Mr Rory Bennett	Thomas Eggar LLP		The viability study contains retail development assumptions that in our view may not make sufficient allowance for the costs involved in obtaining planning permission for a development scheme.	Table 4.30.1 sets out the assumptions that have been applied for commercial development including demolition and construction costs and fees associated with bringing forward retail warehouse and supermarket. A contingency of 5% for unforseen costs was also assumed. The appraisal indicate that retail warehouses and retail supermarkets generate high capital values and would be able to absorb a max. CIL of between £99 to £181/sqm. A considerable 'buffer' has been applied to the maximum rate. We have not been provided with any evidence of additional costs involved in obtaining planning permission for a development scheme
ASDA stores Ltd	Mr Rory Bennett	Thomas Eggar LLP		The viability study provides an arbitrary allocation of £10 per sq.ft (for S106) without any explanation as how this figure has been produced. As a result, the 'balancing exercise' carried out by the viability study is flawed, as it does not include all of the likely costs of bringing forward development. This in turn casts doubt on the level of 'headroom' available out of which CIL can be paid.	With regard to residual S106/S278 we have not been provided with any evidence of allowances to be used instead.
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q2 - Do you agree that the rates proposed will not put the overall development of the area at serious risk?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence.					
Mr Simon Claridge				Surely taxing new housing will restrict its supply, shouldn't we instead be actively identifying land for developers to build on ? Section 106 agreements are onerous enough without introducing another tax on builders	The proposed CIL rates for residential and commencial development have been based on the need for infrastructure identified through the planning process and the potential effects (as a whole) that imposing CIL rates may have on the economic viability of development across the district. A viability buffer has been applied to the maximum CIL rates. Historically the council has been securing contributions through S106 legal agreements. This will need to be scaled back to avoid double charging and not to render development unviable
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			There is a strategic site within Berinsfield (BER4) which has potential to accept new development (100+ homes) but which has overage agreements in place which will require the land owner/developer to contribute 50% of any uplift in the land value to the previous gravel company owner. This additional CIL charge will most likely make the developement of this particular site unviable. BER4 is currently one of the prefered sites for the villages future growth and is being considered as part of the draft NDP.	The viability study has tested a range of schemes including sites of 100+ . The proposed CIL charge rates should not impact on development being brought forward as they are based on the outcome of the viability assessment which identifies a maximum theoretical CIL rate that could be afforded. A viability buffer is then applied to set the actual charge rates.
Mr Mark Sandels				Agree	Comments noted

	Wates Developments Ltd	Mr Asher Ross	Boyer Planning	We do not consider that the figure of £150 per sqm across the vast majority of the District is viable. There are two zones across the District, one requiring a contribution of £150 per sqm of new housing and one zone requiring £85. This is of course different to the evidence base that suggests that there are three zones. Whilst the schedule does not have to follow the evidence, it is reasonable to suggest that there needs to be evidence procured by the Council that suggests that the evidence should not, in this case, be followed. However, no such evidence exists. In addition, we would argue that there are not two zones, but one zone with specific locations excluded. We consider that the Council may wish to combine the so called zones and the specific sites that it wishes to exclude into one category as the current proposed schedule is confusing and complex. In any case, we consider that evidence to suggest that £150 per sqm is viable across the entire District to be highly challengeable and based on assumptions that are unlikely to stand to scrutiny at the independent examination of this document. A greater analysis of the specifics of locations within South Oxfordshire is required, recognising the roles that the towns and larger settlements play and the wider infrastructure requirements that each settlement has.	The Core Strategy identifies land for 400 new homes in Henley, which is approximately 5% of the housing growth set out in the core strategy. Therefore the council examined the implidations of merging the medium and higher land value areas into one charging zone. The findings showed that there is little fall of the projected CIL income over the calculated period of 15 years when lowering the CIL rate in the Henley/Goring area to the same as the rest of the district. This reduces further when looking at the next five years. In the context of the overall funding gap this drop of CIL income does not appear to be significant. As such it is proposed to merge the medium and higher land value areas into one zone. Also Government Guidance states that when setting rates charging authorities should avoid undue complexity and avoid complicated schedules difficult to administer. There has been no evidence propived as to why the assumptions be highly challengeable.
Mr Steven Sensecall	Kemp and Kemp (for UKAEA)	Mr Steve Sensecall	Kemp and Kemp	Culham Science Centre (CSC) is home to the UK's fusion research programme. CSC is about to embark on period of redevelopment and expansion to deliver 1,000 new jobs. The emerging Supplementary Planning Document for the site is not far from adoption. This development forms an integral part of both South Oxfordshire District Council's and the Vale of White Horse District Council's joint wider ambitions for growth in Science Vale. As I am sure the Council is aware, cuts in Public spending are a key fiscal policy of the current Government through its austerity measures, which means that there is less public money available to fund new science and technology development. These financial structures combined with the high costs of infrastructure renewal at CSC (many of the buildings and services and facilities are at the end of their economic life) means that a CIL rate of £35 per m2 for offices (including research and development B 1 (b)) will have serious implications for the viability of redevelopment proposals at CSC. The three most recent permissions for new buildings at CSC are for developments which fall within the B1 (b) (research and development) Use Class. Applying CIL to these projects would have necessitated significantly reducing their specification, possibly to an unacceptable level. Application of the proposed CIL will also affect significantly the UKAEA's ambition, which is shared with the [LPA], to bring forward 1,000 new jobs over the Plan period. At the development density appropriate to the character of the site, the proposed CIL rate is very much higher than the likely development land value at CSC. As a consequence, new commercial development could be rendered unviable. The Viability Study states at para 6.23 that: "Lettings on science parks and for R&D space tend to be higher than average B1 rents in the District (typically averaging £20 per square foot). Both offices and science park developments are marginally viable, and could accommodate a modest CIL of up to £50 per square metre. However, small movements in rents or yields would result in a significant change in viability and the Council may therefore be minded to adopt a relatively nominal or nil rate in the short term.	BNP Paribas have considered recently consented development at CSC and the viability study concluded that office development could accommodate a modest CIL of up to £50 per square metre as such we are proposing a nominal CIL rate of £35 /sqm for office development (which is 0.81% of GDV). No evidence has been provided on land values. It should also be noted that for redevelopment schemes existing premises on the site will be netted off the proposed floorspace for the purpose of calculating the CIL liability, when they have been occupied for six month during a three year period.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	We are concerned that the proposed rates will hinder a number of development from coming forward. SODC are in the process of reviewing their Local Plan after the requirement for 3,900 -5,900 new dwellings as required by the SHMA. There is no information what sites will come forward for development. We are concerned the proposed rates will stop large and strategic sites from coming forward for future development, where there is likely to be large on site mitigation costs which are still to be collected through Section 106 mechanisms. We comment further in our attached representation.	The council is currently in the preparing a new South Oxfordshire Local Plan, which will look ahead to 2031 and consider (among other other things) how best to plan for the additional housing need identified in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which was published in 2014. The new plan is expected to be adopted during 2017. Following this, the council will review the CIL charging schedule and S106 Supplementary Planning Document
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			The Viability Study evidence suggests that a levy based on three CIL residential Charging Rates would be justified on viability grounds. Allowing for the suggested 30% buffer (to avoid the margin of viability) a higher charging rate of £245/m 2 would be possible for Henley, Goring and the surrounding areas. This compares with the proposed charges for "other settlements and rural areas" of £150/m 2 , and Didcot and Berinsfield of £85/m 2 . We note that the district council is consulting on two charging zones for residential development, with a flat rate of £150/m 2 for all parts of the district (excepting Didcot & Berinsfield) and a lower rate for Didcot and Berinsfield. The flat rate of £150m2 would apply to the higher value zone identified by your consultants. We understand that there are administrative advantages in adopting a simple flat rate charge for most of the district and accept this approach pending further work on the new Local Plan. However we suggest that it would be helpful for the rationale to be explained briefly in the Draft CIL Charging Schedule. In foregoing a portion of potential CIL income there is a risk that funding for infrastructure needed in the Henley and Goring area could be reduced in the short term; we would therefore welcome an assurance from the district council that the flat rate charge will not result in any reduction of funding for essential county council infrastructure in the south and east of the district, or in the rest of the district.	The Core Strategy identifies land for 400 new homes in Henley, which is approximately 5% of the housing growth set out in the core strategy. Therefore the council examined the implidations of merging the medium and higher land value areas into one charging zone. The findings showed that there is little fall of the projected CIL income over the calculated period of 15 years when lowering the CIL rate in the Henley/Goring area to the same as the rest of the district. This reduces further when looking at the next five years. In the context of the overall funding gap this drop of CIL income does not appear to be significant. As such it is proposed to merge the medium and higher land value areas into one zone. Also Government Guidance states that when setting rates charging authorities should avoid undue complexity and avoid complicated schedules difficult to administer.

Mr Richard House	Gladman Developments Limited	Mr Gillespie	Carter Jonas LLP	We support the council's proposal not to simply implement the findings of BNP Paribas, and introduce a three zone charging schedule with an upper residential charge rate of £245 per sq m. Nonetheless, we do have concerns that a residential charge rate of £150 per sq m across much of the district will have an adverse impact on the delivery of new housing (incl. affordable housing) in the area.	Comments noted with regard to merging the higher and medium land value areas. A viability buffer of 30% has been applied to the maximum CIL rates. The council does not consider that the proposed rate of £150/sqm will have an adverse impact on the delivery of new housing. However, the Charging Schedule is proposed to be reviewed in line with the development growth set out in the emerging Local Plan.
GraftongateandClowes DevelopmentsLtd		Mr Gary Lees	Pegasus Group	Didcot A is a strategic site that has recently been made available for redevelopment. An important aspect is the fact that the site straddles the administrative boundary with VoWH, particularly regarding the application of CIL with two different charging schedules. A key component of the infrastructure required to support the wider growth of the town (in both SODC and VoWH) is the Science Bridge proposal that would be constructed right through the centre of the Didcot A site, but is unlikely to involve land within SODC. The redevelopment proposals for this strategic, brownfield site are presently being formulated and will provide for the delivery of thisScience Bridge proposal.Involving considerable land AND on site road infrastructure to potentially relieve the estimated £35 million cost of the bridge and link road. In light of this potentially unique relationship between the redevelopment of the site and the delivery of infrastructure to serve wider needs, it would be entirely inappropriate to apply CIL to the redevelopment of this site.It is noted that the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is £0 for three strategic residential sites -the North East and Ladygrove East sites in Didcot and Site B in Wallingford. It is our submission that the Didcot A site be added to this list of 'exempt' strategic sites for the reasons outlined above. Whilst reference to the payment of CIL via land as well as money being appropriate is welcomed and potentially helpful (paragraph 26), this is practically of no help for Didcot A as none of the land required for the Science Bridge or link road involves land within SODC. Finally, as part of the present masterplanning exercise, both VoWH and SODC are seeking to achieve a vibrant mix of uses as part of the site's redevelopment. The site is presently allocated for B class employment in the SODC local plan of 2012 under Policy CSEM2 and it is noted that development in use classes B2 and 88 attract no CIL payment. Applying CIL to residential, offices and retail is clearly a strong disincentive to plan for those uses as part of the site's redevelopment. Proposed change for the Didcot A site as identified on the attached plan to be included as a strategic site exempt from residential, offices and retail CIL rates. Should this submission be ignored, we reserve the right to submit viability evidence at the next stage of the CIL Charging Schedule's consultation.	Viability evidence has been requested
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q3 - Do you think that the boundary between the different residential charging zones as shown on the proposed charging zones map are appropriate?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence.					
Mr Simon Claridge				Disagree	No evidence has been provided as to how the proposed charging schedule should be amended
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Yes	Comments noted
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Yes	Comments noted
Mr Mark Sandels				Yes	Comments noted
	Nurton Developments	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning	The boundary drawn around Didcot would mean that any new site allocations brought forward in the Local Plan 2031 to extend the urban area of Didcot would fall in to the higher rate Zone 1. Assessments made of the Core Strategy strategic residential allocations to Didcot have exempted those proposed developments from the CIL. The same assessment should be made of proposed residential allocations to come forward through the Local Plan 2031 and the CIL rate/boundary should be adjusted accordingly. Intention to make these adjustments should be stated in the CIL Schedule.	The Core Strategy is the adopted development plan document and therefore the preliminary draft charging schedule has been based on development growth set out in the Core Strategy. The charging schedule will have to be reviewed in line with the new Local Plan 2031 when strategic sites have been allocated.

Mr Gareth Morris	Wheatley Parish Council			We fail to see why you did not introduce the three levels of CIL from the outset as suggested by the consultants report, rather than lump Henley and Goring together with the “level 2” area and set the higher rate of £150 per sq mtr for the combined area. You indicated that this would have to be reviewed in 12 months anyway and in the meantime this very high rate may well deter development in some areas where it could benefit local communities and SODC. The rate of £150 per mtr seems to be very high in comparison to Oxford city whose rate is only £100 per mtr	The Core Strategy identifies land for 400 new homes in Henley, which is approximately 5% of the housing growth. Therefore the council examined two scenarios to explore the likely CIL income: Scenario One – Three zones with three different CIL rates Scenario Two – Two zones with two different CIL rates (the higher and medium land value areas have been merged into one zone) The calculations showed that there is little fall of the projected CIL income over the calculated period of 15 years when lowering the CIL rate in the Henley/Goring area to the same as the rest of the district. This reduces further when looking at the next five years. In the context of the overall funding gap this drop of CIL income does not appear to be significant. As such it is proposed to merge the medium and higher land value areas into one zone. Provision of affordable housing impacts on the viability of schemes and the amount of CIL that can be charged. Oxford City Council has a higher afforadble housing percentage (50%) to South Oxfordshire (40%), which explains the lower CIL residential rate. Also Oxford City Council have applied a flat rate for residential development across the City. There would have been areas in Oxford being able to support a higher CIL for residential development.
	Wates Developments Ltd	Mr Asher Ross	Boyer Planning	We do not consider that the proposed zones are evidenced and reasonable.	See above
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	Property values vary significantly across the district. It may therefore be appropriate to include more charging zones to ensure that developments in areas with lower property values can proceed viably whilst retaining higher rates of income from higher value areas.	Government Guidance states that when setting rates charging authorities should avoid undue complexity and avoid complicated schedules difficult to administer. Introducing further charging zones is not considered to be appropriate and neccessary.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	Yes	Comments noted
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q4 - Do you agree with the different rates proposed in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for residential development proposed in each charging zone?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree with the proposed residential CIL rates, please state clearly which rate you are objecting to and how this can be resolved, providing clear justification to your objection.					
Dr Barry Wood	UNITED			Disagree	No evidence has been provides as to how the proposed CIL rates for residential development should be changed
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Agree	Comments noted
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Agree	Comments noted
Mr Mark Sandels				Agree	Comments noted
Mr Broadley	Aylesbury Vale District Council			AVDC does not have any specific comments on South Oxfordshire District Council (SODC) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. For context, the adopted Wycombe CIL (2012) sets out a charge between £125/sqm and £150/sqm for residential development and £200/sqm for supermarkets and superstores. The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for South Northamptonshire district (2013) proposes a charge between £50/sqm and £150/sqm and the draft Charging Schedule for Dacorum, gives a range between £250/sqm and £100/sqm. Given this context and SODC’s CIL Viability Study (2014), we believe the proposed CIL rates between £150 for Zone 1 and £85 for Zone 2 are reasonable. AVDC does not have any matters to raise for SODC’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update (2014) or the CIL Draft Regulation 123 List	Comments noted
Hallam Land Management (Abingdon)	Hallam Land Management	Mr Andrew Wintersgill	David Lock Associates	We object to two specific proposals, as we set out below. • the proposed restriction of a nil CIL rate to “strategic sites” of over 500 homes, when the findings of the Viability Study justify a nil CIL rate on smaller sites of over 250 homes (see para. 6.13, as well as table 6.8.6 and para. 6.7);	Reference to site type 8 in para. 6.13 is not correct and has been omitted. The viability study found that strategic sites (outside the Henley/Goring area), with significant infrastructure requirements cannot sustain CIL in addition to these infrastructure requirements and the provision of affordable housing. Strategic sites that fall within this category have been excluded from CIL .
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	We welcome the zero rating for Didcot North East, Ladygrove and Wallingford Site B. We strongly disagree with the lack of provision for future strategic site to be zero rated. SODC is reviewing their housing supply and delivery of future housing, therefore it is imperative that any emerging strategic sites which are currently being promoted through the draft Local Plan are also zero rated. We strongly recommend that this is widened to all strategic sites, as "a zero CIL rate for strategic sites offers the greatest flexibility to use S106 to fund infrastructure and mitigate site impact.	The rationale for a nil rate on strategic sites is that they will require significant on-site infrastructure in the form of schools. Sites below 500 units will not require on-site schools and the infrastructure burden will be significantly lower. This approach is fully consistent with the SG and we do not consider that the proposed rates of CIL will threaten the viability of sites in the area and developer interest. As set out in Savill's response the pooling of planning obligations will be limited from April 2015 and the preferred mechanism for collecting contributions in respect of strategic infrastructure is CIL, which is what the council is proposing based on the viability study.
Mr Richard House	Gladman Developments Limited	Mr Gillespie	Carter Jonas LLP	Given the size of the funding gap, concerns must be raised in relation to the deliverability of the Local Plan Spatial Strategy. To ensure housing delivery at the levels required to meet the figures set out in the Oxfordshire-wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment it will be essential that the introducation of CIL does not have an adverse impact of delivery rates.	The funding gap report does not acknowledge contributions from the three strategic sites and funding from the Vale of White Horse District Council towards the Science Vale Transport package. An updated funding gap report will be published along the DCS consultation. The Charging Schedule will be reviewed in line with the emerging Local Plan.

	Inland Homes	Ms Ruth Ambrose	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Inland notes that the CIL Draft Charging Schedule seeks to ensure that development is not discouraged by reducing the payment from the BNP Paribas recommendation within the Viability Statement of £350.00 to £150.00.	Comments noted
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q5 - Do you agree with the council's approach to exclude the three strategic sites from CIL and that infrastructure requirements will be secured through S106?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please refer to any evidence you have that indicates a different approach should be applied.					
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	We have no comments to make on these schemes at this time.	Comments noted
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Agree	Comments noted
Mr Mark Sandels				Agree	Comments noted
	Nurton Developments	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning	Agree	Comments noted
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	Agree	Comments noted
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			We note the conclusion of the Viability Study that the three strategic sites at North East Didcot, Ladygrove East Didcot and Wallingford Site B are currently unable to absorb a CIL rate in addition to the 40% affordable housing requirement and planning obligations. (This does not apply to the Henley and Goring area.) The nil rating of the three named Strategic Sitesshould enable appropriate funding contributions towards impact mitigation to be secured through S.106 agreements. We therefore support this as the preferred approach for these three areas.	Comments noted
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Disagree. Berinsfield has equal or greater infrastructure needs to Didcot and should be excluded for the same reasons from CIL. The sports centre, school, health centre, sewerage system, roads and green space are all in need of updating or replacement. The village is a service hub to many neighbouring villages and developers need to be incentivised to build not deterred! How will CIL funds from development in those neighbouriing villages which benefit from the health centre, school, sports centre etc in Berinsfield be directed towards Berinsfield?	For viability reasons three strategic sites have been excluded from CIL as these development sites have to deliver significant on site infrastructure and cannot absorb an additional CIL. The area of Didcot is not excluded from CIL but is charged a levy of £85/m2. The town and parish councils will receive 15% of CIL receipts arising from development in their parish. This rises to 25% in parishes who have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The levy is intended to focus on the provision of new or improved infrastructure and should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies, unless those deficiencies will be made worse by new development. Neighbouring town and parish councils will only receive CIL funds as a result of development in their parish. Town and parish councils should work closely with neighbouring councils and the district council to agree on infrastructure spending priorities. If the town and parish council shares the priorities of the district council, they may agree that the district council should retain the CIL revenue to spend on that infrastructure. It may be that this infrastructure (e.g. school, sports centre) is not in the town/parish but will support the development of the area.

	Wates Developments Ltd	Mr Asher Ross	Boyer Planning	Council is progressing a new Local Plan and this is due to be adopted in 2017. Government guidance is that CIL should be developed at the same time as a Local Plan. Given that the evidence indicates that, as part of the new Local Plan, further strategic sites would have to be developed, we would argue that making decisions on CIL in advance of decisions being made on the Local Plan is premature, and any further consideration on CIL should be delayed till greater clarity on the future distribution of housing across the District is agreed. Exc l usion of s i tes The draft schedule seeks to exclude three sites from paying CIL. These are Ladygrove East, Didcot North East, and Site B inWallingford. The schedule seeks to make a case for these sites having zero CIL rate on the basis that they have to provide 40% affordable housing and that they have significant onsite infrastructure costs. Of course, policy requires all sites within SODC to provide 40% affordable housing, so this cannot be a reasonable excuse for differentiating these sites from other large sites that are coming forward in the District. The only other clue in the evidence that appears to indicate why these sites should be considered differently relates to the provision of a school on site. However, the provision of a school is not regarded as an exceptional piece of infrastructure that makes the difference between a scheme being viable or not. This is clearly identified in the evidence based prepared on behalf of the Council that these specific sites are not the only ones identified as being unviable at the CIL rates proposed. As such, we consider that the identification of these three sites is very likely to constitute 'state aid' and allows the developers of these sites unfair advantage that has not been justified. We are particularly concerned about the exclusion of Site B inWallingfordas this site has been promoted for a significant amount of time with the absolute knowledge that it would have to deliver a new school as well as 40% affordable housing. There is no evidence to suggest that the site would not be viable providing the affordable housing requirement, the new school, and CIL contributions. The draft schedule does not follow the evidence procured for the Council and there is significant divergence between the evidence and the draft schedule. This particularly relates to the matters such as the identification of zones, the differentiation in rates and the identification of specific sites that would have zero CIL rate. We are also concerned that the CIL is being brought forward at a time when the Council is considering new strategic allocations and that there does not appear to be any linkage between the Local Plan process and the CIL process.	Three strategic sites have been excluded from CIL on viability grounds as these development sites have to deliver significant on and off-site provision plus 40% affordable housing and cannot sustain CIL in addition to these requirements. Further information on the council's approach to merge two zones will be set out in an updated funding gap report. The council is currently preparing a new South Oxfordshire Local Plan, which will look ahead to 2031 and consider (among other other things) how best to plan for the additional housing need identified in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which was published in 2014. The new plan is expected to be adopted during 2017. Following this, the council will review the CIL charging schedule.
Mr Simon Claridge				Disagree	No evidence has been provided with regard to the council's approach and how this should be changed.
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q6 - Do you agree with the (commercial) uses the council is proposing to charge for?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence.					
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Agree	Comments noted
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Agree	Comments noted
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	Agree	Comments noted
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	We have no comments to make regarding commercial rates at this time.	Comments noted
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			We accept the findings of the Viability Study with regard to the proposed CIL rates of £35/m 2 for B1 offices and £70/m 2 for supermarkets, superstores and retail warehouses, allowing for a 30% buffer against the margin of viability, as set out in the Draft Charging Schedule	Comments noted
Mr Simon Claridge				Disagree	No evidence has been provided as to how the proposed commercial uses and proposed CIL rates should be changed
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q7 - Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for development?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence.					
Mr Mark Sandels				Agree	Comments noted
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Agree	Comments noted
Mr Simon Claridge				Disagree	Comments noted
	ASDA stores Ltd	Mr Rory Bennett	Thomas Eggar LLP	The proposed retail CIL rates would discourage larger retail developments and would not ensure that the relevant retail and employment aims of the local plan are met. This could have the effect of reducing the range, variety and choice of retail shopping and, if no redevelopment or regeneration schemes are put forward, then existing buildings are unlikely to be refurbished and re-used. Please see attachment	The CIL Regulations require that criteria to be taken into account in setting CIL rates are the need to fund infrastructure to support the development of the area and the viability of development across the area. We disagree that the proposed CIL rate would discourage larger retail development. Viability evidence has shown that development of large retail stores is viable with the proposed CIL charge and the rates have been set well below the theoretical maximum CIL charge identified in the testing. The proposed CIL rates are considered to strike the appropriate balance as required by regulation and will not threaten the overall viability and delivery of the Core Strategy.

Hallam Land Management (Abingdon)	Hallam Land Management	Mr Andrew Wintersgill	David Lock Associates	Object to the proposed charge of £35/sqm for office/R&D uses, when the findings of the Viability Study justify a nil CIL rate for such uses (see the final sentence of para. 6.23). In the context of the relevant Government policy and guidance we have cited, we therefore request the forthcoming Draft Charging Schedule extends nil CIL rates to housing developments of over 250 homes, as well as to all office and R&D uses.	The viability study found that office development including Research and Development are marginally viable and could accommodate a modest CIL of up to £50 per square metre as such we are proposing a nominal CIL rate of £35 /sqm for office development (which is 0.81% of GDV).
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q8 - Do you think that it is appropriate for the council to introduce an instalments policy?**	**Officer comments**
If you agree, what should be the basis of this instalments policy?					
Mr Simon Claridge				Agree. 100% deferral for 18 months from building control sign off	Comments noted
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Yes	Comments noted
	ASDA stores Ltd	Mr Rory Bennett	Thomas Eggar LLP	We would strongly encourage the council to adopt a realistic instalment policy that spreads the cost of CIL over a number of months or years (depending on the size of development scheme proposed). We would recomment that any instalment policy should link the instalments to the pace of the actual development; and should not link the instalments to an arbitrary time frame following on from the date the development is commenced.	The Council has prepared a Draft Instalments Policy which is to be published alongside the Draft Charging Schedule Consultation document. The Draft Instalments Policy sets out the Council's approach to paying CIL charges through Instalments and is considered to follow the regulations and examples of best practice.
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	Establishing an instalments policy could in theory be helpful to enhance viability, but the cashflow implications of the proposed instalment timings will need to be fully taken into consideration.	Comments noted
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	We strongly recommend an installments policy is included. The installments policy should be based on percentages of the total levy at certain benchmark dates. These should allow for larger sites to pay the levy over a longer time period. There should also be provision for large sites, where CIL may lead to an un-viable position, for the payment to be agreed by negotiation.	Comments noted
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			The evidence within the Viability Study suggests that requiring the payment of CIL in full within 60 days of the commencement of a developmentcould adversely affect viability and impede the development of allocated sites. The County Council supports the phasing of the CIL charges in three equal instalments, consistent with the assumption made by the viability consultants in their assessment of the potential for the different types of residential developments to absorb a CIL charge. This should be clarified when the Draft Charging Schedule is published next year.	Comments noted
	Inland Homes	Ms Ruth Ambrose	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	The Viability Study, prepared by BNP Paribas, states that (para 4.21) the Council is yet to formulate its instalment policy, and that for testing purpose the report assumes that any CIL due will be payable at the following points in the development, 33% on commencement, 33% 12 months after commencement and 34% 18 months after commencement. It is requested that a phasing policy related to CIL payments is included within the Charging Schedule within the next round of consultation for comment, and adopted alongside any future CIL Charging Schedule.	Comments noted
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q8 - Do you think that it is appropriate for the council to introduce an instalments policy?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, what would be an alternative approach that you would support and why?					
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			CIL funds should be paid within 1 year following commencement of development. The developer should be allowed to pay a greater premium if he/she wishes to extend this deadline by a further year. A discount could be offered to developers paying within 30 days of granting of consent.	In order to allow the cash flow for larger development sites the council is going to introduce an instalment policy
Mr Mark Sandels				Yes	Comments noted
Full Name	**Company / Organisation**	**Full Name**	**Company / Organisation**	**Q9 - Do you agree that the draft Regulation 123 list consists of relevant infrastructure projects/types and do you agree with the council's approach?**	**Officer comments**
If you disagree, please tell us your reasons for this. Please bear in mind that your reasons should be clearly justified by supporting evidence and that the list does not need to drill down to minute detail of infrastructure projects.					
	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	Agree	Comments noted
Mr S Ely	Lake Estates			Whilst the list does show one infrastructure project for Berinsfield, there appears no rationale for how this decision was reached or a budget for the scheme. great to have one project but what about the health centre, school, roads, sewerage, etc etc. Why are they not equally important? Berinsfield is a larger village and a service hub for smaller neighbouring villages. It is in urgent need of regeneration and funding for these projects should be on the list so they do not get forgotten. They become even more important in the context of many more new homes coming to the village.	The draft Regulation 123 list does not list individual projects (for Berinsfield or any other town or settlement) but general infrastructure such as public transport network improvements, primary and secondary education, indoor and outdoor sports facilities, healthcare provision. This means that CIL can fund (in whole or part) infrastructure projects falling within this category e.g. primary school in Berinsfield.

Mr Mark Sandels				The Infrastructure list should include provision for a Western Wantage relief road because of the number of planned houses at Monks Farm and the Grove Airfield.	The Wantage Eastern Link Road is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. However, housings sites at Monks Farm and Grove Airfield are not located in South Oxfordshire and contributions for infrastructure will be secured through S106 agreements by Vale of Whith Horse District Council.
Mr Jack Moeran	Environment Agency			We have reviewed the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and have no comments to make. We do however have potential environmental infrastructure projects that we consider are needed to ensure the sustainable delivery of new development in the District. These projects may be suitable for consideration for inclusion on the Districts Infrastructure Deliver Plan and Regulation 123 List. As suggested following our telephone conversation, we will be in touch shortly in writing with details of these environmental infrastructure projects.	Comments noted
	Landowners Mr and Mrs Cook Thame Rd and New Rd	Mr Morgan Reece	Barton Willmore	We have no specific comments to make at this time, but it is important that Section 106 assumptions made in the viability study reflect the contributions that are likely to be required to provide infrastructure not listed on the Regulation 123 list.	Comments noted
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	We welcome further comment and clarity on the regulation 106 (123*) list to ensure it works alongside section 106 for site mitigation. Please see our full representation for further information.	The council preparing a draft S106 Supplementary Planning Document and will publish this for public consultation. Update the draft Regulation 123 list.
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			Draft Infrastructure Lists are being prepared by the County Council for each of the Strategic Sites to identify the essential infrastructure required. These lists will inform our negotiations with the developers for the Strategic Sites and discussions with district council officers on how they will be delivered. Continuing joint working with the district council and developers will be necessary to ensure that the Draft Infrastructure Lists for the Strategic Sites are regularly reviewed and updated. Further work is also needed to confirm the proposed infrastructure projects to be excluded from CIL funding, taking account of the S.106 agreements to be negotiated on the three Strategic Sites and the pooling restrictions which will apply from April 2015. Because of the scale of new development in some areas it is likely that CIL income and S.106 contributions will jointly contribute towards major new items of county council infrastructure, such as secondary schools and special educational needs provision.	The District Council and County Council will continue to work together to ensure the required infrastructure can be delivered
	Inland Homes	Ms Ruth Ambrose	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Inland supports the proposals to review the draft Regulation 123 on an annual basis by SODC, as part of the Council's monitoring in order to prevent the table implying any order of preference of spend as well as reviewing how CIL is collected and spent.	Comments noted

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Full Name	Company / Organisation	Q10 - Do you have any further comments on the proposed appoach on CIL?	Officer comments
Mr Chris Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy Power Distribution (SSE)			I have no comments to make.	Comments noted
	Marine Management Organisation			I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation. If you have any questions or need any further information please just let me know. More information on the role of the MMO can be found on our website www.gov.uk/mmo	Comments noted
Dr Barry Wood	UNITED			My concerns are 1. Inflation The effect of CIL is effectively +5-6% on house prices and will inflate prices in the housing market 2. Affordable/Low Cost Housing On a 100 sq meters house the additional cost is + £15k which on a £200k house is a disincentive for the purchaser. The top ends of the market can afford the extra premium of say £30k. Hence, is this a disincentive towards low cost housing for young people. Believe that it should only be against houses of +200sq mts. Thereby gaining an incentive for lower cost housing 3. Offices - do we really need to penalise “places of work” build 4. Formula Guidance states - keep it simple. Looks complex. This formula on P13 is wrong. You have Net Chargeable Area = Area – {AreaxArea} ____________________ = Integer Number - Area Area This no sense at all. I have not the time to work out the answer. 5. SODC Charge I see you are taking 5% for administration – are you not budgeted already for this? Do you need extra people to administer this incremental work or is it just incremental revenue? 6. General even though Parishes may not be building directly they are taking some of the pain – traffic, schools, DRs etc. Think there should be a pot for non- directly affected Parishes to be able to apply for say up to £5k with defined rules.	1 & 2. CIL is the government's prefered mechanism for pooling contributions from numerous development sites. Historically the council has been securing contributions through S106 legal agreements. This will need to be scaled back to avoid double charging and not to render development unviable. The housing market responds to house prices. 3. The viability study showed that office development can absorb CIL contributions of up to £50 per square metre. After allowing a 30% buffer, this suggests a CIL of £35 per square metre. A 5% contingency has also been assumed in the viability study to allow for any increase cost. 4. The formula to calculate the charge is set out in the CIL Regulations and must be applied. 5. CIL Regulation allow charging authorities to use funds from the levy to recover the costs of administering the levy and the set-up costs such as consultation preparing viability evidence, or the cost of the levy examination. 6. Town and parish councils will receive a 15% share (capped at £100 per existing households) or 25% (when they have an adopted Neighbourhood Plan) of CIL revenue for development in their area. Town and parish councils should work with theire neighbouring council and the district council to identify infrastructure

Piotr Behnke	Natural England			Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England has no specific comments to make on the draft CIL Charges, however would like to make the following general comments, which we hope are helpful. Natural England is not a service provider, nor do we have detailed knowledge of infrastructure requirements of the area concerned. However, we note that the National Planning Policy Framework Para 114 states "Local planning authorities should set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure." We view CIL as playing an important role in delivering such a strategic approach. As such we advise that the council gives careful consideration to how it intends to meet this aspect of the NPPF, and the role of the CIL in this. In the absence of a CIL approach to enhancing the natural environment, we would be concerned that the only enhancements to the natural environment would be ad hoc, and not deliver a strategic approach, and that as such the local plan may not be consistent with the NPPF. Potential infrastructure requirements may include: Access to natural greenspace. Allotment provision. Infrastructure identified in the local Rights of Way Improvement Plan. Infrastructure identified by any Local Nature Partnerships and or BAP projects. Infrastructure identified by any AONB management plans. Infrastructure identified by any Green infrastructure strategies. Other community aspirations or other green infrastructure projects (e.g. street tree planting). Infrastructure identified to deliver climate change mitigation and adaptation. Any infrastructure requirements needed to ensure that the Local Plan is Habitats Regulation Assessment compliant.	Comments noted
Mr Powell	Highways Agency			The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. We have reviewed the consultation and do not have any comment at this time.	Comments noted
	ASDA stores Ltd	Mr Rory Bennett	Thomas Eggar LLP	There will be EU State Aid issues arising out of the setting of differential rates for different types of commercial entity within the same use class. The Council appears only to have taken the economics of regeneration projects into account when considering the strategic development areas as otherwise the viability assessments do not appear to have given any weight to this consideration (particularly for retails developments). We would encourage the council to adopt an Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy. Accepting for the purpose of this argument the premise that CIL is necessary for the purpose of funding borough-wide infrastructure, a much fairer solution would be to divide the council's estimate of total infrastructure costs over the charging period by the total expected development floor space and apply a flat rate levy across the borough and across all forms of development. We would urge the council seriously to consider adopting a policy to allow payment in kind in this matter.	There are no state aid implications for charging different retail uses at different rates, or for charging different rates in different zones, as long as the differences are based on robust and credible viability evidence in line with the requirements of the CIL regulations. Exceptional Circumstances Relief - The council is still to consider its position with regard to offering exceptional circumstances relief. Flat Rate Levy: This would not be appropriate. The proposed CIL charges have been based upon robust and credible viability evidence. It has been shown that some forms of development can accommodate a higher level of CIL whilst other development can only accommodate a lower or nil charge. Provision of Infrastructure as Payment in Kind - comments noted.
Ms B Drysdale	Lewknor Parish Council			"Lewknor Parish Council believes that the more money a developer makes, the more money they should plough back into the community".	Comments noted
Mr Jamie Baskeyfield	Wallingford Town Council			The matter was discussed at the P&GP meeting. It is fair to say that partly contributed to the difficulty the councillors had understanding the consultation and being able to form a response, particularly to the charging levels proposed. It may be that others who have responded may also conclude that those responding would really need to possess expertise in CIL to achieve that? Councillors were pleased that the consultation papers confirmed the District's CIL position on Site B (land off Wantage Road here in Wallingford). Generally the Town Council do not have much more to add at this stage but expressed that they would be pleased to receive further opportunity to respond as the consultation progresses.	Comments noted
Mr Broadley	Aylesbury Vale District Council			As an adjoining authority, AVDC would welcome active, constructive and ongoing engagement on the South Oxfordshire CIL proposals so that any wider impacts can be anticipated, identified and addressed for the next stages the CIL process. This approach is in line with the legal requirement of a 'Duty to Co-operate' on strategic issues between neighbouring authorities.	Comments noted
Mr Gareth Morris	Wheatley Parish Council			Firstly, thank you for clarifying the details of the Cap on the 15% rate, which I was pleased to have confirmed at the village forum. Whilst I accept that the rates at which CIL is paid to NP areas and non NP areas are a matter of government policy, there are several sets of circumstance where this differential is unfair especially when communities have followed advice (to produce a community led plan or to await the outcome of the revised local plan/core strategy) and may now be disadvantaged. We would also like confirmation that the exception site currently under consideration for Wheatley will not attract CIL unless planning permission is delayed beyond the introduction of CIL in the district. I am sure that further information will be available over the coming months but hope that these comments will assist the consultation process.	Local Plan saved policy H10 (Rural Exception Sites) identifies the circumstances in which affordable housing can be provided on 'exception sites' in the rural areas, where residential development would not normally be permitted. In certain cases, where robust evidence establishes that viability issues would prevent the delivery of an exception site, the minimum level of market housing required to make the development viable would be permitted. As this element of market housing is only required to enable the delivery of the affordable housing, viability evidence has shown that these schemes cannot sustain a CIL and it is proposed that within the Draft Charging Schedule that all homes on exception sites are exempted from CIL.

Mr Martin Small	English Heritage			Suggest that the district council should consider whether any heritage-related projects within South Oxfordshire would be appropriate for CIL funding. The council should be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on the viability and effective conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets in development proposals. We consider it essential, that the rates proposed in areas where there are groups of heritage assets at risk are not such as would be likely to discourage schemes being put forward for their re-use or associated heritage-led regeneration. In such areas, there may be a case for lowering the rates charged. We are encouraging local authorities to assert in their CIL Charging Schedules their right to offer CIL relief in exceptional circumstances e.g. where development which benefits heritage assets and their settings may become unviable it was subject to CIL.	The CIL rates have been set within a viability buffer for each zone so there should be no reason why development which would benefit heritage assets would be unviable due to the CIL charge. The CIL Regulations only allow for relief in exceptional circumstances to be made on the grounds of viability due to the cost of complying with a planning obligation, and not because a development will result in public benefit (see Reg 55).
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	The research notes that the ability of an area to afford CIL largely depends on the strength of its housing market. Where the housing market is stronger (higher £ per sq ft) the total “pot” available for these contributions is higher. In contrast, lower value areas see reduced viability and subsequently a reduced “pot”. It therefore becomes a question for local authorities to consider what the appropriate trade-off should be, taking into account adopted affordable housing policies. Although we recognise that SODC has proposed a zero CIL rate for strategic sites at Didcot (North East and Ladygrove East) and Wallingford Site B, we strongly recommend that this is widened to all strategic sites, as “a zero CIL rate for strategic sites offers the greatest flexibility to use Section 106 to fund infrastructure and mitigate site impact” . Given SODC’s uncertainty over housing supply as a result of the SHMA review, it is prudent to ensure that the potential developer interest and subsequent delivery of those sites would not be compromised by the introduction of CIL. When relying on a small number of large sites, there is little margin for error and one site not coming forward would result in a significant shortfall in the delivery of housing. We would therefore recommend that all strategic sites (of 200+), required to achieve both the five year land supply and total housing numbers over the Plan period, are zero rated to maximise the potential of these sites coming forward in the required timeframe to meet the Local Authority’s housing need.	The viability study found that strategic sites (outside the Henley/Goring area), with significant infrastructure requirements cannot sustain CIL in addition to these infrastructure requirements and the provision of affordable housing. Strategic sites that fall within this category have been excluded from CIL . All all other development the proposed CIL rate will be applied in accordance to the viability evidence. It is not considered appropriate to exclude sites of 200+. This would also cause problems with securing the necessary infrastructure through S106 given the limitation of pooling.
	National Housebuilder and Landowner Consortium	Ms Elizabeth Foulkes	Savills	A charging schedule should be consistent with, and the implementation of, an-up-to-date relevant Development Plan. South Oxfordshire do not have an up to date Development Plan.	South Oxfordshire has an up-to-date plan – the Core Strategy was adopted in December 2012 which was found during its examination to be compliant with the NPPF. The Council has begun the process of reviewing its Local Plan to ensure that it remains up-to-date in the light of new evidence, including the SHMA, and the public consultation in the summer of 2014 was the first stage of this process. The SHMA, and other evidence, will be tested through the preparation of the new Local Plan, and for the time being reliance on this information needs to be weighted accordingly.
Ms M Sermon	Binfield Heath Parish Council			BHPC councillors have read the available information about CIL and one of our councillors attended the SODC meeting on November 4 th . We intend to discuss its relevance to us at our next meeting but meanwhile our initial comment concerns the proportion of CIL payout to parish councils. Along with the majority of small councils, as represented at the meeting, we had been strongly recommended not to produce a neighbourhood plan on grounds of complexity and cost, given the size of our parish (300 houses approx).We have only a parish plan which holds no legal status in terms of planning. We therefore feel disadvantaged given your decision to award only 15% of CIL payouts to parishes without a neighbourhood plan and 25% to those which do have one (very few). We think all payments should share the same proportion.	The neighbourhood proportion town and parish councils will receive is set out in the CIL Regulations. It is not the district council's decision.
C. Melanie Malcolm	Cholsey Parish Council			Cholsey Parish Council has two comments which both related to the issue of capping. Firstly, why is it necessary to enforce a cap? Surely these funds are intended to support the need for infrastructure in communities effected by development, why is it necessary to contrive a cap? Secondly, why is the council taking into account, and indeed excluding from the calculations, houses in receipt of Council Tax benefit? The infrastructure provided by this levy will be required and used by all residents of the community. Despite these comments, the Parish Council wishes me to express our general support for the Community Infrastructure Levy.	The CIL Regulations set out how the neighbourhood proportion of the levy is applied. The higher percentage may have been introduced to encourage the development of neighbourhood plans. The annual cap of the neighbourhood proportion is calculated on existing dwellings multiplied by £100. This does not take into account council tax benefits reveived by households.

Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			The County Council supports the need for a CIL for SODC and welcomes the District Council's intention to introduce CIL Charges in 2015. Our Cabinet has been briefed on the policy background to your Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and supporting viability assessment and on the role of the levy in securing funding to contribute towards essential infrastructure identified in the district's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Members remain concerned that major sites identified in SODC's Core Strategy will be unable to deliver the infrastructure needed to fully mitigate their impact. In introducing CIL, we would therefore encourage the district council to set its CIL charging rates at levels which optimise the likely income from the levy, having regard to the conclusions of the Viability Study and the overarching national guidance framework. It is also essential that the County Council's planned investment in projects to mitigate the impact of development on infrastructure and services which it provides is not delayed as a result of the adoption of a CIL charge in South Oxfordshire. This will depend upon the agreement in advance of CIL income being secured of a clear protocol between the two authorities and governance arrangements for the prioritisation of income against projects in the district's IDLP. Good progress has already been made towards identifying the infrastructure needed to support proposed development in South Oxfordshire, as set out in the Core Strategy and IDLP. We expect the joint working between the county and the district to continue in anticipation of the next stage of consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule and subsequently in the run up to the examination in 2015.	Strategic sites have been excluded from CIL (on viability grounds) and infrastructure requirements will be secured through S106 and should therefore fully mitigate their impact. The proposed CIL rates have been based on conclusions of the viability study and the rates have been set in mind of Government Guidance to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding the infrastructure required to support development of its area and the potential effefcts (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development. Governance arrangements in relation to spending of CIL will need to be set up in time and will form part of a separate project.
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			We note the Viability Study conclusions that "Residential (C2) Schemes" are unlikely to be able to absorb the maximum CIL contributions alongside the current 40% Affordable Housing policy requirement. Residential care homes will not therefore be subject to a CIL.The County Council considers that a consistent approach is needed in respect residential care homes and Extra Care Housing as both types of housing for older people offer significant elements of care services and some shared facilities (imposing additional costs on developers). Extra Care Housing falls within Use Class C3 and will be subject to CIL under the current proposals. Some forms of private retirement housing may prove to be viable, depending on the value generated within the scheme and these could be subject to a CIL. However the broad conclusion of the Viability Study is that retirement housing which also meets the current policy requirement of 40% affordable housing cannot absorb CIL and we are strongly of the view that this should include Extra Care Housing. We would therefore urge the district council to treat Extra Care Housing as a form of specialist housing for older people which would be unable to absorb CIL alongside other policy requirements.	Extra care development incorporates independent living and is considered nationally to be the same use as residential (C3). The council seeks 40% affordable housing on residential development under Policy CSH3. It is accepted that extra care development provides greater communal areas which increase build costs and generally having a more specialised market take longer to sell. This makes retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. The viability study concludes that extra care housing is unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40% affordable housing (exept in the Henley area). It is therefore proposed to exclude extra care development from CIL
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			allocating income raised through CIL to the different types of infrastructure included in the district council's Draft Regulation 123 List and IDP. The County Council's full participation will be essential in keeping the Regulation 123 List up to date. The district council's arrangements should enable regular liaison with the County Council, statutory agencies and other partners so that the prioritisation and investment of CIL aligns with approved infrastructure plans and programmes. The prioritisation of projects for receipt of CIL monies should be subject to a working protocol and related governance arrangements to be agreed with the district council. We understand that the district council will be looking at existing arrangements between other counties and districts where CIL charges have been adopted. One possible model which should be considered in this context is the protocol for management of CIL income agreed between Oxford City Council and the County Council in 2013, which has now been in operation for just over a year. This protocol is supported by jointly agreed criteria for assessing the appropriateness of the projects proposed for inclusion on the Regulation 123 list.	Governance Arrangements for holding and spending the CIL will form part of a separte project and the District Council has been liaising with the County Council to inform the Reg. 123 list
Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			The Infrastructure Funding Gap Report provides limited information on the assumptions behind the projected CIL income and the residual funding gap of circa £194.7m. For example, no detail is provided on the estimated other sources of funding of circa £80.4m. In our view further work is required to ascertain how this has been calculated and the potential to draw in other funding for infrastructure and services to complement CIL. This could include for example payments of the New Homes Bonus and any regional growth funding which might be secured. Our understanding is that the residual funding gap for South Oxfordshire assumes that the full cost of transport improvements in the Science Vale fall within its section of the Science Vale. This ensures that there is a "hook" for future contributions, but also means that there is therefore a substantial overlap with the funding gap identified for the delivery of infrastructure to support development in the Vale of the White Horse district, which contains the majority of the Science Vale. The total cost of these projects is estimated at £197m. Decisions have yet to be taken on how the costs might ultimately be apportioned between the South and Vale. In our view realistic assumptions should be agreed between the two districts regarding the apportionment of the Science	Comments noted and further information will be provided in an updated funding gap report

Ms Amanda Jacobs	Oxfordshire County Council			The Viability Study has "sensitivity tested" the impact of lower levels of affordable housing for the different types of residential sites and for the three strategic sites. This has shown that a reduced affordable housing policy requirement would greatly assist development viability and infrastructure funding for all of these developments. The County Council strongly supports an early review of the district council's affordable housing policy in the light of the evidence presented in the Viability Study . Local Plan Review – implications for CIL rates. We understand that the district council intends to adopt a CIL charge in 2015 based on the adopted Core Strategy and to review its charging rates in 2016/17 to align with the new Local Plan. Some additional housing development needed to roll forward the strategy to 2031 may in due course be proposed in higher value areas e.g. around Henley and Goring. The County Council would strongly encourage an early review of the CIL Charging Schedule to take account of the new local plan and updated viability evidence and to consider options for a higher CIL rate where appropriate. This review will also provide an early opportunity to consider any significant change in market conditions across the district.	Comments noted. The council will review the CIL charging schedule to align it with the proposed development growth set out in the emerging Local Plan
Unknown	Oxford Brookes University	Alan Divall	West Waddy ADP	In accordance with CIL Regulation 43, the consultation document recognises the development by registered charities for the delivery of their charitable purposes is exempt from the payment of CIL. Oxford Brookes University is a registered charity and as such would claim future CIL exemptions for those developments that may be required to contribute through the Charging Schedule. Oxford Bookes University would request and welcome that the council's next iteration of its charging schedule is supported by specific guidance as to when and why the local authority may seek to not grant the mandatory charitable exemption. The BNP Viability Study concluded that a nil rate for CIL will be set for D1 uses and which are subsequently reflected in the proposed CIL rates as 'NIL'. This is welcomed and supported. The viability study also recognises that proposals for C2 uses are unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions. Again this is welcomed but the charging schedule should make specific reference to the requirements for student accommodation proposals.	Exemptions for charities are set out in CIL Regulation 43 and the Council is going to follow advise in accordance to these Regulations. The majority of development growth set out in the adopted Core Strategy is coming forward in the form of residential development, employment and town centre uses, which has been tested in the viability study. It is considered that requirements for student accommodation does not need to be included in the viability assessment.
Dr M J Mount	Cuddesdon And Denton Parish Council			Cuddesdon and Denton Parish Council have no direct comments to make about the CIL preliminary draft charging schedule consultation. However, the Parish Council does have a view on the operation of the CIL. A planning application was approved recently for the building of some houses in Cuddesdon (P10/W0093). Any money from this development which goes to the community goes to the general funds for services in Oxfordshire. None at all goes directly to benefit our community, and the Parish Council considers that this is a most unsatisfactory way to allocate the funds. We in this community should be the ones who see any improvement from the levy, since we will be the ones who will absorb the effect of the additional housing.	Once CIL is implemented town and parishes accepting development will receive a proportion of CIL revenue, which can be spent on infrastructure improvements by the town/parish.
	Taylor Wimpey Oxon	Mr Steven Brown	Woolf Bond Planning	numbers of market homes may be allowed at the local authority's discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding'. On the basis of the forgoing, the NPPF makes it clear that Local Planning Authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. In so far as CIL is not chargeable on affordable housing, we suggest consideration is given to proposals put forward specifically on the basis of paragraph 54 of the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CSR 1. As an exception site it would follow therefore, that CIL charging could be discounted or removed the market housing element of such schemes in order to ensure the deliverability of affordable housing.This is particularly the case in Wheatley, which settlement is surrounded by the Green Belt. Exceptions sites, including the provision of a mix of housing tenures can make a valuable contribution to meeting identified housing needs. The provision of private dwellings as part of such proposals, where essential to enable the delivery of affordable housing on exception sites should not be subject to the "standardised" and "generic" £150 psm requirement. The imposition of such a requirement could serve to prevent sites coming forward, which approach would fail to meet identified housing needs, particularly at Wheatley. We request that this	Local Plan saved policy H10 (Rural Exception Sites) identifies the circumstances in which affordable housing can be provided on 'exception sites' in the rural areas, where residential development would not normally be permitted. In certain cases, where robust evidence establishes that viability issues would prevent the delivery of an exception site, the minimum level of market housing required to make the development viable would be permitted. As this element of market housing is only required to enable the delivery of the affordable housing, viability evidence has shown that these schemes cannot sustain a CIL and it is proposed that within the Draft Charging Schedule that all homes on exception sites are exempted from CIL.
Mt Simon Tofts	Blue Cedar Homes			8) the CIL rate for all residential development in the District is either £150 (Zone 1) or £85 (Zone 2). Viability testing in other Authorities in the South and South West demonstrates that sheltered retirement housing, which is classified as use class C3, is very challenging. It is my firm belief that applying a CIL rate on retirement developments will be to constrain the delivery of schemes. I strongly believe that specialist accommodation, such as retirement housing, should have its own separate development scenario and not be amalgamated into a general, residential levy rate. I suggest C3 sheltered/retirement housing is subject to an Authority wide zero/nil rate of CIL. Factors such as higher build costs and a longer selling period for our properties make retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. Therefore, it is imperative that when determining CIL rates, the charging authority completes an accurate development scenario for specialist accommodation for the elderly to ascertain whether it can support the same level of CIL. As such, I consider that 'C3 sheltered/retirement housing' should be explicitly exempt from these categories and instead, should be added to the list of Exemptions set out in Section 10, para 29, page 10.	Extra care development incorporates independent living and is considered nationally to be the same use as residential (C3). The council seeks 40% affordable housing on residential development under Policy CSH3. It is accepted that extra care development provides greater communal areas which increase build costs and generally having a more specialised market take longer to sell. This makes retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. The viability study concludes that extra care housing is unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40% affordable housing (exept in the Henley area). It is therefore proposed to exclude extra care development from CIL

	Retirement Housing Group	Mr John Montgomery	Tanner & Tilley	The imposition of CIL on specialist accommodation for older people will disproportionate impact on viability compared with general needs housing. Nearly all types of specialist housing for older people are impacted on financially by communal space and also a slower sales rate than other residential development. These communal areas are a necessary part of a retirement housing development that are non-saleable floor space which the developer has to build but does not receive any direct revenue from. Also the annual service charge for an Extra Care apartment is between £4,730 and £5,200 and £1,400 to £1,820 for a conventional category II sheltered housing scheme. In addition to service charges it has been estimated that the additional build cost of say an Extra Care development over and above over market apartments based on a 50 unit scheme is in the region of £1.8million. Given that viability of such schemes may therefore be marginal, application of a CIL may prevent many forms of retirement housing coming forward.	Extra care development incorporates independent living and is considered nationally to be the same use as residential (C3). The council seeks 40% affordable housing on residential development under Policy CSH3. It is accepted that extra care development provides greater communal areas which increase build costs and generally having a more specialised market take longer to sell. This makes retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. The viability study concludes that extra care housing is unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40% affordable housing (exept in the Henley area). It is therefore proposed to exclude extra care development from CIL
	McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	Mr Ziyad Thomas	The Planning Bureau Ltd	The largest proportional increases in the older population are expected to be of the 'frail elderly requiring specialist care and accommodation provided by Extra Care accommodation. We therefore commend the council on their decision to provide a Viability Assessment of Sheltered/Retirement housing and Extra Care accommodation. Concerned over aspects of the results asserted by BNPP and the methodologies used. The relevant sub-chapter (paras 6.16-6.18) provides limited details on the viability assumptions used in this assessment outside the premium sales values and does not appear to distinguish between the two forms of development. It is made clear in table 6.16.1 that the results of the viability assessment demonstrate that older people's housing cannot support both CIL and provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing. We question the council's interpretation of the viabiliy study which shows that these forms of accommodation cannot support policy compliant levels of affordable housing and CIL	Extra care development incorporates independent living and is considered nationally to be the same use as residential (C3). The council seeks 40% affordable housing on residential development under Policy CSH3. It is accepted that extra care development provides greater communal areas which increase build costs and generally having a more specialised market take longer to sell. This makes retirement housing less viable than new homes in general. The viability study concludes that extra care housing is unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40% affordable housing (exept in the Henley area). It is therefore proposed to exclude extra care development from CIL

Changes identified
None
Amend table 4.7.1 of the Viability Study an omit the word 'flats'
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None

Agenda Item 5

None	None	None	None	None	None	**Changes identified**		None	None	None

Further information on the council's approach has been set out in an updated infrastructure planning and funding gap report
None
None
Further information on the council's approach has been set out in an updated infrastructure planning and funding gap report

None		Changes identified		None	None	None	None	None

Further information on the council's approach has been set out in an updated infrastructure planning and funding gap report
None
None
Changes identified
None
None
None
None
None
Delete reference to site type 8 in para 6.13 of viability study.
None
None

None	**Changes identified**		None	None	None	None	None	None	None

None	None	**Changes identified**		None	None	None	None	None	None	**Changes identified**		None	None	None	None

None
Changes identified
A draft Instalment policy will be published along the next round of consultation
see above
see above
see above
see above
see above
see above
Changes identified
Changes identified
None
None

None	None	None	Update Regulation 123 list	None	None	**Changes identified**		None	None	None

None	None	None	None	None	None.	Rural exeption sites to be exempt from CIL

None	None	None	None	None

None
Exclude extra care from CIL
None
Update funding gap report

None	None	None	Rural exeption sites to be exempt from CIL	Exclude extra care from CIL

Exclude extra care from CIL	Exclude extra care from CIL