# Community Infrastructure Levy: 

## Viability Study (2014 update)

Prepared for
South Oxfordshire District Council

August 2014

## Contents

1 Executive Summary ..... 3
2 Introduction ..... 7
3 Methodology and appraisal inputs ..... 13
4 Development appraisals ..... 18
5 Appraisal outputs ..... 29
6 Assessment of the results ..... 33
7 Conclusions and recommendations ..... 44

## Appendices

Appendix 1 - Residential sub markets and values
Appendix 2 - Map of housing market areas
Appendix 3 - Residential appraisal results
Appendix 4 - Commercial appraisal results

## Contact details:

Anthony Lee, Senior Director - Development Consulting
BNP Paribas Real Estate
5 Aldermanbury Square
London EC2V 7BP
Tel: 02073384061
Fax: 02074042028
Email: anthony.lee@bnpparibas.com

## 1 Executive Summary

1.1 This report tests the ability of a range of development types throughout the District of South Oxfordshire to make contributions to infrastructure requirements through the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL'). Levels of CIL have been tested in combination with the Council's planning requirements set out in its development plan, including the provision of affordable housing.

## Methodology

1.2 The study methodology compares the residual land values of a range of generic developments that reflect local circumstances to a range of benchmark land values. If a development incorporating a given level of CIL generates a higher value than the benchmark land value, then it can be judged that the proposed level of CIL will be viable.
1.3 The study utilises the residual land value method of calculating the value of each development. This method is used by developers when determining how much to bid for land and involves calculating the value of the completed scheme and deducting development costs (construction, fees, finance and CIL) and developer's profit. The residual amount is the sum left after these costs have been deducted from the value of the development, and guides a developer in determining an appropriate offer price for the site.
1.4 The housing and commercial property markets are inherently cyclical and the Council is testing its proposed rates of CIL after a housing market recession and a recovery. We have allowed for this by running a sensitivity analysis which inflates sales values by $10 \%$ and build costs by $5 \%$. This analysis is indicative only, but is intended to assist the Council in understanding the levels of CIL that are viable in today's terms but also the levels that might become viable following an improvement in market conditions over the life of the Charging Schedule. We have also tested a fall in sales values of $5 \%$, to enable the Council to take a view on the impact of any adverse movements in sales values in the short term.

## Key findings

1.5 The key findings of the study are as follows:

- The results of this study are reflective of current market conditions. It is therefore important that the Council keeps the viability situation under review so that levels of CIL can be adjusted to reflect any future improvements.
- The ability of residential (C3) schemes to make CIL contributions varies depending on area and benchmark land value. Having regard to these variations, a majority of residential schemes across the District should be able to absorb some level of CIL. While differential rates of CIL are more complex, it is likely that the Council would lose a significant amount of potential income from higher value areas if it were to adopt a single rate. The maximum rates of CIL for each area are as follows:
- Zone 1: Henley, Goring and surrounding areas - maximum rate £350 per square metre;
- Zone 2: Other settlements and rural areas - maximum rate $£ 220$ per square metre.
- Zone 3: Didcot and Berinsfield - maximum rate $£ 125$ per square metre
- Strategic sites outside Zone 1 are currently unable to absorb both the Council's affordable housing requirements, Section 106 obligations (for which we have incorporated a $£ 10,000$ per unit allowance) and CIL. We therefore recommend a nil CIL on strategic sites in Zones 2 and 3.
- Retirement housing (C3) schemes, including extra care schemes are unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40\% affordable housing in all areas except Henley when the communal area exceeds 20\% of the gross floorspace. We therefore recommend that the Council adopts a nil rate for this type of housing outside Henley. In Henley, retirement housing schemes could absorb a maximum CIL of $£ 350$ per square metre.
- Residential care home (C2) schemes are likely to be able to absorb CIL contributions of up to $£ 150$ per square metre. It is unlikely that the viability of C2 care homes will vary across the District, as the key factor is weekly charges, rather than sales values. Weekly charges do not vary significantly across an area.
- The Council will need to consider a significant discount below these maximum rates to ensure that site-specific factors are allowed for. The extent of discount depends on the Council's view of the risk to development and housing land supply. Other authorities have opted for a $30 \%$ buffer below maximum rates, although this is a guide only - there are no fixed rules.
- In some circumstances, developments are currently unviable whether or not CIL is levied. The imposition of CIL will therefore not affect the prospects of these sites being delivered. Where these sites are required to provide lower proportions of affordable housing, the prospects for securing a viable scheme that can make CIL contributions might improve.
- Hotel developments are likely to be only marginally viable at the current time based on the assumptions in our appraisals and therefore unlikely to be able to absorb a substantive CIL. Our appraisals indicate that a maximum CIL of only $£ 4$ per square metre could be levied.
- At current rent levels, Office development (including Research and Development (B1b) can be viably developed and could absorb a modest CIL contribution of up to $£ 50$ per square metre. After allowing for a 30\% buffer, this would suggest a CIL of $£ 35$ per square metre.
- Residual values generated by Retail developments vary significantly between high street retail (which on the margins of viability at the current time) on the one hand, and retail warehousing and supermarkets ${ }^{1}$ (which generate sufficient residual values to enable the payment of CIL). If the Council expects any major supermarket or retail warehouse developments to come forward, then it might wish to consider seeking CIL. The maximum rate for this type of development would be in the region of $£ 99$ per square metre. After allowing a buffer of $30 \%$, this would suggest a CIL in of around $£ 70$ per square metre.
- Our appraisals of developments of industrial and warehousing floorspace indicate that these uses are unlikely to generate positive residual land values. We therefore recommend a zero rate for industrial

[^0]floorspace.

- D1 and D2 uses - such as swimming pools, hospitals, community centres and schools - often do not generate sufficient income streams to cover their costs. Consequently, they require some form of subsidy to operate. In the event that such uses are built on a commercial basis, the loss of income would be minimal. We therefore suggest that a nil rate of CIL be set for D1 and D2 uses.
- Sui generis uses can be varied and difficult to appraise. We understand that developments of sui generis uses are, in any case, uncommon in the District.

Table 1.5.1: Suggested CIL rates (70\% of maximum rates)

| Intended use | Zone 1 | Zone 2 | Zone 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential including residential (older persons) housing including extra care schemes where communal floorspace is less than $30 \%$ of gross floorspace | $£ 245$ | $£ 150$ | £85 |
| Residential - strategic sites (500+ units) ${ }^{2}$ | £245 | Nil | Nil |
| Residential - retirement housing including extra care housing | £245 | Nil | Nil |
| Residential care homes (C2) | £150 |  |  |
| Residential (older persons) self-contained C3 housing including extra care schemes where communal floorspace exceeds $30 \%$ of gross floorspace | Nil |  |  |
| Offices | £35 |  |  |
| In centre retail (all 'A' use classes and sui generis retail) | Nil |  |  |
| Supermarkets, superstores and retail warehouses ${ }^{3}$ | £70 |  |  |
| Other uses | Nil |  |  |

[^1]
## 2 Introduction

2.1 This study has been commissioned to contribute towards an evidence base to inform South Oxfordshire District Council's ('the Council') CIL Draft Charging Schedule ('DCS'), as required by Regulation 14 of the CIL Regulations April 2010 (as amended). The aims of the study are summarised as follows:

- to test the impact upon the economics of residential development of a range of levels of CIL;
- for residential schemes, to test CIL alongside the Council's requirements for affordable housing and residual S106 obligations; and
- to test the ability of commercial schemes to make a contribution towards infrastructure through CIL.
2.2 We have adopted a standard residual valuation approach to testing the impact on development viability of a range of levels of CIL, with CIL incorporated as a development cost. However, due to the extent and range of financial variables involved in residual valuations, they can only ever serve as a guide. Individual site characteristics (which are unique), mean that conclusions must always be tempered by a level of flexibility in application of policy requirements on a site by site basis. It is therefore essential that levels of CIL are set so as to allow a sufficient margin to address these site specific variations.


## CIL Policy Context

2.3 As of April 2015 or the adoption of a CIL Charging Schedule (whichever is the sooner), the current S106/planning obligations system i.e. the use of 'pooled' S106 obligations will be limited. The adoption of a CIL Charging Schedule is discretionary for the Council, however, the scaling back of the use of pooled S106 obligations is not discretionary. As such, should the Council elect not to adopt a CIL Charging Schedule, it is likely to have significant implications with regard to funding infrastructure in the District and the Council will need to be aware of such implications in their decision-making.
2.4 It is worth noting that some site specific S106 obligations will remain available for negotiation after the adoption of CIL/April 2015. However these will be restricted to site specific mitigation that meet the three tests set out at CIL Regulation 122 and to the provision of affordable housing. They cannot be used for securing payments towards infrastructure that benefit more than one development, unless they are funded from no more than five Section 106 agreements ${ }^{[1]}$.
2.5 The CIL regulations state that in setting a charge, local authorities must strike "an appropriate balance" between revenue maximisation on the one hand and the potentially adverse impact upon the viability of development on the other. The regulations also state that local authorities should take account of other sources of available funding for infrastructure when setting CIL rates. This report deals with viability only and does not consider other sources of funding (this is considered elsewhere within the Council's evidence base).

[^2]2.6 Local authorities must consult relevant stakeholders on the nature and amount of any proposed CIL at two stages; after publication of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule ${ }^{[2]}$ ('PDCS') and the Draft Charging Schedule ('DCS'). Following consultation, a charging schedule must be submitted for independent examination.
2.7 The payment of CIL becomes mandatory on all new buildings and extensions to buildings with a gross internal floorspace over 100 square metres once a charging schedule has been adopted. The CIL regulations allow a number of reliefs and exemptions from CIL. Firstly, affordable housing and buildings with other charitable uses (if controlled by a charity) are subject to relief. Secondly, local authorities may, if they choose, elect to offer an exemption on proven viability grounds. A local authority wishing to offer exceptional circumstances relief in its area must first give notice publicly of its intention to do so. The local authority can then consider claims for relief on chargeable developments from landowners on a case by case basis. In each case, an independent expert with suitable qualifications and experience must be appointed by the claimant with the agreement of the local authority to assess whether paying the full CIL charge would have an unacceptable impact on the development's economic viability.
2.8 The exemption would be available for 12 months, after which time viability of the scheme concerned would need to be reviewed. To be eligible for exemption, regulation 55 states that the Applicant must enter into a Section 106 agreement; and that the Authority must be satisfied that granting relief would not constitute state aid. It should be noted however that CIL cannot simply be negotiated away or the local authority decide not to charge CIL.
2.9 CIL Regulation 40 includes a vacancy period test for calculating CIL liability so that vacant floorspace can be offset in certain circumstances. Where a building is entirely vacant and has no part which has been in lawful use for a continuous period of at least six months within the last three years, ending on the day planning permission first permits the chargeable development, the floorspace may not be offset. Regulation 40 has recently been amended with regards to buildings which fail the use test but where the proposed use of the building is not changing (or does not require planning permission). In these circumstances, developers will now be able to offset the existing floorspace against new floorspace when developing their CIL liability.
2.10 The CIL regulations enable local authorities to set differential rates (including zero rates) for different zones within which development would take place; for different types of development; and different scales of development. The amendment to the Statutory CIL Guidance in December 2012 clarified that CIL Regulation 13 permits charging authorities to levy 'differential rates by reference to different intended uses of development provided that the different rates can be justified by a comparative assessment of the economic viability of those categories of development. The definition of "use" for this purpose is not tied to the classes of development in the Town and Country Planning Act (Use Classes) Order 1987, although that Order does provide a useful reference point.' (Para 35). The February 2014 amendments to the CIL Regulations further extends the ability to set differential rates in relation to, 'scales of development'.

[^3]2.11 The 2010 regulations set out clear timescales for payment of CIL, which varied according to the size of the payment, which by implication is linked to the size of the scheme. The 2011 amendments to the regulations allow local authorities to set their own timescales for the payment of CIL if they choose to do so. If a Charging Authority does not adopt an instalments policy, then the full CIL liability is payable within 60 days of commencement of development. This is an important issue that the Council will need to consider, as the timing of payment of CIL can have an impact on an Applicant's cashflow (the earlier the payment of CIL, the more interest the Applicant will bear before the development is completed and sold).
2.12 Several local authorities have undertaken viability assessments and have drafted CIL charging schedules, which they have submitted for independent examination. To date, a number of charging authorities (including inter alia the Mayor of London, Portsmouth, Newark and Sherwood, Huntingdonshire, Wandsworth, Shropshire, Bristol, Poole, Mid-Devon, Waveney, Brent, Barnet, Croydon, Harrow, Wycombe, Plymouth, Exeter, Waltham Forest, Chelmsford, Bedford, Islington and Redbridge) have been through the examination process and are at various stages of implementation.
2.13 Local authorities must consult relevant stakeholders on the nature and amount of any proposed CIL at two stages; after publication of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule ('PDCS') and the Draft Charging Schedule ('DCS'). Following consultation, a charging schedule must be submitted for independent examination.

## Economic and market context

2.14 The historic highs achieved in the UK housing market by mid-2007 followed a prolonged period of real house price growth. However, a period of 'readjustment' began in the second half of 2007, triggered initially by rising interest rates and the emergence of the US subprime lending problems in the last quarter of 2007. The subsequent reduction in inter-bank lending led to a general "credit crunch" including a tightening of mortgage availability. The real crisis of confidence, however, followed the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008, which forced the government and the Bank of England to intervene in the market to relieve a liquidity crisis.
2.15 The combination of successive shocks to consumer confidence and the difficulties in obtaining finance led to a sharp reduction in transactions and a significant correction in house prices in the UK, which fell to a level some $21 \%$ lower than at their peak in August 2007 according to the Halifax House Price Index. Consequently, residential land values fell by some 50\% from peak levels. One element of government intervention involved successive interest rate cuts and as the cost of servicing many people's mortgages is linked to the base rate, this financial burden has progressively eased for those still in employment. This, together with a return to economic growth early 2010 (see Figure 2.15.1, May 2014 Bank of England GDP fan chart below, showing the range of the Bank's predictions for GDP growth to 2017) has meant that consumer confidence continued to improve.

Figure 2.15.1 May 2014 Bank of England GDP fan chart


Source: Bank of England
2.16 Throughout the first half of 2010 there were some tentative indications that improved consumer confidence was feeding through into more positive interest from potential house purchasers. Against the background of a much reduced supply of new housing, this would lead one to expect some recovery in prices. However, this brief resurgence abated with figures falling and then fluctuating in 2011 and 2012, with the Halifax House Price Indices showing a fall of 0.6\% in the year to March 2012. The Halifax attributed some of recovery during that period to first time buyers seeking to purchase prior to the reintroduction of Stamp Duty from 1 April 2012. The signs of improvement in the housing market towards the end of 2012 continued through 2013 and into 2014 and both The Halifax and Nationwide continue to report positively in their January 2013 Housing Price Index updates. They both refer to the housing market's escalating improvement, referencing the improvement in employment and improving confidence.
2.17 Nationwide's economist, Robert Gardner, identifies that, 'The housing market is continuing to gather momentum on the back of further solid gains in employment, record low mortgage rates and rising confidence.' Whilst The Halifax's economist Martin Ellis reports that, 'Mounting signs that the economic recovery is becoming firmly established, together with a predicted decline in unemployment, should further boost consumer confidence over the coming months. This will increase the likelihood that more people will consider buying a property in 2014, therefore supporting housing demand.'
2.18 Both reports refer to an increase in market activity, however Nationwide is more positive stating that, 'there have been encouraging signs that activity levels in the housing market are also gradually returning towards more normal levels. According to HMRC, the total number of housing transactions increased to 103,000 in December, 30\% higher than the same month in 2012. The pickup in activity appears to be fairly broad-based, and it is encouraging that first time buyers are a key driving factor behind the upturn.'
2.19 The Halifax however refers to a potential for increase in activity as a result of, 'the recent strengthening in house prices' [which] is increasing the amount of equity that many homeowners have in their home. This will potentially encourage and enable more owners to put their property on the market for sale over the coming year, therefore boosting supply. Indeed, our consumer confidence research shows that there has been a significant improvement in
sentiment towards selling in recent months. These factors should help to curb the upward pressure on prices.'
2.20 Nationwide highlights that house prices, 'recorded their thirteenth successive monthly increase in January 2014, rising by $0.7 \%$ on the month', however the rate of increase fell slightly compared with that recorded in December 2013, which was $1.4 \%$. Notwithstanding this, the price of a typical home was $8.8 \%$ higher than January 2013 and 'House prices are now around 4\% below the 2007 peak'. The Halifax reports that, 'House prices in the final three months of 2013 were $1.9 \%$ higher than in the previous three months. This was within the narrow range of $1.8-2.1 \%$ for this measure recorded in each of the preceding six months. The annual rate of price increase fell slightly compared with last month with prices in the three months to December 7.5\% higher than in the same three months last year.'
2.21 On this basis, the outlook for the UK economy and house prices would appear to be expected to continue to rise in 2014.
2.22 According to Land Registry data, residential sales values in Oxfordshire have recovered since the lowest point in the cycle in May 2009. Prices increased by $12.2 \%$ between May 2009 and September 2010 but fell back in the period to January 2012 by $1.6 \%$. Between February 2012 and May 2014 (the latest month for which data is available) values increased by $11 \%$ to stand $4.2 \%$ above peak 2008 values.

Figure 2.22.1: House prices in Oxfordshire


Source: Land Registry
2.23 The future trajectory of house prices is currently uncertain, although Savills' current prediction is that values are expected to increase over the next five years. Medium term predictions are that properties in south east mainstream markets (i.e. non-prime) will grow by $29.4 \%$ between 2014 and 20184. This compares to predicted cumulative growth of $25.2 \%$ for the UK as a whole over the same period.
2.24 The District is situated between the main retail catchment areas of Reading and Oxford. Many residents in the District are employed in Reading, Oxford and London, as well as at the Science Vale High Technology and Enterprise Park. In relation to the rest of the UK, the District has less unemployment and

[^4]has been less affected by cyclical factors than other parts of the country. The District's relative affluence is evident in the Council's 'Retail Vacancy Report'5 which indicates that retail vacancies equated to $4.8 \%$ of available units in January 2012. This compared favourably to the national average vacancy rate of $14.5 \%$. Retail vacancies in the District fell from $5.1 \%$ over the 12 months to January 2012.

## Local Policy context

2.25 In addition to financing infrastructure, the Council expects residential developments to provide a mix of affordable housing tenures, sizes and types to help meet identified housing needs and contribute to the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities. Policy CSH3 of the adopted Core Strategy (December 2012) states that the Council will seek 40\% affordable housing on all sites where there is a net gain of three or more dwellings, subject to the viability of provision on each site. Where this requirement would result in a fraction of a unit, the Council will seek a payment in lieu for the part unit and on-site provision for whole units. The Council will seek a tenure mix of $75 \%$ social rent and $25 \%$ shared ownership.

## Development context

2.26 Developments in the District range from the construction of single dwellings and in-fill developments, up to major developments on the edge of existing settlements. The bulk of development (in terms of volume of units) is expected to come forward on previously undeveloped land. Demand for some types of commercial floorspace and high street retail in some areas is relatively weak. There are significant variations in residential sales values between different parts of the District, with Henley and the surrounding area attracting the highest values, and Didcot and Berinsfield the lowest values.

[^5]
## 3 Methodology and appraisal inputs

3.1 Our methodology follows standard development appraisal conventions, using assumptions that reflect local market and planning policy circumstances. The study is therefore specific to South Oxfordshire District..

## Approach to testing development viability

3.2 The diagram below shows the inputs into a development appraisal. The total scheme value is calculated, as represented by the left hand bar ${ }^{6}$. This includes the sales receipts from the private housing and the payment from a Registered Provider ('RP') for the completed affordable housing units. The model then deducts the build costs, fees, interest, CIL (at varying levels) and developer's profit. A 'residual' amount is left after all these costs are deducted - this is the land value that the Developer would pay to the landowner. The residual land value is represented by the brown portion of the right hand bar in the diagram.

3.3 The Residual Land Value is normally a key variable in determining whether a scheme will proceed. If a proposal generates sufficient positive land value (in excess of existing use value ${ }^{7}$ ), it will be implemented. If not, the proposal will not go ahead, unless there are alternative funding sources to bridge the 'gap'.
3.4 Ultimately, the landowner will make a decision on implementing a project on the basis of return and the potential for market change, and whether alternative developments might yield a higher value. The landowner's 'bottom

[^6]line' will be achieving a residual land value that sufficiently exceeds 'existing use value' or another appropriate benchmark to make development worthwhile. The margin above existing use value may be considerably different on individual sites, where there might be particular reasons why the premium to the landowner should be lower or higher than other sites.
3.5 Clearly, however, landowners have expectations of the value of their land which often exceed the value of the existing use. CIL will be a cost to the scheme and will impact on the residual land value. Ultimately, if landowners' reasonable expectations are not met, they will not voluntarily sell their land and (unless a Local Authority is prepared to use its compulsory purchase powers) some may simply hold on to their sites, in the hope that policy may change at some future point with reduced requirements. It is within the scope of those expectations that developers have to formulate their offers for sites. The task of formulating an offer for a site is complicated further still during buoyant land markets, where developers have to compete with other developers to secure a site, often speculating on increases in value.

## Viability benchmark

3.6 The CIL Regulations provide no specific guidance on how local authorities should test the viability of their proposed charges. However, there is a range of good practice generated by the early adopting CIL charging authorities, the Homes and Communities Agency and appeal decisions that assist in guiding planning authorities on how they should approach viability testing for planning policy purposes.
3.7 In 2009, the Homes and Communities Agency published a good practice guidance manual 'Investment and Planning Obligations: Responding to the Downturn'. This defines viability as follows: "a viable development will support a residual land value at level sufficiently above the site's existing use value (EUV) or alternative use value (AUV) to support a land acquisition price acceptable to the landowner".
3.8 A number of planning appeal decisions provide guidance on the extent to which the residual land value should exceed existing use value to be considered viable:

## Barnet \& Chase Farm: APP/Q5300/A/07/2043798/NWF

"the appropriate test is that the value generated by the scheme should exceed the value of the site in its current use. The logic is that, if the converse were the case, then sites would not come forward for development"

## Bath Road, Bristol: APP/P0119/A/08/2069226

"The difference between the RLV and the existing site value provides a basis for ascertaining the viability of contributing towards affordable housing."

## Beckenham: APP/G5180/A/08/2084559

"without an affordable housing contribution, the scheme will only yield less than $12 \%$ above the existing use value, $8 \%$ below the generally accepted margin necessary to induce such development to proceed."

## Oxford Street, Woodstock: APP/D3125/A/09/2104658

"The main parties' valuations of the current existing value of the land are not dissimilar but the Appellant has sought to add a 10\% premium. Though the site is owned by the Appellants it must be assumed, for valuation purposes, that the land is being acquired now. It is unreasonable to assume that an existing owner and user of the land would not require a premium over the
actual value of the land to offset inconvenience and assist with relocation. The Appellants addition of the 10\% premium is not unreasonable in these circumstances."
3.9 The guidance issued by the Local Housing Delivery Group ${ }^{8}$ ('LHDG') on 22 June 2012 advocates the use of current use value plus an appropriate premium as a benchmark for testing CIL and local plan policy requirements.
3.10 It is clear from the LHDG guidance, planning appeal decisions and HCA good practice publication that the most appropriate test of viability for planning policy purposes is to consider the residual value of schemes compared to the existing or current use value plus a premium. As discussed later in this report, our study adopts benchmark land values that are reflective of the circumstances in which sites are brought forward.
3.11 The examination on the Mayor of London's CIL charging schedule considered the issue of an appropriate land value benchmark. The Mayor had adopted existing use value, while certain objectors suggested that 'Market Value' was a more appropriate benchmark. The Examiner concluded that:
"The market value approach.... while offering certainty on the price paid for a development site, suffers from being based on prices agreed in an historic policy context." (para 8) and that "I don't believe that the EUV approach can be accurately described as fundamentally flawed or that this examination should be adjourned to allow work based on the market approach to be done" (para 9).
3.12 In his concluding remark, the Examiner points out that
"the price paid for development land may be reduced [so that CIL may be accommodated]. As with profit levels there may be cries that this is unrealistic, but a reduction in development land value is an inherent part of the CIL concept. It may be argued that such a reduction may be all very well in the medium to long term but it is impossible in the short term because of the price already paid/agreed for development land. The difficulty with that argument is that if accepted the prospect of raising funds for infrastructure would be forever receding into the future. In any event in some instances it may be possible for contracts and options to be re-negotiated in the light of the changed circumstances arising from the imposition of CIL charges. (para 32 - emphasis added).
3.13 It is important to stress, however, that there is no single benchmark land value at which land will come forward for development. The decision to bring land forward will depend on the type of owner and, in particular, whether the owner occupies the site or holds it as an asset; the strength of demand for the site's current use in comparison to others; how offers received compare to the owner's perception of the value of the site, which in turn is influenced by prices achieved by other sites. Given the lack of a single benchmark land value, it is difficult for policy makers to determine the minimum land value that sites should achieve. This will ultimately be a matter of judgement for each individual Charging Authority. Our approach to determining benchmark land values is discussed at paragraphs 4.27 to 4.31.

[^7]3.14 Respondents to other charging authorities' PDCS consultations have made various references to the RICS Guidance on 'Viability in Planning' and have suggested that those authorities should run their analyses using benchmarks based on market value. This would be an extremely misleading measure against which to test viability of a new policy or charge, as market values should reflect existing policies already in place, and would consequently tell the Council nothing as to how future - as yet unadopted - policies might impact on viability. It has been widely accepted elsewhere that market values are inappropriate for testing levels of CIL.
3.15 The issue of viability benchmarks has been considered at length by the Local Housing Delivery Group. The Harman Guidance counsels against using market values in testing of planning policies and CIL. Relying upon historic transactions is a fundamentally flawed approach, as offers for these sites will have been framed in the context of current planning policy requirements, so an exercise using these transactions as a benchmark would tell the Council very little about the potential for developments to absorb as yet unadopted policies. Various CIL examiners have accepted the key point that CIL will ultimately result in a reduction in land values, so benchmarks must consider a reasonable minimum threshold which landowners will accept. For local authority areas such as Westminster, where most sites have been previously developed, the 'bottom line' in terms of land value will be the value of the site in its existing use. This fundamental point is recognised by the RICS at paragraph 3.4.4. of their Guidance Note on 'Financial Viability in Planning":
"For a development to be financially viable, any uplift from current use value to residual land value that arises when planning permission is granted should be able to meet the cost of planning obligations while ensuring an appropriate Site Value for the landowner and a market risk adjusted return to the developer in delivering that project (the NPPF refers to this as 'competitive returns' respectively). The return to the landowner will be in the form of a land value in excess of current use value".
3.16 The Guidance goes on to state that "it would be inappropriate to assume an uplift based on set percentages ... given the diversity of individual development sites".
3.17 However, given that a Viability Study is not testing specific sites, it is not possible to reflect the individual nature of all sites, so it is necessary to introduce some set percentages in terms of uplifts above current use values. This approach has been accepted at numerous other CIL examinations, including the Mayoral CIL examination, where the approach outlined in the RICS guidance was considered and rejected.
3.18 Other respondents to other authorities' consultations have also made references to 'market testing' of CIL rates. This is another variant of the benchmarking advocated by respondents outlined at paragraph 3.15. These respondents advocate using benchmarks that are based on the prices that sites have been bought and sold for. There are significant weaknesses in this approach which none of the respondents who advocate this have addressed. In brief, prices paid for sites are a highly unreliable indicator of their actual value for the following reasons:

- Transactions are often based on bids that 'take a view' on squeezing planning policy requirements below target levels. This results in prices paid being too high to allow for policy targets to be met. If these transactions are used to 'market test' CIL rates, the outcome would be unreliable and potentially highly misleading;
- Historic transactions of housing sites are often based on the receipt of grant funding, which is no longer available for developments where a RSL is not the lead developer;
- There would be a need to determine whether the developer who built out the comparator schemes actually achieved a profit at the equivalent level to the profit adopted in the viability testing. If the developer achieved a sub-optimal level of profit, then any benchmarking using these transactions would produce unreliable and misleading results. The same issue applies to other key appraisal variables.
- Developers often build assumptions of growth in sales values into their appraisals, which provides a higher gross development value than would actually be achieved today. Given that our appraisal are based on current values, using prices paid would result in an inconsistent comparison (i.e. current values against the developer's assumed future values). Using these transactions would produce unreliable and misleading results.
3.19 For the reasons set out above, the approach of using current use values is a more reliable benchmark for testing viability than using market values or prices paid for sites, as advocated by some.


## 4 Development appraisals

## Residential development

4.1 We have appraised a series of hypothetical developments, reflecting both the range of sales values/capital values and also sizes/types of development and densities of development across the District. This is similar to the approach adopted in the Council's Affordable Housing Viability Study (November 2009). We have tested strategic sites separately and discuss the appraisals in Section 6.

## Residential sales values

4.2 Residential values in the District reflect national trends in recent years but do of course vary across the District. We considered both comparable evidence of transacted properties in the District and the Council sought views from developers on appropriate values for testing purposes. For the July 2012 viability assessment, local stakeholders were invited to a workshop at which the proposed appraisal inputs were presented. This exercise indicated that developments were at the time attracting sales values ranging from $£ 2,547$ to $£ 4,180$ per square metre. Two years have elapsed since this exercise was undertaken and we have completed research on more contemporary transactions in the District.
4.3 Sales values vary between different areas across the District, with higher values in Sonning and Henley upon Thames; and the lowest values in Didcot and Berinsfield. The average values we have assumed in our appraisals are shown in Table 4.3.1. Where values in an area are similar to values elsewhere, these areas have been grouped together. The settlements included in each Sub area are shown in Appendix 1.

Table 4.3.1: Sales values

| Areas | Value <br> per sq m |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Value per <br> sq ft |  |  |
| Sub area A | $£ 4,230$ | $£ 393$ |
| Sub area B | $£ 3,520$ | $£ 327$ |
| Sub area C | $£ 3,385$ | $£ 314$ |
| Sub area D | $£ 3,267$ | $£ 304$ |
| Sub area E | $£ 3,079$ | $£ 286$ |
| Sub area F | $£ 3,003$ | $£ 279$ |

4.4 As noted earlier in the report, Savills predict that sales values will increase over the medium term (i.e. over the next five years). Whilst this predicted growth cannot be guaranteed, we have run a sensitivity analysis assuming growth in sales values of 10\%, accompanied by $5 \%$ increase in costs (the latter assuming a pick up in construction activity and higher labour and materials costs). We have also modelled a fall in prices of $5 \%$, to provide the Council with an indication of the impact a reverse in values would have on viability.

## Affordable housing tenure and values

4.5 The Council's policy position is that developments should provide $40 \%$ affordable housing, with a tenure mix of $75 \%$ social rent and $25 \%$ shared ownership, or other tenures e.g. affordable rent subject to viability. RPs operating locally are currently offering circa $£ 1,083$ per square metre for completed units of social rented housing. This amount reflects the capital value of the net rents, having regard to management and maintenance costs, and financing arrangements of the RPs. For shared ownership housing, RSLs are offering circa $60 \%$ of market value, based on equity sales of $40 \%$ and rent on retained equity of $2 \%$.
4.6 The CLG/HCA '2011-2015 Affordable Homes Programme - Framework' (February 2011) document clearly states that RSLs will not receive grant funding for any affordable housing provided through planning obligations. Consequently, all our appraisals assume nil grant. We recommend that the Council revisits this assumption when it next reviews its charging schedule.

## Residential development types, density and mix

4.7 We have run appraisals using the range of densities that are typically encountered in the District, based on advice from the Council. Densities are assumed to be between 20 and 50 units per hectare. Table 4.7.1 summarises the different development types selected for testing purposes. This mix reflects the housing mix previously used in the Affordable Housing Viability Study (2009). A consistent unit mix has been adopted for both private and affordable tenures, as shown in Table 4.7.2. The mix varies between type of development.

Table 4.7.1: Development types

| Number <br> of units |  | Housing type | Development <br> density units <br> per ha | Net <br> developable <br> area (ha) | Gross site <br> area (ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | House | 20 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 2 | 2 | Houses | 20 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| 3 | 5 | Houses | 25 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| 4 | 25 | Houses | 50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 5 | 25 | Flats | 80 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| 6 | 50 | Houses | 30 | 1.67 | 1.85 |
| 7 | 125 | Houses | 30 | 4.20 | 5.21 |
| 8 | 250 | Houses | 30 | 8.33 | 13.89 |
| 9 | 500 | Houses | 35 | 14.29 | 23.81 |

Table 4.7.2: Unit Mix

| Site type | 1 Bed flat | 2 bed flat | 3 bed flat | 1 bed house | 2 bed house | 3 bed house | 4 bed house |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| 2 | - | - | - | - | 50\% |  | 50\% |
| 3 | - | - | - | - | 20\% | 80\% | - |
| 4 | 24.00\% | - | - | - | 28\% | 24\% | 24\% |
| 5 | 50.00\% | 40.00\% | 10.00\% | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | - | - | - | - | 50\% | 25\% | 25\% |
| 7 |  | - | - | 15\% | 35\% | 30\% | 20\% |
| 8 | - | - | - | 25\% | 35\% | 30\% | 10\% |
| 9 | - | - | - | 25\% | 35\% | 30\% | 10\% |

## Residential build costs

4.8 We have sourced build costs for the residential schemes from the RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS), which is based on tenders for actual schemes. The basic cost for houses is $£ 979$ per square metre ( $£ 91$ per square foot), which excludes external works and fees. The basic cost for flats of 3 to 5 storeys is $£ 1,158$ per square metre ( $£ 108$ per square foot), again excluding external works and fees.
4.9 Our appraisals include a 15\% allowance for external works (roads, pavements, street lights etc) and an additional 5\% allowance for ground works and other costs.
4.10 We have incorporated a contingency of $10 \%$ in our appraisals, which is double the typical allowance built in by developers. This additional allowance accounts for any exceptional costs that might arise in limited circumstances. Applying this allowance to all sites (where exceptional costs are unlikely to apply) is a very cautious assumption.
4.11 On the larger site (site 8) and 'strategic' site (site 9), our appraisals include additional allowances of $£ 6,500$ and $£ 15,000$ per unit respectively for major on-site infrastructure and associated costs.
4.12 A further $6 \%$ allowance is included for the costs associated with meeting Code for Sustainable Homes level 4, which is reflective of the findings of work undertaken by Cyrill Sweett on behalf of CLG.

## Professional fees

4.13 In addition to base build costs, schemes will incur professional fees, covering design, valuation, highways and so on. Our appraisals incorporate a 12\% allowance for these fees, which is at the higher end of the range for most schemes.

## Section 278 and residual Section 106 costs

4.14 Our appraisals incorporate an allowance of $£ 1,000$ per unit to address any Section 278 and residual Section 106 costs. On the strategic site (site 9), our
appraisals incorporate a $£ 10,000$ per unit allowance for on-site Section 106 costs.

## Finance costs

4.15 Our appraisals incorporate finance calculated at 7\% on build and land costs over the development period. We have assumed 100\% debt financing, recognising that equity funding will attract a cost.

## Development and sales periods

4.16 Development and sales periods vary between type of scheme. However, our sales periods are based on an assumption of a sales rate of 3 to 4 units per month. On the large housing (site 8) and strategic site (site 9) we have assumed that two developers will be building out the site. This rate of sale is reflective of current market conditions, whereas in improved markets, a sales rate of up to 6 units per month might be expected. The build and sales periods for each scheme type are summarised in Figure 4.16.1 below.

## Developer's profit

4.17 Developer's profit is closely correlated with the perceived risk of residential development. The greater the risk, the greater the required profit level, which helps to mitigate against the risk, but also to ensure that the potential rewards are sufficiently attractive for a bank and other equity providers to fund a scheme. In 2007, profit levels were at around 15-17\% of development costs. However, following the impact of the credit crunch and the collapse in interbank lending and the various government bailouts of the banking sector, profit margins have increased. It is important to emphasise that the level of minimum profit is not necessarily determined by developers (although they will have their own view and the Boards of the major housebuilders will set targets for minimum profit).
4.18 The views of the banks which fund development are more important; if the banks decline an application by a developer to borrow to fund a development, it is very unlikely to proceed, as developers rarely carry sufficient cash to fund it themselves. Consequently, future movements in profit levels will largely be determined by the attitudes of the banks towards development proposals.
4.19 The near collapse of the global banking system in the final quarter of 2008 is resulting in a much tighter regulatory system, with UK banks having to take a much more cautious approach to all lending. In this context, and against the backdrop of the current sovereign debt crisis in the Eurozone, the banks may not allow profit levels to decrease much lower than their current level, if at all.
4.20 The minimum generally acceptable profit level is currently around $20 \%$ of GDV. Our assumed return on the affordable housing GDV is 6\%. A lower return on the affordable housing is appropriate as there is very limited sales risk on these units for the developer; there is often a pre-sale of the units to an RSL prior to commencement. Any risk associated with take up of intermediate housing is borne by the acquiring RSL, not by the developer. A reduced profit level on the affordable housing reflects the Homes and Communities Agency's guidelines in its Economic Appraisal Tool.

## Phasing of CIL payments

4.21 The Council is yet to formulate its instalment policy. For testing purposes, we have assumed that any CIL due will be payable at the following points in the development (although these periods are adjusted for the very small scheme that would be completed in a shorter timeframe):

- $33 \%$ on commencement;
- $33 \% 12$ months after commencement; and
- $34 \% 18$ months after commencement.
Figure 4.16.1: Development timescales

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year6 | Year 7 | Year 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| Site type | Activity |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  | 10 |  | 12 | 13 | 14 |  | 16 |  |  | 1920 |  | 212 |  |  | 25:26 | 27.2 |  | 330 | 3132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Medium - houses and | Pre-construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Site type | Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 10 |  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 192 | 02 | 2122 | 23 | 24 | 25.26 | 27, | 829 | 330 | 3132 |
| Medium - flats | Pre-constructionConstruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Figure 4.16.1: Development timescales (continued)

| Site type | Activity |  | 2 |  |  | 6] | 78 |  | 10 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 15 | 1617 | 718 |  |  | 2122 | 23.24 | [25 26 | ${ }^{27}{ }^{28}$ | [2930 | 3132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Medium - houses | Pre-construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ste type | Activity |  |  |  | [6] |  |  |  | 1011 | [ | 13 |  |  |  | 18 | 1920 | 21.2 | 232 | 4]2520 | $6^{27} 27$ | 2393 |  | 3132 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLI payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL payment 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stie type | Activity | 12 | 3) |  | 6 |  | 8 | 910 | $10 \mid 11$ | 12 | 13 | 4.15 | 516 |  | [18] | 1920 |  | 223 | 24.252 | $6[27.28$ | 229 |  | 3132 |
|  | Pre-construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLI payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CiL payment 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| Cram |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site type | Activity | 2 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 8 | 910 | 10.11 | $\square$ | 13 |  | 1516 |  | 18 | 1920 |  | 223 | 2425 | ${ }_{6} 2728$ |  |  | 3132 |
|  | Pre-construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Construction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S106 payment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL payment 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Benchmark land values for the residential analysis

4.22 Benchmark land values, based on the existing use value or alternative use value of sites are key considerations in the assessment of development economics for testing planning policies and tariffs. Clearly, there is a point where the Residual Land Value (what the landowner receives from a developer) that results from a scheme may be less than the land's existing use value. Existing use values can vary significantly, depending on the demand for the type of building relative to other areas. Similarly, subject to planning permission, the potential development site may be capable of being used in different ways - as a hotel rather than residential for example; or at least a different mix of uses. Existing use value or alternative use value are effectively the 'bottom line' in a financial sense and therefore a key factor in this study.
4.23 We have arrived at a broad judgement on the likely range of benchmark land values. On previously developed sites, the calculations assume that the landowner has made a judgement that the existing use does not yield an optimum use of the site; for example, it has fewer storeys than neighbouring buildings; or there is a general lack of demand for the type of space, resulting in low rentals, high yields and high vacancies (or in some cases no occupation at all over a lengthy period). We would not expect a building which makes optimum use of a site and that is attracting a reasonable rent to come forward for development, as residual value may not exceed existing use value in these circumstances.
4.24 Redevelopment proposals that generate residual land values below existing use values are unlikely to be delivered. While any such thresholds are only a guide in 'normal' development circumstances, it does not imply that individual landowners, in particular financial circumstances, will not bring sites forward at a lower return or indeed require a higher return. If proven existing use value justifies a higher benchmark than those assumed, then appropriate adjustments may be necessary. As such, existing use values should be regarded as benchmarks rather than definitive fixed variables on a site by site basis.
4.25 In paragraphs 4.26 to 4.28 , we outline our approach to identifying four benchmark land values which we have selected to provide a broad indication of likely land values across the District. It is important to recognise that other site uses and values may exist on the ground. There can never be a single threshold land value at which we can say definitively that land will come forward for development.
4.26 There is very little recent transactional data available, but we would in any case caution against reliance on deals, in light of the comments on this data in the Examiner's report on the Mayor of London's CIL9.
4.27 Benchmark 1 and 2 are for previously developed land, i.e. sites likely to be in current or historic employment use. The first benchmark equates to $£ 750,000$ per hectare based on capitalised rents for existing commercial buildings. The second benchmark land value makes a downwards adjustment to Benchmark 1 to provide an indicative residential land value benchmark for lower value uses. This benchmark equates to $£ 500,000$ per hectare and is intended to

[^8]illustrate the inevitable variation in land values across the District.
4.28 The third and fourth benchmark land values are based on greenfield sites, ranging from $£ 375,000$ per hectare (Benchmark 3 ) to $£ 325,000$ per hectare (Benchmark 4) ${ }^{10}$.

## Commercial development

4.29 We have appraised a series of hypothetical commercial developments, reflecting a range of use classes at average rent levels achieved on lettings of commercial space in actual developments. In each case, our assessment assumes an intensification of the existing use on the site, based on the same type of commercial development. In each case, the existing use value assumes that the existing building is between one third and half the size of the new development, with a lower rent and higher yield reflecting the secondary nature of the building.

## Commercial rents and yields

4.30 Our research on lettings of commercial floorspace indicates a range of rents achieved, as summarised in table 4.30.1. This table also includes our assumptions on appropriate yields to arrive at a capital value of the commercial space. While new build office developments are likely to attract a premium rent above second hand rents, this appears to be relatively modest, although premium rents have been achieved on some science park floorspace. The rents and yields adopted in our appraisals are summarised in Table 4.30.1.
4.31 Our appraisals of commercial floorspace test the viability of developments on existing commercial sites. For these developments, we have assumed that the site currently accommodates the same use class and the development involves intensification of that use. We have assumed lower rents and higher yields for existing space than the planned new floorspace. This reflects the lower quality and lower demand for second hand space, as well as the poorer covenant strength of the likely occupier of second hand space. A modest refurbishment cost is allowed for to reflect costs that would be incurred to secure a letting of the existing space. A 20\% landowner premium is added to the resulting existing use value as an incentive for the site to come forward for development. The premium would vary between sites, but has been adopted as a worst case scenario for testing purposes.

## Commercial build costs

4.32 We have sourced build costs for the commercial schemes from the RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS), which is based on tenders for actual schemes. These costs vary between different uses and exclude external works and fees (our appraisals include separate allowances for these costs).

## Profit

4.33 Our appraisals incorporation a 20\% profit on cost, reflecting the risk of developing commercial units in the current market.

[^9]| Appraisal input | Source/Commentary | Hotels | Offices | Town centre retail | Retail warehouse | Supermarket retail | Industrial |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total floor area (sq ft) | Generic scheme | 131 rooms | 30,000 | 30,000 | 50,000 | 70,000 | 30,000 |
| Rent (£s per sq ft) | Taking average lettings sourced from EGI as starting point | Cap val £80k per room (budget hotel model) | £20 | £21 | £14 | £15 | £9 |
| Rent free/void period (years) | BNPPRE assumption (years) | 0.5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| Yield | BNPPRE prime yield schedule | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5.5\% | 5\% | 6.5\% |
| Purchaser's costs (\% of GDV) | Stamp duty 4\%, plus agent's and legal fees | 5.8\% | 5.8\% | 5.8\% | 5.8\% | 5.8\% | 5.8\% |
| Demolition costs (£s per sq ft of existing space) | BCIS | £5 | £5 | £5 | £5 | £5 | £5 |
| Gross to net (net as \% of gross) | Based on experience from individual schemes | 80\% | 90\% | 80\% | 80\% | 80\% | 90\% |
| Base construction costs (£s per sq ft) | BCIS costs. Offices - 'generally' offices. <br> 'Generally' figure for industrial, supermarkets, retail warehouse and town centre retail | £122 | £132 | £101 | £65 | £85 | £59 |
| External works (\% of build costs) | BNPPRE assumption | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Residual S106 | BNPPRE assumption (per sq ft) | £3 | £3 | £3 | £10 | £10 | £3 |
| Contingency (\% of build costs) | BNPPRE assumption | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Letting agent's fee | (\% of first year's rent) | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Agent's fees and legal fees | (\% of capital value) | 1.75\% | 1.75\% | 1.75\% | 1.75\% | 1.75\% | 1.75\% |
| Interest rate | BNPPRE assumption | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| Professional fees (\% of build) | BNPPRE assumption, relates to complexity of scheme | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% |
| Profit (\% of costs) |  | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |


| Appraisal input | Source/Commentary | Hotel | Offices | Town centre retail | Retail warehouse | Supermarket retail | Industrial |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing floorspace (sq ft) | Assumed to be between 30\% to 50\% of new space | 16,375 | 9,000 | 15,000 | 17,500 | 26,250 | 15,000 |
| Rent on existing floorspace | Reflects poor quality second hand space of same or similar use, low optimisation of site etc and ripe for redevelopment | $\begin{gathered} £ 12 \text { to } \\ £ 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { £8 to } \\ £ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} £ 12 \text { to } \\ £ 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} £ 10- \\ £ 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} £ 12 \text { to } \\ £ 14 \end{gathered}$ | £4 to £6 |
| Yield on existing floorspace | BNPPRE assumption, reflecting lower covenant strength of potential tenants, poor quality building etc | 7.5\% | 8\% | 7\% | 7.0\% | 7\% | 8\% |
| Rent free on existing space | Years | 3 | 3 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3 |
| Refurbishment costs (£s per sq ft) | General allowance for bringing existing space up to lettable standard | £50 | £30 | £30 | £30 | £30 | £5 |
| Fees on refurbishment (\% of refurb cost) | BNPPRE assumption | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| Landowner premium | BNPPRE assumption - in reality the premium is likely to be lower, therefore this is a conservative assumption | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |

## 5 Appraisal outputs

## Residential appraisals

5.1 The full outputs from our appraisals of residential development are attached as Appendix 2. We have modelled nine hypothetical site types, reflecting different densities and types of development, which are tested in each area in the District and against four land value benchmarks. These types are summarised in Table 5.1.1 below.

Table 5.1.1: Development types

| Number <br> of units |  | Housing type | Development <br> density units <br> per ha | Net <br> developable <br> area (ha) | Gross site <br> area (ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | House | 20 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| 2 | 2 | Houses | 20 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| 3 | 5 | Houses | 25 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| 4 | 25 | Houses | 50 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| 5 | 25 | Flats | 80 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| 6 | 50 | Houses | 30 | 1.67 | 1.85 |
| 7 | 125 | Houses | 30 | 4.20 | 5.21 |
| 8 | 250 | Houses | 30 | 8.33 | 13.89 |
| 9 | 500 | Houses | 35 | 14.29 | 23.81 |

## Scenarios tested

- Base sales and base costs (including Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 with $40 \%$ affordable housing
- As Scenario 4, sales values fall by $5 \%$
- As Scenario 4, sales values increase by $10 \%$ and costs increase by $5 \%$
- As Scenario 4, 30\% affordable housing
- As Scenario 4, $20 \%$ affordable housing
5.2 We assumed that all schemes will meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 4. Level 4 is reflected through a $6 \%$ adjustment to our base build costs.
5.3 For all types of site, we have run two sensitivity analyses; firstly, with sales values increasing by $10 \%$ and build costs also increasing by $5 \%$; and secondly, with sales values falling by $5 \%$. This is provided for illustrative purposes and may assist the Council in understanding how viability might be affected by movements in sales values over time. However, the future trajectory of the housing market is inherently uncertain and predictions cannot be relied upon.
5.4 The residual land values from each of the scenarios above in each of the six housing market sub areas are then compared to four benchmark land values ('BLVs') based on the assumptions set out in paragraphs 4.23 to 4.29. This comparison enables us to determine whether the imposition of CIL would have an impact on development viability. In some cases, the equation RLV less BLV results in a negative number, so the development would not proceed, whether CIL was imposed or not. We therefore focus on situations where the

RLV is greater than BLV and where (all other things being equal) the development would proceed. In these situations, CIL has the potential to 'tip the balance' of viability into a negative position.

## Commercial appraisals

5.5 Our research on rents achieved on commercial lettings indicates a range of rents within each main use class. Our commercial appraisals therefore model the lower end of the range of rents and capital values to test the impact on viability and the ability of commercial schemes to contribute towards CIL. For each use class tested (B1, B2/B8, retail etc), we have run appraisals of a quantum of floorspace, each with rent levels reflecting the range identified by our research.

## Presentation of data

## Residential appraisals results

5.6 The results for each site type are presented in tables showing the CIL rate and the corresponding RLV (which is then converted into a RLV per hectare). The RLV per hectare is then compared to the four benchmark land values, which are also expressed as per hectare values. Where the RLV exceeds the benchmark, the amount of CIL entered into the appraisal is considered viable.
5.7 A sample of the format of the results is provided below. This sample relates to site type 5.

| Community Infrastructure Levy South Oxfordshire District Council |  |  |  |  | Benchmark Land Values (per gross ha) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { BLV } \\ \text { Higher brov } \\ £ 750, \mathrm{C} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathrm{V1} \\ \text { wn nield } \\ , 000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | BLV2 <br> Lower brow nfield <br> $£ 500,000$ | BLV3 <br> Higher greenfield <br> $£ 375,000$ | BLV4 <br> low er greenfield <br> $£ 325,000$ |  |
| Site type 5 |  |  |  |  | Affordable \% |  | 40\% |  | Site area |  |
| Flats |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.31 ha |  |
| No of units |  | 25 units |  |  | \% rented |  |  | 75\% |  | Netto gross | 100\% |
| Density: |  | 80 dph |  |  | \% intermed |  | 25\% |  | Growth |  |
| CSH level: |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub area A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sales | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Build | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | Private values |  | $£ 4230 \mathrm{psm}$ |  |  |  |
| CIL amount per sqm | RLV |  | RLV p | per ha | RLV less | BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |  |
| 0 |  | 404,936 |  | ,295,794 |  | 45,794 | 795,794 | 920,794 | 970,794 |  |
| 10 |  | 390,250 |  | ,248,799 |  | 98,799 | 748,799 | 873,799 | 923,799 |  |
| 25 |  | 378,668 |  | ,211,737 |  | 61,737 | 711,737 | 836,737 | 886,737 |  |
| 50 |  | 359,228 |  | 1,149,529 |  | 99,529 | 649,529 | 774,529 | 824,529 |  |
| 75 |  | 339,609 |  | 1,086,749 |  | 36,749 | 586,749 | 711,749 | 761,749 |  |
| 100 |  | 319,990 |  | ,023,969 |  | 73,969 | 523,969 | 648,969 | 698,969 |  |
| 125 |  | 300,372 |  | 961,189 |  | 11,189 | 461,189 | 586,189 | 636,189 |  |
| 150 |  | 280,753 |  | 898,409 |  | 48,409 | 398,409 | 523,409 | 573,409 |  |
| 175 |  | 261,134 |  | 835,629 |  | 85,629 | 335,629 | 460,629 | 510,629 |  |
| 200 |  | 241,515 |  | 772,849 |  | 22,849 | 272,849 | 397,849 | 447,849 |  |
| 225 |  | 221,897 |  | 710,069 |  | -39,931 | 210,069 | 335,069 | 385,069 |  |
| 250 |  | 202,278 |  | 647,289 |  | 02,711 | 147,289 | 272,289 | 322,289 |  |
| 275 |  | 182,659 |  | 584,509 |  | 65,491 | 84,509 | 209,509 | 259,509 |  |
| 300 |  | 163,039 |  | 521,726 |  | 28,274 | 21,726 | 146,726 | 196,726 |  |
| 325 |  | 143,420 |  | 458,945 |  | 29,055 | -41,055 | 83,945 | 133,945 |  |
| 350 |  | 123,802 |  | 396,165 |  | 53,835 | -103,835 | 21,165 | 71,165 |  |
| Maximum CIL rates (per square metre) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BLV1 | BLV2 |  | BLV3 |  | BLV4 |  | ¢350 |  |  |  |
| $£ 200$ |  | $£ 300$ |  | $£ 350$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5.8 Each spreadsheet provides residual values at varying amounts of CIL, starting
at $£ 0$ and increasing to $£ 350$ per square metre. Whilst CIL applies to net additional floor area only, our appraisals assume that it is applied to the whole development (excluding affordable housing). This reflects the fact that the bulk of housing in the District will be developed on greenfield or other previously undeveloped sites.
5.9 Separate data tables are provided in each spreadsheet for each of the housing market areas identified by our research (see Appendix 1).
5.10 The RLV is converted to a per hectare rate and compared to the four benchmark land values (see paragraphs 4.23 to 4.29). This is shown in the columns headed 'RLV less BLV1, BLV2' etc. A positive number indicates that the development is viable, as the developer will receive a normal level of development profit and the land value will be sufficient for the site to come forward.
5.11 The appraisal model determines the maximum CIL that could be levied when the residual is compared to each of the four benchmark land values. These maximum CIL rates represent the 'tipping point' when a higher rate of CIL would make a previously viable scheme unviable. In the example above, the maximum rate when the residual land value is compared to benchmark land value 1 is $£ 200$ per square metre. The next highest CIL rate of $£ 225$ per square metre would result in the scheme generating a negative outcome.

## Commercial appraisal results

5.12 The appraisals include a 'base' rent level, with sensitivity analyses which model rents above and below the base level (an illustration is provided in Chart 5.12.1). The maximum CIL rates are then shown per square metre, against three different current use values (see Table 4.31.1). Chart 5.12.2 provides an illustration of the outputs in numerical format, while Chart 5.12.3 shows the data in graph format. In this example, the scheme could viably absorb between a $£ 267$ and $£ 0$ charge per square metre, depending on the current use value. The analysis demonstrates the significant impact of very small changes in yields (see appraisals 4 and 6 , which vary the yield by $0.25 \%$ up or down) on the viable levels of CIL.

Chart 5.12.1: Illustration of sensitivity analyses

|  | £s per sqft | Yield | Rent free |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Appraisal 1 | $£ 13.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 2 | $£ 14.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 3 | $£ 15.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 4 | $£ 16.00$ | $8.75 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 5 | $£ 16.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| (base) | $£ 17.00$ | $8.25 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 6 | $£ 18.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 7 | $£ 19.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 8 | $£ 20.00$ | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |
| Appraisal 9 | $8.50 \%$ | 2.00 years |  |
| Appraisal 10 |  |  | 8 |

Chart 5.12.2: Maximum CIL rates - numerical format

|  | Change in rent <br> from base |  | CUV 1 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Chart 5.12.3: Maximum CIL rates - graph format


## 6 Assessment of the results

6.1 This section should be read in conjunction with the full results attached at Appendix 3 (residential appraisal results) and Appendix 4 (commercial appraisal results). In these results, the residual land values are calculated for scenarios with sales values and capital values reflective of market conditions across the District. These RLVs are then compared to benchmark land values.
6.2 Charging authorities are required to "strike an appropriate balance" between the need to raise funding to provide infrastructure to ensure development is sustainable and the potential impact of CIL on the economic viability of development. Our recommendations are that:

- Firstly, councils should take a strategic view of viability. There will always be variations in viability between individual sites, but viability testing should establish the most typical viability position; not the exceptional situations.
- Secondly, they should take a balanced view of viability - residual valuations are just one factor influencing a developer's decision making the same applies to local authorities.
- Thirdly, while a single charge is attractive, it may not be appropriate for all authorities, particularly in areas where sales values vary between areas.
- Fourthly, markets are cyclical and subject to change over short periods of time. Sensitivity testing to sensitivity test levels of CIL to ensure they are robust in the event that market conditions improve over the life of a Charging Schedule is essential.
- Fifthly, local authorities should not set their rates of CIL at the limits of viability. They should leave a margin or contingency to allow for change and site specific viability issues.
6.3 The early examinations have seen a debate on how viability evidence should translate into CIL rates. It has now been widely recognised that there is no requirement for a Charging Authority to slavishly follow the outputs of residual valuations (and indeed the April 2013 Statutory Guidance acknowledged that "there is room for pragmatism". At Shropshire Council's examination in public, Newark \& Sherwood Council argued that rates of CIL should be set at the level dictated by viability evidence which would (if followed literally) have resulted in a Charging Schedule with around thirty different charging zones across the Shropshire area. Clearly this would have resulted in a level of complexity that CIL is intended to avoid. The conclusion of this debate was that CIL rates should not necessarily be determined solely by viability evidence, but should not be logically contrary to the evidence. Councils should not follow a mechanistic process when setting rates - appraisals are just a guide to viability and are widely understood to be a less than precise tool.


## Assessment - residential development

6.4 As CIL is intended to operate as a fixed charge, the Council will need to consider the impact on two key factors. Firstly, the need to strike a balance between maximising revenue to invest in infrastructure on the one hand and the need to minimise the impact upon development viability on the other. CLG guidance indicates that councils should avoid setting rates that threaten the viability of the scale of housing identified in their Development Plan. Secondly, as CIL will effectively take a 'top-slice' of development value, there is a potential impact on the percentage or tenure mix of affordable housing that
can be secured. This is a change from the current system of negotiated financial contributions, where the planning authority can weigh the need for contributions against the requirement that schemes need to contribute towards affordable housing provision.
6.5 In assessing the results, it is important to clearly distinguish between two scenarios; namely, schemes that are unviable regardless of the level of CIL (including a nil rate) and schemes that are viable prior to the imposition of CIL at certain levels. If a scheme is unviable before CIL is levied, it is unlikely to come forward and CIL would not be a factor that comes into play in the developer's/landowner's decision making. We have therefore disregarded the 'unviable' schemes in recommending an appropriate level of CIL. The unviable schemes will only become viable following a degree of real house price inflation, or in the event that the Council agrees to a lower level of affordable housing in the short term ${ }^{11}$. Some sites may simply stay in their existing use as they are sufficiently valuable to the owner (either in terms of capital value or income) to reduce pressure to redevelop.

## Determining maximum viable rates of CIL for residential development

6.6 As noted in paragraph 6.5, where a scheme is unviable the imposition of CIL at a zero level will not make the scheme viable. Other factors (i.e. sales values, build costs or benchmark land values) would need to change to make the scheme viable. In some cases, sites would remain in their existing use. For the purposes of establishing a maximum viable rate of CIL, we have had regard to the development scenarios that are currently viable and that might, therefore, be affected by a CIL requirement. All the results summarised below assume that current affordable housing requirements are met in full (sensitivity analyses which adopt reduced levels of affordable housing are provided in subsequent sections).
6.7 Tables 6.71 and 6.7 .2 summarise the results of our appraisals for sites with less than 3 units that fall below the $40 \%$ affordable housing threshold of three units in Core Strategy Policy CSH3. In these tables, 'NV' indicates that the scheme residual land value would be lower than the benchmark land value, even at nil CIL.

Table 6.7.1: Scheme below affordable housing threshold (1 unit scheme)

| Site type 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 275 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | 10 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Sub area F | NV | 125 | 250 | 275 |

[^10]Table 6.7.2: Scheme below affordable housing threshold (2 unit scheme)

| Site type 2 | Small in-fill |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 125 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 25 | 275 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | NV | 125 | 250 | 300 |
| Sub area F | NV | 50 | 175 | 225 |

6.8 Tables 6.8.1 to 6.8.7 summarise the maximum CIL rates on schemes which exceed the three unit threshold in Core Strategy policy CSH3.

Table 6.8.1: Five houses ( $40 \%$ affordable housing)

| Site type 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Small in-fill |  |  |  |  |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area B | 325 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area C | 225 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area D | 125 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area E | NV | 175 | 300 | 325 |  |
| Sub area F | NV | 125 | 225 | 275 |  |

Table 6.8.2: Twenty-five houses with flats (40\% affordable housing)

| Site type 4 | Medium - houses and flats |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | 100 | 200 | 275 | 300 |
| Sub area F | 25 | 150 | 200 | 225 |

Table 6.8.3: Twenty-five flats ( $40 \%$ affordable housing)

| Site type 5 | Medium - flats |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 200 | 300 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area C | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area D | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | NV |

Table 6.8.4: Fifty houses ( $40 \%$ affordable housing)

| Site type 6 | Medium - houses |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 325 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 200 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 100 | 325 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | NV | 150 | 275 | 300 |
| Sub area F | NV | 100 | 200 | 250 |

Table 6.8.5: One hundred and twenty five houses (40\% affordable housing)

| Site type 7 | Large housing |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 50 | 250 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | NV | 100 | 175 | 225 |
| Sub area F | NV | 25 | 125 | 150 |

Table 6.8.6: Large housing site - two hundred and fifty houses (40\% affordable housing)

| Site type 8 | Large strategic |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | NV | 10 | 225 | 300 |
| Sub area C | NV | NV | 100 | 200 |
| Sub area D | NV | NV | 10 | 100 |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | NV |

Table 6.8.7: Strategic site - five hundred houses (40\% affordable housing)

| Site type 9 | Large strategic |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | NV | 250 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area C | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area D | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | NV |

6.9 In the short term, the Council has the option of securing greater contributions towards infrastructure by accepting a lower level of affordable housing where a proven site viability assessment proves this is justified. To test the impact of reducing the level of affordable housing, we re-ran our appraisals for the large housing site (site type 8) and strategic site (site type 9) with $30 \%$ and $20 \%$ affordable housing. The results are provided in tables 6.9.1 and 6.9.2 (30\% affordable housing) and 6.9.3 and 6.9.4 ( $20 \%$ affordable housing).

Table 6.9.1: Site type 8 (large housing site of 250 units): Maximum viable rates of CIL (£s per square metre) with reduced affordable housing - 30\%

| Site type 8 | Large housing |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 40\% affordable | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ affordable |  |  |
| Sub area A | 350 | BLV4 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area B | 225 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 100 | 200 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 10 | 100 | 250 | 325 |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | 150 | 225 |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | 75 |

Table 6.9.2: Site type 9 (strategic site of 500 units): Maximum viable rates of CIL (£s per square metre) with reduced affordable housing - 30\%

| Site type 9 | Large strategic |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 40\% affordable |  | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ affordable |  |
|  | BLV3 | BLV4 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | NV | NV | 50 | 125 |
| Sub area C | NV | NV | NV | 25 |
| Sub area D | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | NV |

Table 6.9.3: Site type 8: (large housing site of 250 units): Maximum viable rates of CIL (£s per square metre) with reduced affordable housing - 20\%

| Site type 8 | Large housing |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 40\% affordable | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ affordable |  |  |
|  | BLV3 | BLV4 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 225 | 300 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 100 | 200 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 10 | 100 | 275 | 325 |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | 125 | 175 |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | 75 | 125 |

Table 6.9.3: Site type 9: (strategic site of 500 units): Maximum viable rates of CIL (£s per square metre) with reduced affordable housing - 20\%

| Site type 9 | Large strategic |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 40\% affordable | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ affordable |  |  |
|  | BLV3 | BLV4 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | NV | NV | 200 | 250 |
| Sub area C | NV | NV | 100 | 150 |
| Sub area D | NV | NV | 10 | 75 |
| Sub area E | NV | NV | NV | NV |
| Sub area F | NV | NV | NV | NV |

6.10 Reducing affordable housing to $30 \%$ would enable the Council to set higher rates of CIL in sub areas $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ and a further reduction to $20 \%$ would also enable schemes in area D to absorb a CIL contribution. However, this would result in a significant impact on the potential supply of affordable housing in the District. Such an approach has also been rejected by examiners at other charging authorities' CIL examinations, including Mid-Devon.
6.11 Given the range of results above, our recommendation is that a single CIL rate across the District is unlikely to maximise revenue at the same time as minimising the impact on development. However, six different charging zones across the District would be overly complex. The Council could consider the following charging zones:

- Zone 1: Henley, Goring and surrounding areas;
- Zone 2: Other settlements; and
- Zone 3: Didcot and Berinsfield.
6.12 The maximum viable rates, which would be the starting point for the Council's decision making on where to set CIL rates, is around the following levels:
- Zone 1: $£ 350$ per square metre;
- Zone 2: $£ 220$ per square metre; and
- Zone 3: $£ 125$ per square metre.
6.13 The strategic site (site type 9) outside the Henley and Goring area are unable to viably absorb both 40\% affordable housing, on-site Section 106 allowances (for which we have included $£ 10,000$ per unit), on-site infrastructure and CIL contributions. We therefore recommend that strategic sites in the Henley and Goring area should attract the same CIL as other schemes in the area, but schemes elsewhere should attract a nil rate of CIL.
6.14 The Council should avoid setting rates at the margins of viability in order to minimise the potential for CIL to have an adverse impact on viability and/or levels of affordable housing that can be provided. As noted in the tables above, in many situations, there is significant scope to set a rate that leaves a reasonable margin to absorb site-specific issues that might emerge. However, the Council needs to have regards to the risk of setting rates of CIL too high and the impact this might have on land supply. The closer the rates are set to the maximum level, the greater the risk that landowners may not bring sites forward for development.
6.15 In determining the maximum levels of CIL, we have based our assessment on current costs and values only. We have run a set of appraisals that show the impact of an increase in sales values, accompanied by an increase in build costs. These appraisals indicate a significant improvement in viability that would assist in enhancing the existing viability 'buffer' between CIL rates and the maximums identified above. However, given that the future trajectory of the housing market is uncertain, the Council should use these predictions with caution when setting its CIL rates.


## Older persons housing

6.16 The viability of residential care homes is similar to that of general residential as sales values reflect local market levels. However, residential care schemes include a significantly higher level of communal space to accommodate social areas and other facilities. This has an adverse impact on viability. Our appraisal assumes a gross to net ratio of $70 \%$, compared to $85 \%$ for a standard residential scheme. However, the adverse impact of a higher amount of communal floorspace is at least partly offset by premium values ${ }^{12}$ and higher densities, associated with lower car parking requirements. BCIS

[^11]indicates that build costs for these facilities will average $£ 1,232$ per square metre, which we have reflected in our appraisals, together with an additional allowance for external works of $10 \%$.
6.17 Our appraisal (attached at Appendix 3) assumes a capital value of $£ 4,865$ per square metre of completed development. This reflects the higher value areas within the District at Henley, plus a $15 \%$ premium. This is likely to be the most commercially attractive area for developments of this type. The results of our appraisals with $0 \%$ to $40 \%$ affordable housing are summarised in Table 6.16.1.

Table 6.16.1: Older persons housing development
Site type Older persons housing scheme

|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $40 \%$ affordable housing | NV | NV | NV | 0 |
| $30 \%$ affordable housing | 100 | 175 | 200 | 225 |
| $20 \%$ affordable housing | 275 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| $10 \%$ affordable housing | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| $0 \%$ affordable housing | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |

6.18 Our appraisal indicates that older persons developments are only able to absorb CIL contributions if they are not required to provide the full 40\% affordable housing required by Core Strategy policy CSH 3. If the affordable housing requirement was reduced to $30 \%$, schemes could absorb between $£ 100$ and $£ 225$ per square metre. Higher amounts of CIL become viable if affordable housing is reduced to $20 \%$ or less.

## Hotel development

6.19 We have separately assessed the ability of hotel developments to make contributions through CIL (appraisal results attached at Appendix 3).
Assuming a capital value of $£ 80,000$ per room (based on hotel sales across Oxfordshire), our appraisals indicate that hotel development is likely to be viable (see Chart 6.18.1) with a CIL of up to $£ 4$ per square metre.

Chart 6.18.1: Hotel development


## Assessment - commercial development

6.20 Our appraisals indicate that the potential for commercial schemes to be viably delivered is under considerable pressure at the current time. Although retail warehousing and supermarket developments generate positive RLVs in excess of existing use value benchmarks, the Council does not expect any such developments to come forward in current market conditions. Town centre retailing, local centre retailing, office developments and industrial developments are only marginally viable or unviable in the current market.
6.21 As noted in section 4, the level of rents that can be achieved for commercial space varies according to exact location; quality of building; and configuration of space. Consequently, our appraisals reflect this range to show the likely contributions that can be secured in the 'least viable' scenario where rents are lowest. For uses where even the higher levels of rent result in unviable development scenarios, we have not tested with the lower rent levels.

## Office development

6.22 The results of our office appraisals indicate that the rent levels that could be secured on new developments in the District are unlikely to be sufficiently high to generate positive residual land values. Comparable evidence and recent marketing activity indicates that offices are achieving rents averaging between $£ 16$ to $£ 20$ per square foot. The results of our appraisal, with varying rates of CIL, are shown in Chart 6.22.1 below.
6.23 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.

Chart 6.23.1: Residual land values generated by office developments (rent of $£ 20$ per square foot or $£ 215$ per square metre)


## Industrial/warehouse development

6.24 Industrial and warehousing uses in South Oxfordshire attract rents of up to $£ 132$ per square metre ( $£ 12.24$ per square foot) for small units and $£ 97$ per square metre ( $£ 9$ per square foot) for larger units. Industrial yields are currently around $6.5 \%$. As a result of relatively low rents, industrial floorspace does not currently generate positive residual land values, as shown in Chart 6.25.1. As a consequence, it is unlikely that a significant quantum of speculative industrial development will come forward in the short term.

Chart 6.23.1: Industrial development


## Retail development

6.25 While rent levels do not vary hugely between the different types of retail, there are variations in yield, reflecting the relative strength of covenant offered by each type of occupier. Yields for supermarket operators are typically much lower than for independent retailers, resulting in higher capital values for supermarkets.
6.26 Town centre retail development is on the margins of viability and cannot therefore readily make contributions towards infrastructure through CIL at the current time. The results of our appraisals of town centre retail development are summarised in Chart 6.26.1.

Chart 6.26.1: Town Centre retail development

6.27 Our appraisals indicate that retail warehouses and retail supermarkets generate high capital values and would be able to absorb a maximum CIL of between $£ 99$ to $£ 181$ per square metre. We could suggest that the Council adopts a cautious approach and selects the lower end of this range for the purposes of rate setting.

Chart 6.27.1: Supermarket development


## D1 and D2 floorspace development

6.28 D1 and D2 floorspace typically includes uses that do not accommodate revenue generating operations, such as schools, health centres, museums and places of worship. Other uses that do generate an income stream (such as swimming pools) have operating costs that are far higher than the income and require public subsidy. Many D1 and D2 uses will be infrastructure themselves, which CIL will help to provide. It is therefore unlikely that D1 and D2 uses will be capable of generating any contribution towards CIL.

## 7 Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 The results of our analysis indicate a degree of variation in viability of development in terms of different uses. In light of these variations, two options are available to the Council under the CIL regulations. Firstly, the Council could set a single CIL rate across the Borough, having regard to the least viable types of development and least viable locations. This option would suggest the adoption of the 'lowest common denominator', with sites that could have provided a greater contribution towards infrastructure requirements not doing so. In other words, the Council could be securing the benefit of simplicity at the expense of potential income foregone that could otherwise have funded infrastructure. Secondly, the Council has the option of setting different rates for different types of development and different areas. The results of our study point firmly towards the second option as our recommended route.
7.2 We have also referred to the results of development appraisals as being highly dependent upon the inputs, which will vary significantly between individual developments. In the main, the imposition of CIL is not the critical factor in determining whether a scheme is viable or not (with the relationship between scheme value, costs and land value benchmarks being far more important). This point is illustrated in Chart 7.2.1 below, which compares the impact on the residual value of a scheme of a 10\% increase and decrease in sales values and a $10 \%$ increase and decrease in build costs to a $£ 100$ per sq metre change in CIL.

Chart 7.2.1: Impact of changing levels of CIL in context of other factors

7.3 Given the nature of CIL as a fixed tariff, it is important that the Council selects rates that are not on the margins of viability. This is particularly important for commercial floorspace, where the Council does not have the ability to 'flex' other planning obligations to absorb site-specific viability issues. In contrast, the Council could in principle set higher rates for residential schemes as the level of affordable housing could be adjusted in the case of marginally viable schemes. However, this approach runs the risk of frustrating one of the Council's other key objectives of delivering affordable housing. Consequently,
sensitive CIL rate setting for residential schemes is also vital.
7.4 Our core recommendations on levels of CIL are therefore summarised as follows:

- The results of this study are reflective of current market conditions. It is therefore important that the Council keeps the viability situation under review so that levels of CIL can be adjusted to reflect any future improvements.
- The ability of residential (C3) schemes to make CIL contributions varies depending on area and benchmark land value. Having regard to these variations, a majority of residential schemes across the District should be able to absorb some level of CIL. While differential rates of CIL are more complex, it is likely that the Council would lose a significant amount of potential income from higher value areas if it were to adopt a single rate. The maximum rates of CIL for each area are as follows:
- Zone 1: Henley, Goring and surrounding areas - maximum rate $£ 350$ per square metre;
- Zone 2: Other settlements and rural areas - maximum rate $£ 220$ per square metre.
- Zone 3: Didcot and Berinsfield - maximum rate $£ 125$ per square metre
- Strategic sites outside Zone 1 are currently unable to absorb both the Council's affordable housing requirements, Section 106 obligations (for which we have incorporated a $£ 10,000$ per unit allowance) and CIL. We therefore recommend a nil CIL on strategic sites in Zones 2 and 3 .
- Retirement housing (C3) schemes, including extra care schemes are unlikely to be able to absorb CIL contributions alongside 40\% affordable housing in all areas except Henley when the communal area exceeds $20 \%$ of the gross floorspace. We therefore recommend that the Council adopts a nil rate for this type of housing outside Henley. In Henley, retirement housing schemes could absorb a maximum CIL of $£ 350$ per square metre.
- 
- Residential care home (C2) schemes are likely to be able to absorb CIL contributions of up to $£ 150$ per square metre. It is unlikely that the viability of C2 care homes will vary across the District, as the key factor is weekly charges, rather than sales values. Weekly charges do not vary significantly across an area.
- The Council will need to consider a significant discount below these maximum rates to ensure that site-specific factors are allowed for. The extent of discount depends on the Council's view of the risk to development and housing land supply. Other authorities have opted for a $30 \%$ buffer below maximum rates, although this is a guide only - there are no fixed rules.
- In some circumstances, developments are currently unviable whether or not CIL is levied. The imposition of CIL will therefore not affect the prospects of these sites being delivered. Where these sites are required to provide lower proportions of affordable housing, the prospects for securing a viable scheme that can make CIL contributions might improve.
- Hotel developments are likely to be only marginally viable at the current time based on the assumptions in our appraisals and therefore unlikely to be able to absorb a substantive CIL. Our appraisals indicate that a maximum CIL of only $£ 4$ per square metre could be levied.
- At current rent levels, Office development (including Research and Development (B1b) can be viably developed and could absorb a modest CIL contribution of up to $£ 50$ per square metre. After allowing for a $30 \%$ buffer, this would suggest a CIL of $£ 35$ per square metre.
- Residual values generated by Retail developments vary significantly between high street retail (which on the margins of viability at the current time) on the one hand, and retail warehousing and supermarkets) ${ }^{13}$ (which generate sufficient residual values to enable the payment of CIL). If the Council expects any major supermarket or retail warehouse developments to come forward, then it might wish to consider seeking CIL. The maximum rate for this type of development would be in the region of $£ 99$ per square metre. After allowing a buffer of $30 \%$, this would suggest a CIL in of around $£ 70$ per square metre.
- Our appraisals of developments of industrial and warehousing floorspace indicate that these uses are unlikely to generate positive residual land values. We therefore recommend a zero rate for industrial floorspace.
- D1 and D2 uses - such as swimming pools, hospitals, community centres and schools - often do not generate sufficient income streams to cover their costs. Consequently, they require some form of subsidy to operate. In the event that such uses are built on a commercial basis, the loss of income would be minimal. We therefore suggest that a nil rate of CIL be set for D1 and D2 uses.
- Sui generis uses can be varied and difficult to appraise. We understand that developments of sui generis uses are, in any case, uncommon in the District.

Table 7.4.1: Suggested CIL rates ( $70 \%$ of maximum rates)

| Intended use | Zone 1 | Zone 2 | Zone 3 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | $£ 245$ | $£ 150$ | $£ 85$ |  |
| Residential - strategic <br> sites (500+ units) | $£ 245$ | Nil | Nil |  |
| Residential - retirement <br> housing including extra <br> care housing | $£ 245$ | Nil | Nil |  |
| Residential (older <br> persons) self-contained <br> C3 housing including extra <br> care schemes where <br> communal floorspace <br> exceeds 30\% of gross <br> floorspace |  |  |  |  |
| Offices | Nil |  |  |  |
| In centre retail (all 'A' use <br> classes and sui generis <br> retail) |  |  |  |  |

[^12]| Supermarkets, <br> superstores and retail <br> warehouses | £70 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other uses | Nil |

[^13]
# Appendix 1 -Residential sub markets and values 

## Appendix 2 - Map of housing market areas

## Appendix 3 - Residential appraisal results

## Appendix 4 - Commercial appraisal results

SODC - sub market areas and values

| Settlement | New build average | 2nd hand average | Overall average | New build average | 2nd hand average | Overall average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | square feet |  |  | square metre |  |  |
| Sub area A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Great Milton |  | £356 | £356 |  | £3,832 | £3,832 |
| Goring | £337 | £361 | £357 | £3,627 | £3,886 | £3,843 |
| Netlebed | £415 | £345 | £368 | £4,467 | £3,714 | £3,961 |
| Moulsford |  | £372 | £372 |  | £4,004 | £4,004 |
| Sandford on Thames |  | £387 | £387 |  | £4,166 | £4,166 |
| Rotherfield Peppard | £394 | £394 | £394 | £4,241 | £4,241 | £4,241 |
| Henley | £411 | £397 | £397 | £4,424 | £4,273 | £4,273 |
| Lewkmor |  | £400 | £400 |  | £4,306 | £4,306 |
| Lower Shiplake/Shiplake |  | £437 | £437 |  | £4,704 | £4,704 |
| Sonning Common |  | £390 | £390 |  | £4,198 | £4,198 |
| Stoke Row | $£ 378$ | £503 | £462 | £4,069 | £5,414 | £4,973 |

Sub area B

| Waltington | $£ 362$ | $£ 322$ | $£ 324$ |  | $£ 3,897$ | $£ 3,466$ | $£ 3,488$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dorchester | $£ 393$ | $£ 305$ | $£ 324$ |  | $£ 4,230$ | $£ 3,283$ | $£ 3,488$ |
| Stanton St John |  | $£ 328$ | $£ 328$ |  |  | $£ 3,531$ | $£ 3,531$ |
| West Hagbourne |  | $£ 332$ | $£ 332$ |  |  | $£ 3,574$ | $£ 3,574$ |

Sub area C

| Benson | $£ 311$ | $£ 313$ | $£ 313$ |  | $£ 3,348$ | $£ 3,369$ | $£ 3,369$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Horspath |  | $£ 313$ | $£ 313$ |  |  | $£ 3,369$ | $£ 3,369$ |
| Thame | $£ 325$ | $£ 314$ | $£ 315$ |  | $£ 3,498$ | $£ 3,380$ | $£ 3,391$ |
| Woodcote | $£ 317$ | $£ 317$ | $£ 317$ |  | $£ 3,412$ | $£ 3,412$ | $£ 3,412$ |

Sub area D

| Ewelme |  | $£ 301$ | $£ 301$ |  |  | $£ 3,240$ | $£ 3,240$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Wallingford | $£ 305$ | $£ 302$ | $£ 302$ |  | $£ 3,283$ | $£ 3,251$ | $£ 3,251$ |
| Crowmarsh Gifford | $£ 298$ | $£ 310$ | $£ 303$ |  | $£ 3,208$ | $£ 3,337$ | $£ 3,261$ |
| Long Wittenham |  | $£ 308$ | $£ 308$ |  |  | $£ 3,315$ | $£ 3,315$ |

Sub area E

| Cholsey | $£ 310$ | $£ 270$ | $£ 280$ |  | $£ 3,337$ | $£ 2,906$ | $£ 3,014$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Barton |  | $£ 295$ | $£ 295$ |  |  | $£ 3,175$ | $£ 3,175$ |
| Woodeaton |  | $£ 292$ | $£ 292$ |  |  | $£ 3,143$ | $£ 3,143$ |

Sub area F

| Tetsworth |  | $£ 271$ | $£ 271$ |  |  | $£ 2,917$ | $£ 2,917$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Weatley | $£ 295$ | $£ 272$ | $£ 273$ |  | $£ 3,175$ | $£ 2,928$ | $£ 2,939$ |
| Garsington |  | $£ 274$ | $£ 274$ |  |  | $£ 2,949$ | $£ 2,949$ |
| Chinnor | $£ 368$ | $£ 255$ | $£ 278$ |  | $£ 3,961$ | $£ 2,745$ | $£ 2,992$ |

Sub area G

| Didcot | $£ 279$ | $£ 258$ | $£ 264$ | $£ 3,003$ | $£ 2,777$ | $£ 2,842$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stadhampton |  | $£ 265$ | $£ 265$ |  |  | $£ 2,852$ | $£ 2,852$ |
| East Hagbourne |  | $£ 265$ | $£ 265$ |  |  | $£ 2,852$ | $£ 2,852$ |
| Berinsfield |  | $£ 191$ | $£ 191$ |  |  | $£ 2,056$ | $£ 2,056$ |
| Chalgrove |  | $£ 229$ | $£ 229$ |  | $£ 2,465$ | $£ 2,465$ |  |
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## Results summary

| Site type 1 | Single dwelling |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 275 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | 10 | 200 | 300 | 350 |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | 125 | 250 | 275 |


| Site type 2 | Small in-fill |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 125 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 25 | 275 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | 125 | 250 | 300 |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | 50 | 175 | 225 |


| Site type 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |  |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area B | 325 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area C | 225 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area D | 125 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | 175 | 300 | 325 |  |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | 125 | 225 | 275 |  |


| Site type 4 | Medium - houses and flats |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | 100 | 200 | 275 | 300 |
| Sub area F | 25 | 150 | 200 | 225 |


| Site type 5 | Medium - flats |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 200 | 300 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |

Community Infrastructure Levy Viability
\#N/A = Scheme RLV is lower than EUV with nil rate of CIL.

South Oxfordshire District Council

## Results summary

| Site type 6 | Medium - houses |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 325 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area C | 200 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area D | 100 | 325 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | 150 | 275 | 300 |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | 100 | 200 | 250 |


| Site type 7 | Large housing |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |  |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area B | 250 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area C | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area D | 50 | 250 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | 100 | 175 | 225 |  |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | 25 | 125 | 150 |  |


| Site type 8 | Large housing |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |  |
| Sub area A | 150 | 350 | 350 | 350 |  |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | 10 | 225 | 300 |  |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | 100 | 200 |  |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | 10 | 100 |  |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |  |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |  |


| Site type 9 | Strategic site |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | \#N/A | 250 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |



Site type

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\quad$ E 2079 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 39,034 | 780,676 | 30,676 | 280,676 | 405,676 | 455,676 |
| 10 | 37,739 | 754,783 | 4,783 | 254,783 | 379,783 | 429,783 |
| 25 | 36,806 | 736,113 | -13,887 | 236,113 | 361,113 | 411,113 |
| 50 | 35,249 | 704,982 | -45,018 | 204,982 | 329,982 | 379,982 |
| 75 | 33,693 | 673,852 | -76,148 | 173,852 | 298,852 | 348,852 |
| 100 | 32,135 | 642,702 | -107,298 | 142,702 | 267,702 | 317,702 |
| 125 | 30,579 | 611,571 | -138,429 | 111,571 | 236,571 | 286,571 |
| 150 | 29,022 | 580,441 | -169,559 | 80,441 | 205,441 | 255,441 |
| 175 | 27,466 | 549,311 | -200,689 | 49,311 | 174,311 | 224,311 |
| 200 | 25,909 | 518,180 | -231,820 | 18,180 | 143,180 | 193,180 |
| 225 | 24,353 | 487,050 | -262,950 | -12,950 | 112,050 | 162,050 |
| 250 | 22,795 | 455,900 | $-294,100$ | -44,100 | 80,900 | 130,900 |
| 275 | 21,238 | 424,769 | -325,231 | -75,231 | 49,769 | 99,769 |
| 300 | 19,682 | 393,639 | -356,361 | -106,361 | 18,639 | 68,639 |
| 325 | 18,125 | 362,509 | -387,491 | -137,491 | -12,491 | 37,509 |
| 350 | 16,569 | 331,378 | -418,622 | -168,622 | -43,622 |  |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




Site type 2

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\quad$ E 2079 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 64,435 | 644,352 | -105,648 | 144,352 | 269,352 | 319,352 |
| 10 | 62,315 | 623,154 | -126.846 | 123,154 | 248,154 | 298,154 |
| 25 | 60,799 | 607,995 | -142,005 | 107,995 | 232,995 | 282,995 |
| 50 | 58,271 | 582,712 | -167,288 | 82,712 | 207,712 | 257,712 |
| 75 | 55,744 | 557,439 | -192,561 | 57,439 | 182,439 | 232,439 |
| 100 | 53,216 | 532,156 | $-217.844$ | 32,156 | 157,156 | 207,156 |
| 125 | 50,688 | 506,883 | -243,117 | 6,883 | 131,883 | 181,883 |
| 150 | 48.161 | 481,610 | $-268,390$ | -18,390 | 106.610 | 156,610 |
| 175 | 45,633 | 456,327 | -293,673 | $-43.673$ | 81,327 | 131,327 |
| 200 | 43,105 | 431,055 | -318,945 | -68,945 | 56,055 | 106,055 |
| 225 | 40,578 | 405,782 | -344,218 | -94,218 | 30,782 | 80,782 |
| 250 | 38,050 | 380,499 | -369,501 | -119,501 | 5,499 | 55,499 |
| 275 | 35,523 | 355,226 | -394,774 | $-144,774$ | -19,774 | 30,226 |
| 300 | 32,994 | 329,943 | -420,057 | -170,057 | -45,057 | 4,943 |
| 325 | 30,467 | 304,670 | -445,330 | -195,330 | -70,330 | -20,330 |
| 350 | 27,940 | 279,397 | -470,603 | -220,603 | -95,603 | -45,60 |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#N/A |  |  |  | £300 |


| Sub area F |  |  | Private values $\quad$ E 3003 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 57.767 | 577,671 | -172,329 | 77,671 | 202,671 | 252,671 |
| 10 | 55,763 | 557,631 | -192,369 | 57,631 | 182,631 | 232,631 |
| 25 | 54,246 | 542,461 | -207.539 | 42,461 | 167,461 | 217,461 |
| 50 | 51,719 | 517,188 | $-232.812$ | 17,188 | 142,188 | 192,188 |
| 75 | 49,191 | 491,905 | -258,095 | -8,095 | 116,905 | 166,905 |
| 100 | 46,663 | 466,632 | -283,368 | -33,368 | 91,632 | 141,632 |
| 125 | 44,136 | 441,360 | -308,640 | -58,640 | 66,360 | 116,360 |
| 150 | 41,608 | 416,077 | $-333,923$ | -83,923 | 41,077 | 91,077 |
| 175 | 39,080 | 390,804 | $-359,196$ | -109,196 | 15,804 | 65,804 |
| 200 | 36,552 | 365,521 | -384,479 | $-134,479$ | -9,479 | 40,521 |
| 225 | 34,025 | 340,248 | -409,752 | -159,752 | -34,752 | 15,248 |
| 250 | 31,498 | 314,975 | -435,025 | -185,025 | -60,025 | -10,025 |
| 275 | 28,969 | 289,692 | -460,308 | -210,308 | -85,308 | $-35,308$ |
| 300 | 26,442 | 264,420 | $-485,580$ | -235,580 | -110,580 | $-60,580$ |
| 325 | 23,915 | 239,147 | -510,853 | -260,853 | -135,853 | $-85.853$ |
|  | 21,386 | 213,864 | -536,136 | 286,1 | -161,136 |  |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#N/A |  |  |  |  |



Site type 3




| Site type 4 |  | Private values |  | £3079 psm |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sub area E |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 |  | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 492,204 | 984,408 | 234,408 | 484,408 | 609,408 | 659,408 |
| 10 | 473,191 | 946,382 | 196,382 | 446,382 | 571,382 | 621,382 |
| 25 | 457,369 | 914,737 | 164,737 | 414,737 | 539,737 | 589,737 |
| 50 | 430,999 | 861,997 | 111,997 | 361,997 | 486,997 | 536,997 |
| 75 | 404,629 | 809,258 | 59,258 | 309,258 | 434,258 | 484,258 |
| 100 | 378,258 | 756,516 | 6.516 | 256,516 | 381,516 | 431,516 |
| 125 | 351,888 | 703,776 | -46,224 | 203,776 | 328,776 | 378,776 |
| 150 | 325,518 | 651,036 | -98,964 | 151,036 | 276,036 | 326,036 |
| 175 | 299,147 | 598,294 | -151,706 | 98,294 | 223,294 | 273,294 |
| 200 | 272,777 | 545,555 | -204,445 | 4,555 | 170,555 | 220,555 |
| 225 | 246,406 | 492,813 | -257,187 | -7.187 | 117,813 | 167,813 |
| 250 | 220,037 | 440,073 | -309,927 | -59,927 | 65,073 | 115,073 |
| 275 | 193,667 | 387,333 | -362.667 | -112,667 | 12,333 | 62,333 |
| 300 | 167,296 | 334,592 | -415,408 | -165,408 | -40,408 | 9,592 |
| 325 | 140,926 | 281,852 | -468,148 | -218,148 | -93,148 | -43,148 |
| 350 | 114,556 | 229,112 | $-520.888$ | $-270.888$ | -145,888 | $-95,888$ |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | bLV3 |  | BLV4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\pm 200$ |  |


| Sub area F |  |  | Private values E 5003 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 423,665 | 847.330 | 97,330 | 347,330 | 472,330 | 522,330 |
| 10 | 405,830 | 811,660 | 61,660 | 311,660 | 436,660 | 486,660 |
| 25 | 390,008 | 780,016 | 30,016 | 280,016 | 405,016 | 455,016 |
| 50 | 363,637 | 727,274 | -22,726 | 227,274 | 352,274 | 402,274 |
| 75 | 337,267 | 674.534 | -75,466 | 174,534 | 299,534 | 349,534 |
| 100 | 310,897 | 621,794 | -128,206 | 121,794 | 246,794 | 296,794 |
| 125 | 284,526 | 569,052 | -180,948 | 69,052 | 194,052 | 244,052 |
| 150 | 258,156 | 516,313 | $-233,687$ | 16,313 | 141,313 | 191,313 |
| 175 | 231,786 | 463,573 | $-286,427$ | -36.427 | 88,573 | 138,573 |
| 200 | 205,416 | 410,831 | $-339,169$ | -89,169 | 35,831 | 85,831 |
| 225 | 179,046 | 358,091 | -391,909 | -141,909 | -16,909 | 33,091 |
| 250 | 152.676 | 305,352 | -444,648 | -194,648 | -69,648 | $-19,648$ |
| 275 | 126,305 | 252,610 | $-497,390$ | $-247,390$ | -122,390 | -72,390 |
| 300 | 99,935 | 199,870 | -550,130 | $-300,130$ | $-175,130$ | -125,130 |
| 325 | 73,565 | 147,130 | -602,870 | $-352,870$ | $-227.870$ | -177,870 |
| 350 | 47,194 | -388 | 5.6 |  |  |  |



Site type 5

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\quad$ ¢ 3079 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV |
| 0 | -335,558 | -1,073,786 | -1,823,786 | ${ }^{-1,573,786}$ | -1,448,786 | -1,398,786 |
| 10 | $-337,763$ | -1,080,843 | -1,830,843 | -1,580,843 | -1,455,843 | -1,405,843 |
| 25 | -349,727 | -1,119,126 | -1,869,126 | -1,619,126 | -1,494,126 | -1,444,126 |
| 50 | -369,666 | -1,182,932 | -1,932,932 | -1,682,932 | -1,557,932 | -1,507,932 |
| 75 | -389,607 | -1,246,741 | -1,996,741 | -1,746,741 | -1,621,741 | -1,571,741 |
| 100 | $-409,546$ | -1,310,547 | $-2.060,547$ | -1,810,547 | ${ }^{-1,685,547}$ | -1,635,547 |
| 125 | -429,485 | -1,374,353 | -2,124,353 | $-1,874,353$ | -1,749,353 | -1,699,353 |
| 150 | -449,425 | -1,438,159 | -2,188,159 | $-1.938,159$ | -1,813,159 | $-1,763,159$ |
| 175 | -469,365 | -1,501,969 | -2,251,969 | -2,001,969 | -1,876,969 | -1,826,969 |
| 200 | -489,305 | -1,565,775 | -2,315,775 | $-2,065,775$ | -1,940,775 | -1,890,775 |
| 225 | -509,244 | -1,629,581 | -2,379,581 | --, 129,581 | -2,004,581 | -1,954,581 |
| 250 | -529,184 | -1,693,390 | -2,443,390 | -2,193,390 | -2,068,390 | $-2,018,390$ |
| 275 | -549,124 | -1,757,196 | -2,507,196 | $-2,257,196$ | -2,132,196 | -2,082,196 |
| 300 | $-569,063$ | -1,821,002 | -2,571,002 | $-2,321,002$ | -2,196,002 | $-2,146,002$ |
| 325 | -589,003 | $-1,884,808$ | -2,634,808 | -2,384,808 | $-2,259,808$ | -2,209,808 |
| 350 | -608,943 | -1,948,617 | -2,698,617 | $-2.448,617$ | -2,323,617 | -2,273,61 |




Site type 6

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values £3079 psm |  | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 |  |  |
| 0 | 1,332,474 | 719,536 | -30.464 | 219,536 | 344,536 | 394,536 |
| 10 | 1,287,581 | 695,294 | -54,706 | 195,294 | 320,294 | 370,294 |
| 25 | 1,254,617 | 677,493 | -72,507 | 177,493 | 302,493 | 352,493 |
| 50 | 1,199,678 | 647,826 | -102,174 | 147,826 | 272,826 | 322,826 |
| 75 | 1,144,007 | 617,764 | -132,236 | 117,764 | 242,764 | 292,764 |
| 100 | 1,088,169 | 587,611 | -162,389 | 87,611 | 212.611 | 262,611 |
| 125 | 1,032,331 | 557,459 | -192,541 | 57,459 | 182,459 | 232,459 |
| 150 | 976,493 | 527,306 | -222,694 | 27,306 | 152,306 | 202,306 |
| 175 | 920,655 | 497,154 | $-252,846$ | -2,846 | 122,154 | 172,154 |
| 200 | 864,818 | 467,002 | -282,998 | -32,998 | 92,002 | 142,002 |
| 225 | 808,980 | 436,849 | -313,151 | -63,151 | 61,849 | 111,849 |
| 250 | 753,142 | 406,697 | -343,303 | $-93,303$ | 31,697 | 81,697 |
| 275 | 697,304 | 376,544 | $-373,456$ | $-123,456$ | 1,544 | 51,544 |
| 300 | 641,466 | 346,392 | -403,608 | -153,608 | -28,608 | 21,392 |
| 325 | 585,479 | 316,159 | -433,841 | -183,841 | -58,841 | -8,841 |
| 350 | 528,729 | 285,514 | $-464,486$ | -214,486 | $-89.486$ | -39,486 |


| Sub area F |  |  | Private values £3003 psm |  | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 |  |  |
| $\square 0$ | 1,190,038 | 642,620 | -107,380 | 142,620 | 267,620 | 317,620 |
| 10 | 1,147,389 | 619,590 | -130,410 | 119,590 | 244,590 | 294,590 |
| 25 | 1,113,887 | 601,499 | -148,501 | 101,499 | 226,499 | 276,499 |
| 50 | 1,058,049 | 571,347 | -178,653 | 71,347 | 196,347 | 246,347 |
| 75 | 1,002,211 | 541,194 | -208,806 | 41,194 | 166,194 | 216,194 |
| 100 | 946,374 | 511,042 | -238,958 | 11,042 | 136,042 | 186,042 |
| 125 | 890,536 | 480,889 | -269,111 | -19,111 | 105,889 | 155,889 |
| 150 | 834,698 | 450,737 | --299,263 | -49,263 | 75,737 | 125,737 |
| 175 | 778.860 | 420,584 | -329,416 | -79,416 | 45,584 | 95,584 |
| 200 | 723,022 | 390,432 | $-359,568$ | -109,568 | 15,432 | 65,432 |
| 225 | 667,185 | 360,280 | -389,720 | -139,720 | -14,720 | 35,280 |
| 250 | 611.347 | 330,127 | $-419,873$ | -169,873 | -44,873 | 5,127 |
| 275 | 555,107 | 299,758 | -450,242 | -200,242 | -75,242 | -25,242 |
| 300 | 498,356 | 269,112 | $-480,888$ | $-230,888$ | -105,888 | $-55,888$ |
| 325 | 441,605 | 238,467 | -511,533 | -261,533 | -136,533 | -86,533 |





Site type 7

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\quad$ E 2079 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| $\square 0$ | 2,515,102 | 643,866 | -106,134 | 143,866 | 268,866 | 318,866 |
| 10 | 2,421,877 | 620,000 | -130,000 | 120,000 | 245,000 | 295,000 |
| 25 | 2,346,424 | 600,684 | -149,316 | 100,684 | 225,684 | 275,684 |
| 50 | 2,219,461 | 568,182 | -181,818 | 68.182 | 193,182 | 243,182 |
| 75 | 2,092,499 | 535,680 | -214,320 | 35,680 | 160,680 | 210,680 |
| 100 | 1,965,536 | 503,177 | -246,823 | 3,177 | 128,177 | 178,177 |
| 125 | 1,838,573 | 470,675 | -279,325 | -29,325 | 95,675 | 145,675 |
| 150 | 1,711,611 | 438,172 | -311.828 | -61.828 | 63,172 | 113,172 |
| 175 | 1,584,641 | 405,668 | $-344,332$ | -94,332 | 30,668 | 80,668 |
| 200 | 1,455,602 | 372,634 | -377,366 | $-127,366$ | $-2,366$ | 47,634 |
| 225 | 1,326,563 | 339,600 | -410,400 | -160,400 | -35,400 | 14,600 |
| 250 | 1,197,524 | 306,566 | -443,434 | -193,434 | $-68,434$ | -18,434 |
| 275 | 1,068,485 | 273,532 | -476,468 | -226,468 | -101,468 | $-51,468$ |
| 300 | 939,446 | 240,498 | -509,502 | -259,502 | -134,502 | -84,502 |
| 325 | 810,407 | 207,464 | $-542,536$ | -292,536 | -167.536 | -117,536 |
| 350 | 679,549 | 173,965 | -576,035 | 326,035 | -201,035 | 151.03 |



| Sub area F |  |  | Private values E3003 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| $\bigcirc$ | 2,195,757 | 562,114 | -187,886 | 62,114 | 187,114 | 237,114 |
| 10 | 2,107,207 | 539,445 | -210,555 | 39,445 | 164,445 | 214,445 |
| 25 | 2,031,030 | 519,944 | -230,056 | 19,944 | 144,944 | 194,944 |
| 50 | 1,904,067 | 487,441 | -262,559 | -12,559 | 112,441 | 162,441 |
| 75 | 1,777,105 | 454,939 | -295,061 | -45,061 | 79,939 | 129,939 |
| 100 | 1,650,142 | 422,436 | $-327,564$ | -77,564 | 47,436 | 97,436 |
| 125 | 1,522,806 | 389,838 | -360,162 | -110,162 | 14,838 | 64,838 |
| 150 | 1,393,767 | 356,804 | -393,196 | -143,196 | -18,196 | 31,804 |
| 175 | 1,264,728 | 323,770 | $-426,230$ | -176,230 | -51,230 | -1,230 |
| 200 | 1,135,689 | 290,736 | $-459,264$ | -209,264 | -84,264 | $-34,264$ |
| 225 | 1,006,650 | 257,702 | -492,298 | -242,298 | -117,298 | -67,298 |
| 250 | 877,611 | 224,668 | -525,332 | -275,332 | -150,332 | -100,332 |
| 275 | 748,172 | 191,532 | -558,468 | $-308,468$ | -183,468 | $-133,468$ |
| 300 | 617,023 | 157,958 | -592,042 | -342,042 | -217,042 | -167,042 |
| 325 | 485,873 | 124,384 | -625,616 | $-375,616$ | $-250,616$ | -200,616 |
| 350 | 354,724 | 90,809 | -659,191 | -409,191 | -284,191 |  |



Site type 8

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\quad$ ¢ 3079 psm |  | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 |  |  |
| 0 | 4,192,130 | 301,833 | -448,167 | -198,167 | -73,167 | -23,167 |
| 10 | 4,035,556 | 290,560 | -459,440 | -209,440 | -84,440 | -34,440 |
| 25 | 3,908,414 | 281,406 | -468.594 | $-218,594$ | -93,594 | $-43,594$ |
| 50 | 3,693,778 | 265,952 | -484,048 | $-234,048$ | -109,048 | -59,048 |
| 75 | 3,476,308 | 250,294 | -499,706 | -249,706 | -124,706 | -74,706 |
| 100 | 3,256,339 | 234,456 | -515,544 | $-265,544$ | -140,544 | $-90,544$ |
| 125 | 3,034,623 | 218,493 | -531,507 | $-281,507$ | -156,507 | -106,507 |
| 150 | 2,812,907 | 202,529 | -547,471 | $-297,471$ | -172,471 | -122,471 |
| 175 | 2,591,192 | 186,566 | -563,434 | $-313,434$ | -188,434 | -138,434 |
| 200 | 2,366,898 | 170,417 | -579,583 | $-329,583$ | $-204,583$ | -154,583 |
| 225 | 2,141,556 | 154,192 | -595,808 | $-345,808$ | $-220,808$ | $-170,808$ |
| 250 | 1,916,215 | 137,967 | -612,033 | -362,033 | -237,033 | -187,033 |
| 275 | 1,690,873 | 121,743 | $-628,257$ | -378,257 | -253,257 | -203,257 |
| 300 | 1,461,945 | 105,260 | $-644,740$ | $-394,740$ | -269,740 | $-219,740$ |
| 325 | 1,232,919 | 88,770 | -661,230 | -411,230 | -286,230 | -236.230 |
| 350 | 1,003,891 | 72,280 | -677,720 | $-427,720$ | $-302,720$ | $-252,720$ |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Sub area F |  |  | Private values E3003 psm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 3,661,821 | 263,651 | -486,349 | -236,349 | -111,349 | -61,349 |
| 10 | 3,512,454 | 252,897 | -497,103 | -247,103 | -122,103 | -72,103 |
| 25 | 3,381,566 | 243,473 | $-506,527$ | $-256.527$ | -131,527 | $-81,527$ |
| 50 | 3,161,405 | 227,621 | $-522,379$ | $-272.379$ | -147,379 | -97,379 |
| 75 | 2,939,690 | 211,658 | $-538,342$ | $-288,342$ | -163,342 | -113,342 |
| 100 | 2,717,974 | 195,694 | -554,306 | $-304,306$ | -179,306 | -129,306 |
| 125 | 2,496,259 | 179,731 | -570,269 | -320,269 | -195,269 | -145,269 |
| 150 | 2,271,430 | 163,543 | -586,457 | -336,457 | -211,457 | -161,457 |
| 175 | 2,046,088 | 147,318 | -602,682 | $-352,682$ | -227,682 | -177,682 |
| 200 | 1,820,747 | 131,094 | -618,906 | $-368,906$ | $-243,906$ | -193,906 |
| 225 | 1,594,622 | 114,813 | -635,187 | -385,187 | -260,187 | -210,187 |
| 250 | 1,365,596 | 98,323 | -651,677 | -401.677 | -276,677 | -226,677 |
| 275 | 1,136,568 | 81,833 | -668,167 | -418,167 | -293,167 | $-243,167$ |
| 300 | 907,541 | 65,343 | -684,657 | $-434,657$ | -309,657 | -259,657 |
| 325 | 676,173 | 48,684 | -701,316 | $-451,316$ | $-326,316$ | -276,316 |
|  | 443,4 | 31,92 | -718 | 468,0 | -343,075 | -293,075 |



Site type 9

| Sub area E |  |  | Private values $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { P3079 psm }\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| 0 | 1,189,662 | 49,966 | -700,034 | -450,034 | -325,034 | -275,034 |
| 10 | 986,648 | 41,439 | -708,561 | -458.561 | $-333,561$ | -283,561 |
| 25 | 712,819 | 29,938 | -720,062 | -470,062 | $-345,062$ | -295,062 |
| 50 | 256,436 | 10,770 | -739,230 | -489,230 | -364,230 | -314,230 |
| 75 | -203,217 | -8.535 | -758,535 | -508,535 | ${ }^{-383,535}$ | $-333,535$ |
| 100 | -667,063 | -28,017 | -778.017 | -528.017 | $-403,017$ | ${ }^{-353,017}$ |
| 125 | -1,130,910 | -47,498 | -797,498 | -547,498 | -422,498 | -372,498 |
| 150 | -1,594,756 | -66,980 | -816,980 | -566,980 | $-441,980$ | -391,980 |
| 175 | -2,058,603 | -86,461 | -836,461 | -586,461 | -461,461 | -411,461 |
| 200 | -2,522,450 | -105,943 | -855,943 | -605,943 | -480,943 | -430,943 |
| 225 | -2,986,296 | -125,424 | -875.424 | -625,424 | $-500,424$ | $-450,424$ |
| 250 | $-3,450,143$ | -144,906 | -894,906 | -644,906 | -519,906 | -469,906 |
| 275 | -3,913,990 | $-164,388$ | -914,388 | -664,388 | $-539,388$ | -489,388 |
| 300 | -4,377,837 | -183,869 | -933,869 | -683,869 | $-558,869$ | -508,869 |
| 325 | $-4,841,683$ | -203,351 | -953,351 | -703,351 | -578,351 | -528,351 |
| 350 | -5,305,530 | -222,832 | -972,832 | -722,832 | -597,832 | -547,832 |



| Sub area F |  |  | Private values $\quad £ 3003 \mathrm{psm}$ |  | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIL amount per sq m | RLV | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 |  |  |
| 0 | 92,713 | 3,894 | -746,106 | -496,106 | $-371,106$ | -321,106 |
| 10 | -92,929 | -3,903 | -753,903 | -503,903 | -378,903 | -328,903 |
| 25 | $-371,238$ | -15,592 | -765,592 | -515,592 | -390,592 | -340,592 |
| 50 | -835,084 | -35,074 | -785,074 | $-535.074$ | $-410.074$ | -360.074 |
| 75 | -1,298,930 | $-54,555$ | -804,555 | $-554.555$ | $-429,555$ | $-379,555$ |
| 100 | -1,762,777 | -74,037 | $-824,037$ | -574,037 | -449,037 | -399,037 |
| 125 | -2,226,623 | -93,518 | -843,518 | -593,518 | $-468,518$ | -418,518 |
| 150 | -2,690,471 | -113,000 | -863,000 | -613,000 | -488,000 | ${ }^{-438,000}$ |
| 175 | -3,154,317 | $-132.481$ | -882,481 | -632,481 | -507,481 | -457,481 |
| 200 | $-3,618,164$ | -151,963 | -901,963 | -651,963 | -526,963 | -476,963 |
| 225 | -4,082,010 | -171,444 | $-921,444$ | $-671,444$ | -546,444 | -496,444 |
| 250 | $-4.545,857$ | -190,926 | -940,926 | -690,926 | $-565.926$ | $-515,926$ |
| 275 | -5,009,704 | -210,408 | -960,408 | -710,408 | $-585.408$ | $-535.408$ |
| 300 | $-5,473,550$ | -229,889 | -979,889 | -729,889 | $-604.889$ | -554.889 |
| 325 | $-5,937,397$ | -249,371 | -999,371 | -749,371 | -624,371 | -574,371 |
|  | -6,401,243 | 68,85 | $18,85$ | -68,85 | -643,85 |  |


| BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |





| Community Infrastructure Levy <br> South Oxfordshire District Council |  |  | Benchmark Land Values (per gross ha) |  |  |  |  | RETIREMENT HOUSING |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { BLV1 } \\ \text { Higher brownfield } \\ £ 750,000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BLV2 Lower brownfield $£ 500,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BLV3 } \\ \substack{\text { Higher greenfield } \\ £ 375,000} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BLV4 } \\ \text { lower greenfield } \\ £ 325,000 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site type 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flats |  |  | Affordable \% 10\% |  |  |  | 0.60 ha |  |  |  |  |  |
| Noensity: $\quad 100$ dph |  |  | \% rented $\quad 75 \%$ |  |  | $\frac{\text { Site area }}{\text { Netto gross }}$ | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | \% intermed $\quad 25 \%$ Growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CSH level: $\quad 4$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Sales | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub area A |  |  |  |  |  | Build | 0\% |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Private values | £4865 psm |  |  |  | Maximum CIL rates (per square metre) |  |  |  |  |
| CIL amount per sq m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | RLV RL | RLV per ha | RLV less BLV 1 | RLV less BLV 2 | RLV less BLV 3 | RLV less BLV 4 |  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 |  |  |
| 0 | 1,587,455 | 2,645,759 | 1,895,759 | 2,145,759 | 2,270,759 | 2,320,759 |  | £350 |  | £350 | £350 | £350 |
| 10 | 1,534,566 | 2,557,610 | 1,807,610 | 2,057,610 | 2,182,610 | 2,232,610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 1,496,187 | 2,493,644 | 1,743,644 | 1,993,644 | 2,118,644 | 2,168,644 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 1,432,221 | 2,387,035 | 1,637,035 | 1,887,035 | 2,012,035 | 2,062,035 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | 1,368,255 | 2,280,425 | 1,530,425 | 1,780,425 | 1,905,425 | 1,955,425 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 1,304,289 | 2,173,815 | 1,423,815 | 1,673,815 | 1,798,815 | 1,848,815 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 125 | 1,240,126 | 2,066,877 | 1,316,877 | 1,566,877 | 1,691,877 | 1,741,877 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 150 | 1,175,115 | 1,958,524 | 1,208,524 | 1,458,524 | 1,583,524 | 1,633,524 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 175 | 1,110,103 | 1,850,171 | 1,100,171 | 1,350,171 | 1,475,171 | 1,525,171 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200 | 1,045,091 | 1,741,818 | 991,818 | 1,241,818 | 1,366,818 | 1,416,818 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 225 | 980,078 | 1,633,464 | 883,464 | 1,133,464 | 1,258,464 | 1,308,464 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 250 | 915,066 | 1,525,111 | 775,111 | 1,025,111 | 1,150,111 | 1,200,111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 275 | 850,055 | 1,416,758 | 666,758 | 916,758 | 1,041,758 | 1,091,758 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 300 | 785,043 | 1,308,405 | 558,405 | 808,405 | 933,405 | 983,405 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 325 | 720,031 | 1,200,052 | 450,052 | 700,052 | 825,052 | 875,052 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 350 | 655,019 | 1,091,699 | 341,699 | 591,699 | 716,699 | 766,699 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
Commercial Development

|  | £s per sqft | Yield | Rent free |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Appraisal 1 | $£ 19.50$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 2 | $£ 20.00$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 3 | $£ 20.50$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 4 | $£ 21.00$ | $6.25 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 5 (base) | $£ 21.00$ | $6.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ years |
| Appraisal 6 | $£ 21.00$ | $5.75 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 7 | $£ 21.50$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 8 | $£ 22.00$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 9 | $£ 22.50$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |
| Appraisal 10 | $£ 23.00$ | $6.00 \%$ | 0.50 years |


Results - Maximum CIL rates per square metre

| Use class: | Hotel |
| :--- | :--- |


Current use value
Existing space as percentage of new
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalised (including all costs)
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium

|  | £s per sqft | Yield | Rent free |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Appraisal 1 | $£ 7.50$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 2 | $£ 8.00$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 3 | $£ 8.50$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 4 | $£ 9.00$ | $6.75 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 5 (base) | $£ 9.00$ | $\mathbf{6 . 5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ years |
| Appraisal 6 | $£ 9.00$ | $6.25 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 7 | $£ 9.50$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 8 | $£ 10.00$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 9 | $£ 10.50$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |
| Appraisal 10 | $£ 11.00$ | $6.50 \%$ | 1.00 years |


Ctrl +y to goal seek max CIL





| Common assumptions |  | CUV 1 |  | CUV 2 |  | CUV 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% | 15,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | £4 psf |  | £5 psi |  | £6 psf |  |
|  |  | £60,000 |  | £75,000 |  | £90,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.0 | 0.7938 | 3.0 | 0.7938 | 3.0 | 0.7938 |
|  |  | 8.00\% |  | 8.00\% |  | 8.00\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| £5 psf |  | £75,000 |  | £75,000 |  | £75,000 |  |
| 7\% |  | £5,250 |  | £5,250 |  | £5,250 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | £515,124 |  | £663,968 |  | £812,811 |
| 5.80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | £515,124 |  | £663,968 |  | £812,811 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 20\% | £618,149 | 20.00\% | £796,761 | 20.00\% | £975,374 |

urrent use value
Current use value
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalised (including all costs)
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium

Results - Maximum CIL rates per square metre


CURRENT USE VALUE
Commercial Development
Current use value
Existing space as percentage of new
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalised (including all costs)
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium



| Use class: | Retail warehouse |
| :--- | :---: |
| Location: | SODC |

Existing floorspace as \% of new
Existing floorspace as \% of new

$$
35 \%
$$

Ctrl +y to goal seek max CIL

Premium


Rent $f$ 2.50 years 2.50 years | Current use value 1 | $£ 10.00$ | $7.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Current use value 2 | $£ 11.00$ | $7.00 \%$ |
| Current use value 3 | $£ 12.00$ | $7.00 \%$ |

Results - Maximum CIL rates per square metre


| DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL | Use class: | Retail warehous |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Development | Location: | SoDC |


| DEVELOPMENT VALUE | Common assumptions |  | Appraisal 1 |  | Appraisal 2 |  | Appraisal 3 |  |  | Appraisal 4 |  | Appraisal 5 |  |  | Appraisal 6 |  | Appraisal 7 |  | Appraisal 8 |  | Appraisal 9 |  |  | Appraisal 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rental Income | Floor area |  | £ psf £ per annum £ |  | psf |  |  | £ per annum £ psf |  |  | £ per annum £ psf |  | $\underbrace{\text { 14, }}$ per annum $£$ psf |  |  | £ per annum £ p | ${ }_{\text {¢14.50 }}$ | $£$ per annum <br> $£ 725,000$ <br> $£$ | £ psf | $\sum_{\text {¢ per annum }}^{\text {¢750,000 }} \mathrm{f}$ psf |  | £ per annum $£$ |  | £ psf | $\begin{array}{r} \text { £ per annum } \\ £ 800,000 \end{array}$ |
| Rent - area 1 | 50,000 |  |  |  | £13 |  |  | £15.00 | £15.50 | £775,000 |  |  | £16.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent-area 2 |  |  | £12.50 | £0 | £13 |  |  |  |  |  | £13.50 | £0 |  |  |  | £14.00 | £0 |  | $£ 14.00$ | £0 | £14.00 | £0 | £14.50 | £0 | £15.00 | £0 |  | £15.50 | £0 | £16.00 |  |
| Rent- area 3 |  |  | $£ 12.50$ | £0 | £13 | £0 |  | £13.50 | £0 | £14.00 | £0 |  | $£ 14.00$ | £0 | £14.00 | £0 | £14.50 | £0 | £15.00 | £0 |  | £15.50 | £0 | £16.00 | £0 |
| Total floor area/ rent |  | 50,000 |  | £625,000 |  | £650,000 |  |  | £675,000 |  | £700,000 |  |  | £700,000 |  | £700,000 |  | £725,000 |  | £750,000 |  |  | £775,000 |  | £800,000 |
| Rent free/voids (years) |  |  | 1.0 | 0.9479 | 1.0 | 0.9479 |  | 1.0 | 0.9479 | 1.0 | 0.9456 |  | 1.0 | 0.9479 | 1.0 | 0.9501 | 1.0 | 0.9479 | 1.0 | 0.9479 |  | 1.0 | 0.9479 | 1.0 | 0.9479 |
| Yield | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.75\% |  |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.25\% |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  |  | 5.50\% |  | 5.50\% |  |
| Capitalised rent |  |  |  | £10,771,219 |  | £11,202,068 |  |  | £11,632,917 |  | £11,511,975 |  |  | £12,063,766 |  | £12,668,250 |  | £12,494,614 |  | £12,925,463 |  |  | £13,356,312 |  | £13,787,161 |
| gross development value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchaser's costs | 5.80\% |  |  | £624,731 |  | £649,720 |  |  | £674,709 |  | £667,695 |  |  | £699,698 |  | £734,759 |  | £724,688 |  | £749,677 |  |  | £774,666 |  | £799,655 |
|  |  |  |  | E10,146,489 |  | £10,552,348 |  |  | £10,958,208 |  | £10,844,280 |  |  | £11,364,067 |  | £11,933,492 |  | £11,769,927 |  | £12,175,786 |  |  | £12,581,646 |  | £12,987,505 |
| DEVELOPMENT COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land costs |  |  |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |  |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |  |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |  |  | £2,365,686 |  | £2,365,686 |
| Stamp duty and acquisition costs |  |  |  | - £137,210 |  | -£137,210 |  |  | -£137,210 |  | - £137,210 |  |  | -£137,210 |  | - £137,210 |  | £137,210 |  | - ¢137,210 |  |  | -£137,210 |  | - £137,210 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing floor area | 35\% | 17,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demolition costs | £5 psf |  |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |  |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |  |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |  |  | £87,500 |  | £87,500 |
| Building costs | £65 pst |  |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |  |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |  |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |  |  | £4,041,249 |  | £4,041,249 |
| Area | 80\% grs to net | 62,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External works | 10.00\% |  |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |  |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |  |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |  |  | £404,125 |  | £404,125 |
| Professional fees | 10.00\% |  |  | £45,287 |  | £453,287 |  |  | £453,287 |  | £45,287 |  |  | £453,287 |  | £453,287 |  | £45,287 |  | £453,287 |  |  | £453,287 |  | £45,287 |
| Contingency | 5.00\% |  |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |  |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |  |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |  |  | £249,308 |  | £249,308 |
| Mayoral CIL | £0.00 | 62,500 |  | £0 |  | £0 |  |  | £0 |  | £0 |  |  | £0 |  | £0 |  | £0 |  | £0 |  |  | £0 |  |  |
| Residual S106 | £10 psf |  |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |  |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |  |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |  |  | £500,000 |  | £500,000 |
| CIL |  | 62,500 | £2 | -£124,863 | £3 | £186,032 |  | £8 | £497,759 | £7 | £408,592 |  | £11 | £697,861 | ¢ £20 | £1,250,514 | £18 | £1,121,129 | £23 | £1,433,514 |  | £28 | £1,749,727 | £33 | £2,053,308 |
| Disposal Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Letting Agent's fee (\% of rent) | 10.00\% |  |  | £62,500 |  | £65,000 |  |  | £67,500 |  | £70,000 |  |  | £70,000 |  | £70,000 |  | £72,500 |  | £75,000 |  |  | £77,500 |  | £80,000 |
| Agent's fees (on capital value) | 1.00\% |  |  | £107,712 |  | £112,021 |  |  | £116,329 |  | £115,120 |  |  | £120,638 |  | £126,683 |  | £124,946 |  | £129,255 |  |  | £133,563 |  | £137,872 |
| Legal fees (\% of capital value) | 0.75\% |  |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |  |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |  |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |  |  | £80,784 |  | £80,784 |
| Finance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loan arrangement fee | 1.00\% |  |  | £56,106 |  | £59,215 |  |  | £62,332 |  | £61,441 |  |  | £64,333 |  | £69,860 |  | £68,566 |  | £71,690 |  |  | £74,852 |  | £77,888 |
| Interest rate | 7.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest | 18 months |  |  | £307,734 |  | £324,414 |  |  | £341,137 |  | £336,523 |  |  | £468,994 |  | £381,331 |  | £374,578 |  | £391,336 |  |  | £408,295 |  | £424,590 |
| Profit on cost |  |  |  | £1,692,570 |  | £1,760,937 |  |  | £1,828,421 |  | £1,807,875 |  |  | £1,897,511 |  | £1,990,374 |  | £1,963,478 |  | £2,030,263 |  |  | £2,092,979 |  | £2,169,119 |
| Profit on cost (\%) |  |  |  | 20.02\% |  | 20.03\% |  |  | 20.03\% |  | 20.01\% |  |  | 20.04\% |  | 20.02\% |  | 20.02\% |  | 20.01\% |  |  | 19.95\% |  | 20.05\% |
| Net additional floorspace (sq ft) |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |  |  | 32,500 |  | 32,500 |
| Net additional floorspace (sq m) |  | 3.019 |  | 3,019 |  | 3.019 |  |  | 3,019 |  | 3.019 |  |  | 3,019 |  | 3.019 |  | 3,019 |  | 3.019 |  |  | 3,019 |  | 3.019 |


Current use value
Existing space as percentage of new
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalised (including all costs)
Total revenue, capitalis
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium

Results - Maximum CIL rates per square metre
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| Common assumptions |  | CUV 1 |  | CUV 2 |  | CUV 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35\% | 26,250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | £12 psf |  | £13 psf |  | £14 psf |  |
|  |  | £315,000 |  | £341,250 |  | £367,500 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.5 | 0.8444 | 2.5 | 0.8444 | 2.5 | 0.8444 |
|  |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  | 7.00\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| £30 psf |  | £787,500 |  | £787,500 |  | £787,500 |  |
| 7\% |  | £55,125 |  | £55,125 |  | £55,125 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | £2,957,108 |  | £3,273,752 |  | £3,590,397 |
| 5.80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | £2,957,108 |  | £3,273,752 |  | £3,590,397 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 20\% | £3,548,529 | 20.00\% | £3,928,503 | 20.00\% | £4,308,476 |

Current use value
Existing space as percentage of new
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalis
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium

Results - Maximum CIL rates per square metre



Current use value
Existing space as percentage of new
Rent per sq ft
Rental income per annum
Rent free/voids (years)
Total revenue, capitalised (including all costs)
Total revenue, capitalis
Refurbishment costs
Capitalised rent, net of refurb and fees Purchaser's costs
Current use value
CUV including Landowner premium

Community Infrastructure Levy Viability South Oxfordshire District Council

## Results summary

\#N/A = Scheme RLV is lower than EUV with nil rate of CIL.

| Site type | Older persons housing 85\% GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 100 | 150 | 175 | 175 |
| Sub area C | 10 | 50 | 75 | 100 |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | 10 | 25 |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing 82.5\% GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | 25 | 75 | 100 | 125 |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | 0 | 25 | 25 |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | 25 | 50 | 50 |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing 77.5\% GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing $75 \%$ GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |

Community Infrastructure Levy Viability South Oxfordshire District Council

## Results summary

\#N/A = Scheme RLV is lower than EUV with nil rate of CIL.

| Site type | Older persons housing $\mathbf{7 2 . 5 \%}$ GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing 70\% GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing $67.5 \%$ GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV4 |
| Sub area A | 325 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


| Site type | Older persons housing $65 \%$ GtN |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | BLV1 | BLV2 | BLV3 | BLV44 |
| Sub area A | 250 | 325 | 350 | 350 |
| Sub area B | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area C | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area D | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area E | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |
| Sub area F | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A | \#N/A |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Retail warehouses and supermarkets can be defined as retail stores that exceed 280 square metres and are classified as larger stores under the Sunday Trading Act 1994. See 'Report on the Examination into the Portsmouth Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule' by David Hogger and Examiner appointed by the Council, 10 January 2012.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2} 500$ units is the minimum number of units that would require on-site educational facilities to be provided
    ${ }^{3}$ Retail warehouses: are large stores specialising in the sale of household goods (such as carpets, furniture and electrical goods), DIY items and other ranges of goods, catering for mainly car-borne customers.
    Superstores and supermarkets: are shopping destinations in their own right, selling mainly food or food and non-food goods, which normally have a dedicated car park.

[^2]:    ${ }^{[1]}$ This infrastructure should not be identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list.

[^3]:    ${ }^{[2]}$ In addition to these statutory consultation exercises, the Council has consulted informally with key stakeholders to open a dialogue regarding CIL and development viability.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ Savills Research: Residential Property Focus, November 2011

[^5]:    5 South Oxfordshire District Council - Retail Vacancy Survey 2012: Henley, Thame and Wallingford

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ For a residential scheme, total scheme value would be comprised of the values achieved for the private housing and the payment for the affordable housing received from a Registered Provider. For a commercial scheme, the value would be arrived at by calculating the investment value of the rental income receivable from tenants.
    ${ }^{7}$ We refer throughout this report to 'existing use value', by which we mean the value of the site assuming it remains in its existing use (i.e. redevelopment options disregarded. This reference should not be confused with the RICS 'Professional Standards' (Red Book) definition of existing use value, which is a valuation for accounting purposes.

[^7]:    ${ }^{8}$ This group was led by the Homes and Communities Agency and comprises representatives from the National Home Builders Federation, the Royal Town Planning Institute, local authorities and valuers (including BNP Paribas Real Estate).

[^8]:    9 Para 32: "the price paid for development land may be reduced.... a reduction in development land value is an inherent part of the CIL concept.... in some instances it may be possible for contracts and options to be re-negotiated in the light of the changed circumstances arising from the imposition of CIL charges."

[^9]:    10 CLG Research report 'Cumulative impacts of regulations on house builders and landowners' Research Paper March 2011 indicates a range from $£ 247,000$ to $£ 371,000$ per gross hectare.

[^10]:    ${ }^{11}$ However, it is noted that even a reduction in affordable housing does not always remedy viability issues. In these situations, it is not the presence or absence of planning obligations that is the primary viability driver - it is simply that the value generated by residential development is lower than some existing use values. In these situations, sites would remain in their existing use.

[^11]:    12 The Retirement Housing Group briefing note 'CIL and sheltered housing/extra care developments' May 2013 indicates that older persons flats will achieve premiums of $15 \%$ above market values for general needs flats

[^12]:    ${ }^{13}$ Retail warehouses and supermarkets can be defined as retail stores that exceed 280 square metres and are classified as larger stores under the Sunday Trading Act 1994. See 'Report on the Examination into the Portsmouth Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule' by David Hogger and Examiner appointed by the Council, 10 January 2012.
    14500 units is the minimum number of units that would require on-site educational facilities to be provided

[^13]:    ${ }^{15}$ Retail warehouses: are large stores specialising in the sale of household goods (such as carpets, furniture and electrical goods), DIY items and other ranges of goods, catering for mainly car-borne customers.
    Superstores and supermarkets: are shopping destinations in their own right, selling mainly food or food and non-food goods, which normally have a dedicated car park.

