

Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule

Statement of Representations

June 2024



Statement of Representations for the Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule consultation

20 respondents commented on the Draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule. The table below summarises the main comments that were made and full representations can be found as part of the CIL examination library.

The Draft Charging Schedule has been modified from the original version that was consulted on from November 2023 to January 2024, following further viability testing as suggested by the responses, with the full compiled list of modifications to be listed in the statement of modifications.

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments	Council's Response	Modification
1	Viability Assumptions – E Class Developments	Carter Jonas (On Behalf of OBO Advanced Research Clusters, Arc Oxford)	<p>Concerns are raised about the five-fold increase in CIL rates for Office/R&D developments, with particular concern that this may make developments unviable outside of the City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent scrutinised testing inputs in the BNP viability study including finance rate assumptions and build costs. The timing of the review in general was questioned, revising CIL rates at a time of increasing costs and labour shortages.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised that Office/R&D developments under all tested scenarios outside the City Centre would generate negative residual land values and are therefore unlikely to come forward, particularly for those providing affordable workspace.</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the RICS Practice Statement 'Assessing viability in Planning under the National Planning Policy Framework for England (2021)' and the Local Housing Delivery Group guidance 'Viability Testing Local Plans: Advice for planning practitioners'.</p> <p>Additional site-specific viability testing has been carried out in a viability addendum note.</p> <p>The viability addendum takes into consideration recent data for Office and R&D developments within and outside of the City Centre and demonstrates that surpluses generated are substantially above the proposed CIL rate, which justifies the increase, even when tested at upper quartile build costs. These higher surpluses achieved could also accommodate for additional contributions such as the affordable workspaces policy.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

2	Objection – B2/B8 Rates	David Lock Associates (On behalf of BMW UK)	<p>Concerns that the proposed CIL rate for B2/B8 development could hinder the Local Plan’s economic objectives. The proposed five-fold increase in the CIL rate for B2/B8 raises questions about the viability of industrial development, especially considering that it would become the highest industrial CIL rate among all charging authorities in England and Wales. Additionally, there are concerns about the robustness of the viability assessment, as it relies on market assumptions that may not accurately reflect local market conditions or larger industrial developments.</p> <p>The proposed industrial CIL rate is scrutinised concerning the lack of anticipated B2/B8 floorspace supply following the recent approval of the BMW electric plant application; the proposed rate increase for B2/B8 might not generate the expected level of proceeds and there is higher potential for CIL generation from Office and R&D uses. Concerns are also raised about the potential competitive disadvantage the rate could pose for MINI Plant Oxford and other manufacturers in the region, potentially stifling investment.</p> <p>Suggested that a nil charge for B2/B8 developments is applied and for a reassessment of rental values, yields, build costs, and Benchmark Land Value used in the viability assessment.</p>	<p>Noted - the BMW 23/02166/FUL application was recently approved and was granted a discretionary CIL Exemption based on independent viability testing. Beyond this, there is limited additional B2/B8 floorspace likely to come forward (see Background Paper 6a of the Local Plan).</p> <p>As such, we have not been able to test any additional sites for B2/B8 uses. This is unlike the case for use class E Office and R&D uses which have both high levels of known supply and can demonstrate substantial surpluses when tested on a site-specific level.</p> <p>Modification 2 proposes that CIL Rates are not increased for B2/B8 uses in the city for the CIL partial review.</p>	<p>Rates for B2/B8 to remain at the current ‘lower rate’ of £33.74/m² and will not be raised to £168.74/m² as was proposed in the consultation version of the draft charging schedule.</p>
---	--------------------------------	--	--	---	--

3	Objection – E Class Development Rate	Quod/ DP9 (On behalf of British Land Shell Trust)	<p>Support a joint examination with the Local Plan to consider a holistic view of local plan policies and CIL together.</p> <p>Criticism of Viability Assessment – which proposes 500% increase in Office, R&D and industrial rates which has relied on high-level generic testing of development typologies. It does not consider or provide any sense-check against specific strategic site allocations within the draft Local Plan. Recommendation that viability assessments are undertaken for site allocations in the Local Plan to justify a rate increase.</p> <p>The Council should not rely upon an exceptional circumstances relief policy to ensure the deliverability of sites, as this would create unnecessary uncertainty.</p>	<p>We acknowledge comments requesting additional site-specific testing and concerns about testing for sites outside of the city centre and additional site-specific viability testing has been carried out in a viability addendum note.</p> <p>This addendum takes into consideration recent data for Office and R&D developments within and outside of the City Centre. The addendum demonstrates that surpluses generated from Office and R&D developments are substantially above the proposed CIL rate, which justifies the increase, even when tested at upper quartile build costs.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.
4	County Infrastructure, S106 and Joint CIL funding	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Support increase in CIL Rates as there is need for additional infrastructure funding. Seeks that some CIL funding is used for infrastructure that the County Council provides; the County Council would welcome discussions on a CIL spending strategy to plan with greater certainty.</p> <p>Definition of Use Classes unclear in current charging schedule, should further expand on definitions of Class 'E'.</p> <p>Libraries are 'F1 Non-residential institutions' which benefit from the lower rate. The County Council owns and operates Oxfordshire libraries. Allowing part of a library to be used as an office, shop, café etc. to make the library more viable, should not lead to a separate higher CIL liability.</p>	<p>We acknowledge the County's comments and welcome further discussions on CIL. As demonstrated in our Infrastructure Funding Statements, CIL funding is already being applied to County infrastructure, particularly transport projects.</p> <p>The definitions of what developments can be charged are not required to match Use Classes Order definitions (CIL Guidance Para 23 Reference ID: 25-023-20201116). As a charging authority we do not experience administrative issues applying CIL rates under our current definitions.</p> <p>For libraries, a change of use would not attract CIL if it is still in use as a library or has been used as a library for 6 months in last 36 months (regulation 40 (Schedule 1) as amended)</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

5	Objection – E Class Development Rate	Savills (On behalf of Forge Bio GP2)	<p>Representation relates to Beaver House.</p> <p>Criticism of viability inputs and assumptions which may render strategic objectives of the adopted development plan and emerging Local Plan undeliverable. Such inputs include: Site Value Benchmark; Development Revenue; Development Costs; Finance Costs; and Developer’s Return.</p> <p>Suggests the consideration of a viability buffer to account for variations in viability across sites.</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Acknowledge comments requesting additional site-specific testing and concerns about testing for sites outside of the city centre; additional site-specific viability testing has been carried out in a viability addendum note.</p> <p>The addendum takes into consideration recent data for Office and R&D developments within and outside of the City Centre and demonstrates that surpluses generated are substantially above the proposed CIL rate, which justifies the increase, even when tested at upper quartile build costs.</p> <p>These higher surpluses achieved could also accommodate for additional contributions for the Cowley Branch Line and affordable workspaces policy. Setting the CIL rate considerably below the maximum that can be charged is effectively applying a buffer.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.
6	Objection – E Class Development Rate	Gerald Eve (On behalf of Merton College)	<p>Representation relates to Red Barn Farm.</p> <p>Criticism of viability inputs and assumptions in justifying 500% increase.</p> <p>Viability work needs to be re-evaluated with site-specific testing to ensure development can still come forward.</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, and additional evidence, demonstrates that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

7	Charitable Exemptions	Headington Heritage	<p>The CIL charging schedule is unsound due to the concentration of exempt or low charged institutions that generate high demand for additional infrastructure, disbursement of funds to subsidise private industry leading to imposition high costs on a small business sector.</p> <p>Concern that many of the large development sites identified in the Local Plan 2040, and much of the future growth for which CIL funding will be required, belong to the Universities and hospitals (Oxford University owned) which are the largest landowners in Oxford and are likely to be subject to CIL exemptions.</p> <p>Suggestions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase rates for all uses to higher levels • Review if charitable status must be accepted • Review CIL not to be received from sites from universities/ hospitals which would claim exemption • Remove all private industry subsidies • Re-run the study to identify the correct CIL charging, which eventually is a tax on house purchases 	<p>CIL Charitable relief is mandatory and is set out in the CIL regulations 43-48. Where it is eligible, we must legally comply. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy#para054</p> <p>We do not and do not intend to subsidise privately owned companies with our CIL expenditure.</p> <p>Addendum viability evidence suggests that rates can be raised on office and R&D developments above our current rates, and we have proposed an increase in CIL rates where we have found the appropriate evidence to do so.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.
8	All Other Use CIL Rates, including for Agricultural Development	Henry Venners	<p>BNP Paribas viability omits testing impacts on Class F, equestrian or farming, or Class E(d), E(e), or E(f) development. There is no evidence to justify any CIL charges on those forms of development. Suggested a zero rating for 'all other' uses developments.</p> <p>Concern there will remain farmland in the charging area on which developments can occur. Land value uplift is questionable has not been quantified for agricultural/farmland, and the city</p>	<p>Delivery of developments in 'all other uses' classes have not been affected since the implementation of CIL in Oxford city in 2013. As such, and given the substantial infrastructure funding gap in Oxford, rates are not proposed to be changed.</p> <p>There is no boundary review planned.</p> <p>Agricultural land is considered as part of the fourth benchmark land value in viability testing (paragraph 4.51) and standardly represents the lowest land values.</p>	Viability report updated to amend nil charge typo for D1 and D2 uses.

			<p>boundary may change when new developments come forward in the neighbouring districts as already planned.</p> <p>Class D1 and D2 uses were nil rated and can be considered infrastructure. These are now more found in use Class F. There is no allowance for such well-meant and desirable uses coming forward sans CIL charge, but there should be.</p> <p>The charging of CIL on infrastructure development like hospitals only makes the costs of delivery higher and less likely to happen. Not all such ventures will necessarily be given charitable exemption.</p>	<p>D1 and D2 uses were never zero rated in the charging schedule – this was a typo in the viability report and these uses have been charged since adoption of the charging schedule in 2013. Use classes in E and F also contain private developments which are not for public community benefit.</p>	
9	C1 - Hotel Rates	Oxfordshire Liberal Democrats	<p>The table on page 5 shows that any Hotel developments would remain at the lower rate. We do not see the justification for this and want the CIL rate to be the same as any other commercial development. This would exclude the possibility that a developer could build a ‘hotel’ but then convert it to other commercial uses.</p>	<p>Hotels were tested as part of the viability study and shown to not be able to accommodate for an increase in CIL rates.</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.</p>
10	All Other Use CIL Rate for Healthcare Developments	NHS Property Services	<p>The NHS, Council and other partners must work together to forecast the infrastructure and costs required to support the projected growth and development across the local authority area. A vital part of this is ensuring the NHS is not burdened with costs such as CIL which could render health developments unviable.</p> <p>The viability assessment does not consider the impact of CIL being levied on health developments. We anticipate this is due to fact that D1 uses, which would have covered health/medical developments except hospitals, were subject to a nil rate</p>	<p>The Council are working together closely with ICB to consider expected levels of growth accordingly.</p> <p>Differential rates have been set in a way that does not disadvantage any developments in general and delivery of healthcare uses have not been affected or presented any cases of unviability since the implementation of CIL in Oxford city. As such and given the substantial infrastructure funding gap in Oxford, rates are not proposed to be changed.</p> <p>The nil rate stated for D1/D2 uses in the viability study is a typo and was never nil rated in Oxford’s charging schedule.</p>	<p>Viability report updated to amend nil charge typo for D1 and D2 uses.</p> <p>Annex 2 updated to refer to calculation referred to in Schedule 1 of the CIL regulations.</p>

			<p>in the adopted CIL Charging Schedule. The Assessment is also silent on the impact of the proposed CIL rate of £33.74 on hospital and health developments falling under Use Class C2 and E(e), respectively.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 rate for C2 and E(e) Healthcare use classes • The Draft Charging Schedule Consultation Document includes an earlier version of the CIL Regulations at Annex 2 (Page 14 to 15). This refers to the calculation of the chargeable amount being set out in Regulation 40, however the current CIL Regulations (as amended) set this out in Schedule 1. For clarity we suggest the Annex is updated to reflect the current version of the Regulations. 	<p>There is risk here for private healthcare/medical facilities which also fall within Class E(e)s. Furthermore, Class C2s is not exclusively covered by healthcare but also student accommodation and care homes.</p> <p>CIL regulations update acknowledged – to be changed in Annex 2.</p>	
11	CIL Rates for Campus Developments	JPPC (On behalf of Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies)	<p>Concerns that the viability assessment does not appear to consider the impact of proposed CIL charges on campus sites of the colleges and universities. Campus sites are fundamental to delivery of the existing and emerging local plans and have specific viability challenges. This is particularly concerning where schemes include residential and student accommodation, as is the case with the Centre's sites, which are subject to high CIL rates.</p> <p>Care must be taken to ensure their delivery is not inhibited. We believe, having regard to the specific challenges of viability, there is merit in zero-rating campuses allocated for development in the Local Plan including that of the Centre.</p>	<p>University developments are already often exempt under mandatory charitable CIL relief and in practice, generally do not pay CIL charges.</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.</p>

12	Objection – E Class Development Rate	Savills (On behalf of Oxford Science Park)	<p>Concern about proposed amendments to the CIL Charging Schedule, which leads to fivefold increase in charges. This rise is expected to have adverse effects on new development in the city, including hindering its delivery, increasing unaffordability, reducing build quality and sustainability, and suppressing economic growth.</p> <p>The recommendation lacks reasonable justification and evidence as required by regulations. The absence of a suitable evidence base is highlighted, with identified discrepancies in key inputs of the Viability Assessment, such as development revenue, costs, finance, and developer returns, which do not reflect current market conditions.</p> <p>There are concerns that the subject site may not viably support the proposed CIL levy increase, potentially impeding its development during the Local Plan period and affecting employment opportunities and planning obligations in the region.</p> <p>Suggested that the Council must conduct further testing and consultation to ensure that the proposed CIL rates strike a suitable balance and are supported by accurate viability evidence, especially considering the dynamic nature of the development industry, including factors like the pandemic, regulatory changes, cost inflation, and market uncertainty.</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Planning permissions granted are subject to the prior rates of CIL, only new planning permissions would be affected by new charging schedule rates. Reserved matters for the E(g) parts of development have already been submitted and permitted. Only redevelopments to be affected at Oxford Science Park.</p> <p>Addendum viability evidence suggests that rates can be raised on office and R&D developments (irrespective of their location in the city) above our current rates. We have proposed an increase in CIL rates where we have found the appropriate evidence to do so.</p>	<p>Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.</p>
----	---	---	--	--	--

13	Objection – E & B Class Development Rates	DP9 (On behalf of Oxford University Developments, OUD)	<p>Relates to Osney Mead SPCW7 - OUD is concerned that the Draft Charging Schedule will have an adverse impact on the deliverability of the Osney Mead site, directly impacting the deliverability of the draft Local Plan. The Viability Assessment prepared by BNP Paribas fails to consider the implications of a significant uplift in rates for Class E, B2 and B8 uses (a 400% increase) on the deliverability of Osney Mead, or any strategic site allocation identified in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The evidence base is inappropriately broad-brush and too high-level for conclusions to be drawn as to the effect of new proposed CIL rates on strategic site allocations. It is recommended that there is additional consideration for the Council's designated strategic sites.</p> <p>OUD would like to explore the opportunity to take a more considered and effective approach to Osney Mead.</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, and additional evidence, the findings demonstrate that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.
14	Objection – E & B Class Development Rates	CBRE UK (On behalf of Redevo)	<p>Relates to development at Templars Square - CBRE raises concerns regarding the validity and reliability of the viability evidence base to increase rates and the legal compliance CIL Draft Charging Schedule with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>The LVPA evidence base is criticised for not being up to date, failing to assess the cumulative impact of policy costs and the impact of updated 2024 indexed CIL rates on financial viability and deliverability of OCC's land supply. Brownfield and regeneration schemes are expected to struggle to meet affordable housing targets, and variations in land values</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>There is a misunderstanding of the data. The tables presented in table 6.56.1 do not take CIL rates as an input so do not need to be retested. Maximum CIL rates per sqm are shown in rightmost column of the viability table following the cumulative application of policies, and the change of indexed 2024 CIL rates to £168.74/m² from £158/m² do not materially affect the conclusions of the testing.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

			<p>prompt consideration of a zonal CIL.</p> <p>The commentary points out poor timing with economic, sector, and political uncertainties in the UK. Specific criticisms are directed towards assumptions in yields, construction costs, benchmark land values, CIL surplus calculations, and the variation of land values across the city. The commentary also questions the robustness of Build-to-Rent appraisals and the optimistic nature of assumptions. Overall, there are reservations about the accuracy, transparency, and fairness of the proposed CIL rates and their impact on development viability.</p> <p>Concerns are also raised over the lack of allowance for additional infrastructure delivery and potential underestimation of financial contributions in Policy S3 for the Cowley Branch Line.</p>	<p>Implementation of the CIL residential rate has not been changed and has not fettered development over the last 10 years of its implementation. We acknowledge the challenge by not further increasing residential CIL rates.</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, evidence demonstrates that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments. It also demonstrates that there is also a substantial surplus for other contributions, for example for Policy S3.</p>	
15	Objection – E & B Class Development Rates	Savills (On Behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society)	<p>The proposed fivefold increases raise concerns about impact on forthcoming employment uses. The changes are anticipated to have adverse effects on new development, including heightened unaffordability, compromised build quality, issues meeting sustainability commitments, and restricted economic growth. Emphasis that the Local Plan should avoid policies that hinder development opportunities or force major investment decisions to operate at margins of viability.</p> <p>Critique of BNPP's evidence base highlighting unclear data analysis and transparency, particularly regarding</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, and additional evidence, the findings demonstrate that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments. This stems from the fact that in most cases, rental rates achieved are higher than previously tested. Furthermore, the testing shows that the surpluses generated by the Class E(g)</p>	Rates for B2/B8 to remain at the 'lower rate' of £33.74/m ² and will not be raised to £168.74.

			<p>revenue allowances and the absence of crucial investment sale data supporting yield profiles. The viability assessment lacks clarity on whether revenue allowances for the 'City Centre' or 'Rest of City' would apply to site allocations. Furthermore, concerns are raised about overstated office rental values and the insufficiency of construction data captured by BCIS. BNPP's allowances for professional fees, contingency, marketing, and legal costs are questioned, especially regarding the potential erosion of contingency allowances by build cost inflation. Finance costs are criticised for being understated, and there are doubts about the representation of 15% on Gross Development Value (GDV) as unrepresentative. Questions are raised about the consideration of a viability buffer in interpreting the evidence for the proposed CIL levy increase.</p>	<p>Office/R&D uses is very high, far beyond the proposed CIL rate. Setting the rates considerably below maximums is comparable to applying a viability buffer.</p> <p>Although CIL rates for Class B2/B8 are evidenced to be viable at increased rates as set out by the LVPA, we acknowledge the lack of general B2/B8 supply, with no other major sites anticipated to come forth. We therefore consider at this moment in time that keeping the CIL rate as it is (currently on the 'lower' CIL rate) is appropriate and achieves the balance between viability and the capacity of the CIL levy being able to raise funds for infrastructure.</p>	
16	Objection – E Class Development Rates	Savills (On behalf of Shell Trust)	<p>Local plan proposals for employment uses such as Policy SPCW8 (Botley Road Retail Park) would be adversely affected by the proposed changes to the CIL Charging Schedule – equivalent to a fivefold increase.</p> <p>Concerns raised surrounding the methodology and assumptions included within the Local Plan Viability Assessment supporting the proposed increase in CIL.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed increase in CIL levy will undermine the viability of the site at Meadowside Retail Park taking account of other Council policies including energy efficiency. The proposed increase in CIL therefore fundamentally is</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, and additional evidence, demonstrates that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments.</p> <p>The assumptions of the testing take into account a cumulative application of all local plan policies and also have inputs for the inclusion of S106 and S278 costs.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

			<p>detrimental to both scheme viability and the potential deliverability of the site. The consequence of adopting this increase in CIL, could preclude the site from being brought forward for development during the Local Plan period, fettering the delivery of new investment and employment opportunities.</p>		
17	All Other Use CIL Rates – Sport and Leisure Facilities	Sport England	<p>There are concerns regarding the negative impact of the charging schedule on the delivery of sport and physical activity facilities necessary to support growth. The proposed rate of £33.75/m² for ‘all other’ development types, includes those related to sport and physical activity, such as leisure centres, playing fields, and Artificial Grass Pitches. This potentially hinders the accessibility of physical activity opportunities for communities.</p> <p>Oxford City Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) includes sport facilities, creating a situation where developments intended to fund or partly fund sports facilities would also be subject to the levy. Sport England emphasises the need to exclude sport facilities and facilities promoting physical activity from the proposed CIL charging schedule, citing historically nil rated D1/D2 uses.</p> <p>Additionally, Sport England highlights the importance of ensuring that proposed improvements to Cutteslowe Park, including the potential relocation of a football pitch, align with NPPF guidelines and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. These upgrades must be supported by evidence from the updated Parks and Playing Spaces Strategy (PPS) to meet regulatory requirements.</p>	<p>Differential rates have been set in a way that does not disadvantage any particular type of development in general and delivery of developments in ‘all other’ use classes have not been affected since the implementation of CIL in Oxford city. As such and given the substantial infrastructure funding gap in Oxford, rates are not proposed to be changed.</p> <p>Class D1/D2 rates were never nil rated - this was an error in the viability study which will be corrected.</p>	<p>Viability report updated – nil charge typo for Class D1 and D2 uses.</p>

18	All Other Use CIL Rates for Hotels, Boarding Schools and Non-residential Schools and Colleges	Summertown and St Margaret's Forum	<p>The Forum supports the uplift where proposed but believes it should be increased more widely across the use classes, better reflecting their impact on the neighbourhoods.</p> <p>It should be applied at the full uplifted rate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C1: Hotels, • C2: Boarding schools and residential colleges, • F1: Non-residential schools and colleges • Sui generis assembly and leisure [with the exception of community and not-for profit facilities] • All development types unless stated otherwise unless exceptionality can be proven. <p>Propose that a default position of payment of the uplifted maximum rate should include sui generis and 'all development types' unless exceptionality can be proven, e.g. community provided facilities.</p> <p>The Forum has responsibility for the annual distribution of CIL monies within its neighbourhood. Propose that a maximum sum of 5% from the annual Neighbourhood CIL Allocation is automatically allowed for administrative expenses incurred by the Forum</p>	<p>We are not proposing any changes to the CIL rate for the above use classes. Hotels were tested as part of the viability study and did not demonstrate that they would be able to absorb any additional CIL rate. Furthermore, C2 and F1 use classes cover a lot of uses including those for private and public uses. We therefore consider it an appropriate balance to not propose any increases to these rates.</p> <p>Regulations do not allow for the allocation of 5% of Neighbourhood CIL to administrative expenses for Neighbourhood Forums.</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.
19	Objection – E Class Development Rates	Savills (On behalf of Thomas White Ltd and Oxford North Ventures Ltd)	<p>Concerns the proposed amendments to the CIL Charging Schedule could significantly impact upcoming employment uses under the Hybrid consent Oxford North and wider Northern Gateway development areas.</p> <p>Critiques of the Viability Assessment</p>	<p>BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>As the reserved matters for employment uses on this site have already come through</p>	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

			<p>highlight its focus on small-scale developments, calling for site-specific appraisals for larger strategic sites to enhance understanding and engagement with the consultation process.</p> <p>Concerns are raised about the viability inputs and assumptions, particularly regarding the Site Value Benchmark and the inadequacy of BNPP's approach in reflecting market evidence and professional research on local agricultural land values. Concerns are also raised about assumptions about landowner premiums.</p> <p>At Oxford North, the ratio of infrastructure costs to new buildings is anticipated to be significantly higher than currently estimated by the viability assessments - 25% (on shell & core costs) which is above the 10% currently included by BNPP.</p> <p>The Viability Assessment is criticised for excluding costs associated with delivering strategic sites like Oxford North, including substantial Section 106 obligations.</p> <p>Specific comments are made on the target return percentages included in the assessment and additional comments are raised highlighting site-specific circumstances which mean that the economics of development will vary over the course of development given the varied nature of large-scale mixed-use development and the associated costs associated with strategic sites.</p>	<p>within the existing CIL regime, new levy rates would not affect the proposed Class E(g) uses for the site, unless new planning applications come through for these or the land is later redeveloped.</p> <p>Additional viability work has been commissioned to test strategic sites that could be affected by the proposed changes to CIL rates. Following this testing, and additional evidence, demonstrates that higher rental rates can be charged for Office/R&D developments.</p> <p>The assumptions of the testing considers a cumulative application of all local plan policies and also have inputs for the inclusion of S106 and S278 costs.</p> <p>Office/R&D sites tested at Oxford North demonstrate a substantial surplus at expected rental rates even after applying CIL, such that additional site-specific infrastructure costs can be accommodated for.</p>	
20	Objection – E Class Development	Bidwells (on behalf of Firoka) Submitted as	Firoka owns sites which including include Kassam Stadium (SPS2), Ozone Leisure Park (SPS2), Overflow Car Park (SPS3), and	BNP Paribas have put together the evidence base using standard inputs and assumptions in compliance with the requirements of	Comments acknowledged - No modifications to be made from this representation.

	<p>Rates</p>	<p>part of Local Plan 2040 Reg. 19 consultation.</p>	<p>part of Oxford Science Park (SPS5).</p> <p>Viability evidence is criticised for not engaging sufficiently with developers. Recommendation that further testing is conducted to account for proposed policies on a site-specific basis to avoid delays at the development management stage.</p> <p>The infrastructure delivery plan highlights shortfalls in funding, particularly impacting proposed transport projects such as the Cowley Branch Line and Littlemore area of focus.</p>	<p>viability evidence (as stated in representation 1).</p> <p>We conducted the CIL consultation and provided supplementary site-specific testing of 19 commercial sites across Oxford in response to developer feedback.</p> <p>The testing shows that there is substantial uplift across the city for a range of office/lab developments including at Oxford Science Park which would be able to accommodate for both the increased CIL charge and also further S106 contributions, such as towards the Cowley Branch Line.</p> <p>We agree that there is a funding shortfall for infrastructure, as is demonstrated by the infrastructure funding gap. We have sought to ensure that CIL rates are increased where the viability evidence shows that it is possible to do so to help address this shortfall.</p>	
--	---------------------	---	---	--	--