



Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation Response

Woodstock Town Council (WTC) has reviewed the Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and would like to provide the following comments.

In addition to the comments below WTC also supports the submission from Bladon Parish Council, which includes further points that Woodstock has not covered below but feels are relevant.

The Town Council has the following concerns.

First Concern

The Town Council is concerned that with the introduction of CIL, there is no longer any guarantee that funds received from developments in the area will be used to mitigate the impact that they create on the local services and infrastructure in Woodstock and around Woodstock.

Due to the way that CIL is operated, a general funding pot with basically no restriction on how it is used, there is no requirement under the CIL Regulations to ensure that funds remain in the area, unlike S106 which ringfence contributions to specific services/infrastructure and must be in the vicinity or serving the site. The only requirement is for 15% capped at £100 per council tax dwelling town/parish area to be passed to the town/parish councils. The draft schedule provided does not make it clear that the cap is £100 per council tax dwelling, we had to find that clarification from the regulations.

It is acknowledged this could increase to 25% uncapped if the town/parish has a neighbourhood plan. As Woodstock does not have a neighbour plan that deals with development we would receive the minimum amount.

WTC is also concerned with how the cap works when more than one development occurs in a year rather than spread out over several years. Timing could mean that the combined CIL from 2 developments is more than the cap level for the year, but if these developments occurred in separate years then the town/parish would more than likely receive more funds. It is not clear from the CIL Regulations if there is anyway to rollover the CIL if this scenario was to occur.

The risk that funds could be taken away from the area is a genuine risk. Even though most of the services/infrastructure is the responsibility of other public bodies, such as OCC and NHS, WODC can decide on the priorities. The funds received in the Woodstock area could be used on other projects elsewhere in the district or county and technically even further afield if it was to benefit development in the area. At the moment there is no information has been provided on how the allocation/decision process will work.

There is also a possibility that any funds received by the towns/parish will be needed to fund items such as school places in their area rather than the plans the town/parish may have because the remaining CIL from the development may not be enough to fund the need infrastructure. There again is no information provided as to how WODC would deal with issues such as this.

Second Concern

The Town Council believes that CIL will not generate as much revenue as is possible under the current S106 process and also that any revenue received will have more competition for spending as it is now available to other public bodies and services that did not make requests under the S106 process, such as Emergency Services, Water/Flooding and NHS/GP.

For an example of how CIL will generate less funding than S106 see Appendix A which provides details of a recent appeal site in Woodstock. This is just one example and other major/strategic sites would produce similar outcomes.

In the example provided S106 generated £5,106,508 but apply CIL rates using national spacing stands and applying the CIL charge to market housing only the CIL Liability is £1,532,250 and if 5% administration is deducted the amount available is reduced to £1,455,637. This is a difference of £3,650,870 and this difference could be higher if the S106 contributions are uplifted to the same base date as the CIL rate.

Even with CIL being charged on all market houses built WTC cannot see how there could be enough smaller developments being built to compensate. As mentioned below there is a chance that due to the increase in cost to the smaller developers/developments, they may not come forward.

Third Concern

CIL will be of benefit to the larger developers as the average amount payable per dwelling on large/strategic sites is higher under S106 compared to the possible CIL rate and additional CIL is not payable on affordable houses, which reduces the cost for larger developers even more.

Smaller developments, those under 10 which currently do not pay, and the minor developments who pay a lower S106 per dwelling, mainly due to where they are built having capacity in the local infrastructure and not justify S106, will now be charged considerably more.

There is a risk that this increased cost will have to be passed on to the purchases of the property which will increase house prices in an already expensive area. There is also a risk that this increase in cost may stop smaller developments come forward which could also affect house prices.

Appendix A

Site Land East Of Hill Rise Woodstock Oxfordshire – 21/00189/FUL

Housing Mix - Total 190 dwellings split Market Housing 1 bed 20, 2 bed 38, 3 bed 30 & 4 bed 2 the mix for affordable is the same. The housing mix has been taken from OCC and WODC Housing responses.

Section 106

This does not allow for benefits in kind or that if the mix changes SEND and Secondary contributions would change.

WODC/NHS	£	OCC	£
Community Contribution	18,900	Primary Education	2,298,496
Health	162,079	Secondary	1,169,640
Outdoor Pitch	322,200	SEND	125,637
Swimming Pool	86,322	Bus Stop	8,926
		Public Transport Infrastructure	675,690
		Public Transport Services	203,940
		PROW	30,000
		Travel Plan	1,558
		TRO	3,120
Totals	589,501		4,517,007

Total S106 is **£5,106,508** which equates to **£26,876** per dwelling (Total/190) or if costed over market dwellings only the figure becomes **£57,738** (Total/90)

CIL Calculation

Using the national space standards from WODC 2020 CIL Viability report the charge per dwelling would be: -

1 bed 50sqm x £225 = £11,250

2 bed 75sqm x £225 = £16,875

3 bed 90sqm x £225 = £20,250

4 bed 130sqm x £225 = £29,250

Apply the above rates to the possible housing mix the possible CIL contribution would be: -

1 bed £11,250 x 20 = £ 225,000

2 bed £16,875 x 38 = £ 641,250

3 bed £20,250 x 30 = £ 607,500

4 bed £29,250 x 2 = £ 58,500

Total CIL **£1,532,250** which equates to **£8,064** per dwelling (Total/190) or if costed over market dwellings only then the figure becomes **£17,025** (Total/90)

Once 5% administration fee is removed the total available for infrastructure is **£1,455,637**

Amount for Town Council is **£205,000** which is the lower of 15% which is £229,837 or £100 per council tax dwelling which is £205,000. Woodstock has approx. 2050 properties