



# Buckingham Town Council

Town Council Office, Buckingham Centre,  
Verney Close, Buckingham, MK18 1JP  
01280 816426

[office@buckingham-tc.gov.uk](mailto:office@buckingham-tc.gov.uk)

Town Clerk: Claire Molyneux

**FULL COUNCIL**

Wednesday, 22 April 2026

Councillors,

You are summoned to a meeting of the Full Council of Buckingham Town Council to be held on Monday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026 at 7pm in the Council Chamber, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham.

Please note that the meeting will be preceded by a Public Session in accordance with Standing Orders 3.e, 3.f, and 3.g, which will last for a maximum of 15 minutes. A member of the public shall not speak for more than 3 minutes. Members of the public can attend the meeting in person. If you would like to address the meeting virtually, please email [committeeclerk@buckingham-tc.gov.uk](mailto:committeeclerk@buckingham-tc.gov.uk) or call 01280 816426 for details.

The meeting can be watched live on the Town Council's YouTube channel here:  
<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC89BUTwVpjAOEIdSIfcZC9Q/>.

Claire Molyneux  
Town Clerk

## AGENDA

### 1. Apologies for absence

Members are asked to receive apologies for absence.

### 2. Declarations of interest

To receive declarations of any personal or prejudicial interest under consideration on this agenda in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 Sections 26-34 & Schedule 4.

### 3. Buckinghamshire Council consultation on CIL charging schedule

To receive a report from the Town Plan Officer.

[BTC/181/25](#)

### 4. Chair's announcements - for information only

### 5. Date of the next meetings:

Annual Statutory Meeting: Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2026  
Full Council: Monday 11<sup>th</sup> May 2026

To:

All Councillors



Twinned with Mouvaux, France;

Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany



Valmadrera, Italy



Members are reminded when making decisions that the Public Sector Equality Duty 2010 requires Members to have due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited by the Act, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a characteristic and those who don't, and to foster good relations between people who share a characteristic and those who don't. All Committee documents can be found on the Buckingham Town Council's website. Alternatively, the Clerk can send you a copy of any minutes, reports, or other information. To do this, send a request using the contact details set out above.

**Buckingham Town Council**  
**Full Council**  
**Monday 27th April 2026**

Contact Officer: Town Plan Officer

## 1. Recommendations

- 1.1. It is recommended that Buckingham Town Council submits the consultation responses noted below, with discretion given to the Town Plan Officer to make supportive adjustments if required before the closing date.
- 1.2. It is recommended that Buckingham Town Council request to be heard by the independent examiner.

## 2. Summary

- Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL] is an important developer contribution towards infrastructure for Buckingham. A key reason is the 25% portion legally allotted to the Town Council as a result of having a “made” Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Town Council would be free to allocate this money to projects [within certain legal limits]. It does not need to meet the needs of any one development.
- There are concerns as to how CIL is being implemented in the old AVDC area ahead of the new Buckinghamshire Local Plan.
- The principal objections are:

### ❖ **Prematurity**

The infrastructure needs are based on VALP and also make no reference to Neighbourhood Development Plans. There is no evidence as to how future infrastructure needs within the new Plan would be met or could be met with the proposed CIL rates.

There is no clear undertaking that the rates in South & Central [set in 2020] or West [set in 2012] will be reviewed in light of the new Local Plan, The result would be 5 different areas with different charges within the county, and potentially not conforming with PPG as to lack of complexity in an area.

### ❖ **Viability Evidence**

The main evidence is supplied by the Dixon Searle Partnership Report [DSP Report]. The charging schedule does have to balance between providing for the infrastructure needs of the area and not threatening the viability of the project.

Only the areas of North & Central are considered in the DSP Report, wider options, as well as “do nothing” were rejected at an early stage by Buckinghamshire Council.

Differential areas [here Zones A & B] are permissible if justified by evidence. Much of the evidence used has been classified as commercially sensitive and not published.

Aylesbury and Buckingham are placed in Zone A with lower rates per square metre on the basis that developers have lower margins in these areas. It is not fully clear how this conclusion was reached and why, for instance, Winslow or Haddenham as other settlement areas of potential growth are excluded.

As noted above, no reference is made to any strategic policies within neighbourhood plans. This means that viability calculations have been made assuming 25% affordable housing costs to developers, whereas currently these are 35% in the BNDP Area, and will rise to 40% under the emerging Local Plan. What may result is developers arguing that such rates of affordable homes threaten viability [as CIL is not negotiable development by development] and thus there will be a lower percentage of affordable homes delivered. It also may result in smaller developments bearing a greater developer contribution burden contrary to Planning Policy Guidance [PPG]. It is not clear whether Zone A around Buckingham is the parish boundary or the BNDP Area boundary.

Very little consideration appears to have been given to Buckinghamshire Council's policy of £0 CIL on 400+ homes development in the DSP Report, which has made the distinction only between 1-9 homes and 10+ homes on the basis of the threshold for affordable housing obligation. It is not demonstrated that s.106 agreements will provide the equivalent or better. Regardless s.106 money is tied to the needs generated by the specific development and does not always assist the existing infrastructure gap.

#### ❖ **General**

Wide disparity between areas within the county that would be created, even in the interim. The DSP Report states that costs of development of brownfield (“previously developed land”) are greater and help justify proposed lower rates in Aylesbury and Buckingham; yet in the West the zone around High Wycombe attracts the higher rate of CIL. Yet, there is no report of concerns of viability (although DSP Report not commissioned to research this) appear to have arisen recently. This may not be in compliance with the Planning Policy Guidance [PPG] in terms of lack of complexity within the area. In addition, the DSP Report documents the more recent increase in costs for builders which through doubt on the charging scheduled set in other areas in 2012 and 2020.

If s106 agreements are to do “the heavy lifting” in terms of delivery of infrastructure on strategic sites, then greater consultation would be required between parish/towns and Buckinghamshire Council to ensure necessary infrastructure delivery. There is also a need to explain how the existing

infrastructure gap can be funded from s106 agreements in terms of the requirements of this form of contribution.

There is little evidence to such that there has been consultation with neighbouring authorities as is required by PPG [Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 25-012-20190901]. This is most apparent in the DSP Report excluding strategic sites on the border of Milton Keynes from Zone A.

### 3. Background

#### 1.0 Introduction to Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL]

1.01 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is governed by the Planning Act 2008 and for greater detail, the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

1.02 CIL is basically a general local tax on development within an area. It is administered by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) [in the current instance, Buckinghamshire Council].

1.03 CIL does not replace s106 agreements and there are likely to be found working together. There is an interaction in terms of overall viability for a development. It should also be noted that affordable housing on a development is always provided through s106 agreements.

1.04 It is implemented by way of introduction of a charging schedule [s.211(1) of the Planning Act 2008]. This provides the basic levy rates charged in a LPA's area. There does not need to be just *one* rate for the whole of the planning area, provided that each separate rate can be evidenced and justified. This can be seen in the current areas in Buckinghamshire which already have CIL. The introduction of CIL and a charging schedule for the North & Central areas [formerly AVDC area] of Buckinghamshire Council is the reason for this consultation.

1.05 Much greater detail can be found in the Planning Policy Guidelines [PPG] on CIL - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy>

#### 1.1 What can CIL be used for?

1.1.1 Unlike s106 agreements which pertain to the specific development, the proceeds of CIL can be used more generally. The Regulations state:

**59C.** *A local council [the Town Council (Reg58A)] must use CIL receipts passed to it in accordance with regulation 59A or 59B to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area, by funding—*

*(a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or*

*(b) anything else that is concerned with **addressing the demands that development places on an area.** [emphasis added]*

1.1.2 It should be noted that apparently the base 15% granted to parish/town councils can be used for affordable housing but the “bonus” 10% from having a Neighbourhood Development Plan [NDP] cannot. As currently advised it is unlikely that provision of affordable housing will be an option on the likely returns [see illustrative examples later]. Certainly, it is stated in the PGG that if charging authorities pass on more than the 25% that cannot be used for affordable homes.

1.1.3 There are arrangements stated in CIL Regulations that the neighbourhood portion is applied pro rata per square metre to developments lying in other parishes. So that if there were a development which lay within the BNDP Area that lies within Gawcott-cum-Lenborough Parish, then the Parish Council would receive a percentage of the neighbourhood portion on that basis [but also on the basis of whether they have a NDP or not – see 59A(8) of the 2010 Regulations.

1.1.4 This can be contrasted with s.106 agreements which require that it is **necessary** to make the development **acceptable** in planning terms; it is **directly related** to the development and that it is **fairly and reasonably in scale and kind** to the development [emphasis added]. The following table may aid comparison:

Table 1.

Developer Contribution	Purpose	Administered	Basis	Timeframe	Viability
s.106	The agreement is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; It is directly related to the development; It is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	Buckinghamshire Council	Specific to the relevant development and thus variable.	10 years – after that developer may seek return of money	Subject to challenge on viability by developer on each development.
CIL	funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on the area	25% Buckingham Town Council 75% Buckinghamshire Council	General Charge on most development NB apart from the statutory exemptions, Buckinghamshire County currently has a policy of charging CIL at £0 on developments of 400+ homes and it is proposed to do the same on all flats.	BTC has five years to spend the money, otherwise reverts to BC but it must then be spent in this area. The developer cannot reclaim the levy.	This must be considered at the creation of charging schedule and justified to independent examiner.

1.1.5 S.216(2) of the Planning Act 2008 gives a definition of “infrastructure” for the charging authority [here Buckinghamshire Council] which includes roads and other transport facilities; flood defences; schools and other educational facilities; medical facilities; sporting and recreational facilities and open space. This definition is apparently specifically not carried into the portion to be given to local councils (see s.216A(2) and s216A(2) person = legal entity The definition above is carried into the 2010 Regulations via Regulation 2).

1.1.6 The charging authority [Buckinghamshire Council] is required to publish an infrastructure list which is a statement of the infrastructure projects or types of infrastructure which the charging authority intends will be, or may be, wholly or partly funded by CIL by 31<sup>st</sup> December each year [Regulation 121A of 2010 Regulations]. The most recently published can be found here: [https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/IFS\\_2024.25\\_Final.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/IFS_2024.25_Final.pdf). This most recent statement only appeared in recent weeks during the preparation of this report and not by the required 31<sup>st</sup> December.

1.1.7 Future planned expenditure in this document makes reference to the emerging Local Plan, so it is not as yet very specific.

1.1.8 The consultation documents provide supporting infrastructure requirements based on VALP infrastructure delivery to match the DSP Report basis in VALP as the current Local Plan.

## 1.2 How is CIL implemented?

1.2.1 It was stated in the 2023/2024 Infrastructure Funding Statement published by Buckinghamshire Council that CIL would be introduced into the former AVDC area [or North & Central Area as it is now designated] in 2025/26. The process has been started in 2026/2027.

1.2.2 This is a statutory process for the completion of the charging schedule – that is the rates that will be charged in any given area. The proposed zoning into Zone A [Aylesbury and Buckingham] and Zone B [all other areas] is permissible under Regulation 13 of the 2010 Regulations. This occurs in the current charging schedule for the West, where the built-up area of Wycombe has a higher charge. Both the rates and any divisions must be evidenced and justified to the satisfaction of an independent examiner.

1.2.3 In summary, a charging schedule is prepared and adopted as follows [emphasis added]:

- Buckinghamshire Council prepares its evidence base in order to prepare its draft levy rates, and **collaborates** with neighbouring/overlapping authorities (and **other stakeholders**).

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) states: “When deciding the levy rates, an authority must strike an **appropriate balance between additional investment**

**to support development** and the potential effect on **the viability** of developments” [Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 25-010-20190901]

In addition PPG states: “It is the responsibility of authorities when preparing their charging schedules to collaborate with the **local community**, developers and other **stakeholders**, to create realistic and viable charging schedules.”[Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 25-015-20190901 emphasis added].

1.2.4 Buckinghamshire Council has commissioned an evidence base for this purpose, from Dixon Searle Partnership. It is part of the published evidence for this consultation. Dixon Searle Partnership note that they consulted the following to be stakeholders – “we have consulted with both the development industry (represented by parties including local property agents, developers, housebuilders and others) as well as affordable housing providers” [paragraph 2.2.1 of the DSP Report; a more detailed list appears in Appendix 5 of the Report] It would appear that town and parish councils are not viewed as stakeholders.

1.2.5 It is assumed that the current consultation is the collaboration with the local community required by paragraph 015 of the PPG above.

1.2.6 It might be asked whether this proposal does in fact “strike an appropriate balance” with exemptions for 400+ home developments and all flats developments. In relation to the latter, it provides an incentive to build only flats on a site. This may assist in density and achieving required housing numbers, but flats are viewed with some suspicion these days in terms of rapidly rising service charges and leasehold tenancies generally. Mention is made of the increased costs associated with Building Safety as an issue to be considered for viability [see below], but building safety and costs have been a major headache for flat owners since the terrible events of Grenfell in 2017.

1.2.7 The charging schedule adoption procedure continues by

- Buckinghamshire Council prepares and publishes a draft charging schedule **for consultation**;
- **representations are sought** on the published draft;

This is governed by Regulation 15 which states that it must prepare a preliminary draft charging schedule for consultation and that it must send a copy of the draft and invite representations from the stated consultation bodies of which the Town Council is one by virtue of Regulation 15(3)(b).

*This notification was received on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> April at 16:52.*

There is a clear legal requirement for Buckinghamshire Council to seek representations from the Town Council (and all other parishes in the included area).

There must be a minimum period of 4 weeks of consultation after the date of publication of the draft [Regulation 17(3) of the 2010 Regulations]

*Consultation closes on 24<sup>th</sup> May, 2026*

**In addition there is a right to be heard by the examiner** – this should be requested when representations are submitted [Regulation 17(1) &(2) of the 2010 Regulations]

*It is recommended that the Town Council exercise this right.*

- Buckinghamshire Council **must take into account any representations** made to it before submitting a draft charging schedule for examination [Regulation 17(5) of the 2010 Regulations];
- The submitted documents must be published on the Buckinghamshire Council website [Regulation 19 of the 2010 Regulations]
- **an independent person** (the “examiner”) examines the charging schedule in **public**;
- the examiner’s recommendations are published;
- Buckinghamshire Council has regard to the examiner’s recommendations and reasons for them;
- Buckinghamshire Council approves the charging schedule.

It is a process not dissimilar to the BNDP. It is not a “closed doors” process per se.

## **(2) CIL in other areas in Buckinghamshire**

### **2.0 Rates in the other areas:**

2.0.1 For the purposes of this report the rates for C3 and C4 planning class use have been cited as perhaps being of the most interest. [More information can be found in the Buckinghamshire CIL Annual Rates Summary 2026:

[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/CIL\\_Annual\\_Rates\\_Summary\\_2026.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/CIL_Annual_Rates_Summary_2026.pdf); [ and the same for 2025:

[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/CIL\\_Annual\\_Rates\\_Summary\\_2025.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/CIL_Annual_Rates_Summary_2025.pdf)] If the Summary is viewed, it will be observed that the categorisation is planning class and no distinction is drawn on housing numbers nor £0 given to all flats development. The 400+ home £0 rate is applied.

### **2.0.2 East and South areas (formerly Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils)**

**This was established in 2020.**

£179.64 per sqm [£175.60sqm in 2025] [Base line from 2020 -£150 per sqm]

### **2.0.3 West (formerly Wycombe District Council) This was established in 2012**

Zone A – £223.21 per sqm [2025 -£218.19 per sqm] [Baseline from 2012 -£125 per sqm]

Zone B- £267.86 per sqm [2025 -£261.83 per sqm] [Baseline from 2012 - £150 per sqm]

2.0.4 Zone B is the more densely built up area around High Wycombe – map can be viewed here:

<https://buckinghamshire.moderngov.co.uk/Data/WDC%20Cabinet/201203051900/Agenda/Cabinet%205%20March%2012%20-%20CIL%20Draft%20Charging%20Schedule%20-%20App%20A.pdf>

[a reminder again that High Wycombe is unparished]

2.0.5 It is clear that the figure first set is very important going forward. The above rates are set using a formula which includes the rates first set for these areas, when their charging schedules were first introduced. This formula is set out in the Annual Rates Summary above, but its statutory origin is in the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2019 [Part 1 of Schedule1] which uses the original rate in the first year along side the factor for that year and the yearly rate set by RICS to calculate annual rate adjusted for market conditions. Once the original figure is set it is fixed into this yearly calculation.

2.0.6 It may be observed that the West Rates were originally set as far back as 2012 demonstrating there is no legal requirement to review the charging schedule once made. [PPG paragraph 045] A factor that should also be considered here in terms of whether the West, and East & South charging schedules will be reviewed at the time of the new Local Plan. The PPG suggests that a review of charging schedules alongside reviews of Local Plans and associated evidence bases. [PPG Paragraph 045]

2.0.7 The PPG also states that “[a] charging authority that plans to set differential rates should seek to avoid undue complexity.” [PPG Paragraph 22]. As proposed there will be 5 different basic charging schedules within Buckinghamshire. Given the nature of the county that might not be unexpected but the variation of the basis of the 3 main areas does lead to undue complexity. There will in effect be three completely separate charging schedules within Buckinghamshire and not just differential rates.

2.0.8 There would have been an opportunity with the emerging Local Plan to review all charging schedules and introduce CIL in the North & Central areas, both in light of that document and also the new unitary authority’s role as the Local Planning Authority for all areas. According to the DSP Report, this option was rejected at the first stage by Buckinghamshire Council. No detailed reasoning is brought forward for this decision.

### 2.1 Examples of annual payments to comparable councils within existing CIL areas in Buckinghamshire

2.1.1 The following payments in Table 2 are selected for interest, either as Town Councils or to illustrate how significant sums may occur occasionally through development. These payments should be considered in relation to the significantly higher rates of CIL in both the West and East & South than are being proposed for the North & Central.

2.1.2 The sources are: Buckinghamshire Council Infrastructure Funding Statement 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 -31<sup>st</sup> March 2024

[[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/Infrastructure\\_Funding\\_Statement\\_1\\_April\\_2023\\_to\\_21\\_March\\_2024.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/Infrastructure_Funding_Statement_1_April_2023_to_21_March_2024.pdf)]

Buckinghamshire Council Infrastructure Funding Statement 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024-31<sup>st</sup> March 2025 [[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/IFS\\_2024.25\\_Final.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/IFS_2024.25_Final.pdf)]

Table 2

Town/Parish Council	2023/2024 CIL Receipts	2024/2025 CIL Receipts		
West [NB High Wycombe is unparished]				
Marlow Town Council	£34,061	£13,613		
Princes Risborough Town Council**	£5,390	£33,727		
Wooburn & Bourne End*	£89,922	£34,696		
Great & Little Kimble*	£232,389	£82,642		
Hazlemere Parish Council*	£15,679	£165,143		
Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council*	£118,703	-		
East & South				
Amersham Town Council	-	£3,231		
Beaconsfield Town Council	£56,650	£60,179		
Gerrards Cross Town Council*	£37,717	£72,513		
Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council*	£118,703	-		
Iver Parish Council*	£7,434	£60,318		
* Denotes made Neighbourhood Development Plan	** Denotes emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan			

### **(3)The Current Consultation**

Buckinghamshire Council is proposing introducing CIL to the old AVDC District area, now North & Central areas.

#### **3.0 The Proposed Charging Schedule**

3.01 This schedule is, and can be, different from the other areas within Buckinghamshire Council. It appears that this may be a temporary position until the charging schedules overall are reviewed in light of the emerging Local Plan. There may be an underlying assumption that the existing schedules will be adjusted in light of the most recent evidence in terms of “viability” as presented by the Dixon Searle Partnership Report [the DSP Report] although that is only focused on the North & Central land values. There may well be a need to produce at least one other report for the existing areas for this to happen. None of this is certain.

#### **3.1 Evidence Base – The Dixon Searle Partnership Report**

3.1.1 This supporting 138 page report is the basis of the proposed charging schedule in terms of the essential requirement of “viability” in the CIL legislation, the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] & Planning Policy Guidance [PPG]. It stresses the experience the firm has in this area and thus their ability to “sense check” figures and assumptions. There is evidence from stakeholders [those approached but not necessarily those that replied can be found in Appendix 5 of the Report] but almost all of this is stated to be commercially sensitive, and it is not published in the report. This can make it difficult to verify the figures that Dixon Searle Partnership has received.

3.1.2 The report is based on VALP which is the current Local Plan for the North & Central areas. There is no mention at all of existing neighbourhood development plans except in the extensive quotation from the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF] and Planning Policy Guidance [PPG].

3.1.3 This absence does make a difference. The then existing BNDP 2015 which was the most up-to-date part of the Development Plan at the time the DSP Report was being compiled, requires a minimum of 35% affordable housing in the BNDP Area [not clear that this equates to the boundary shown as Zone A or whether this is simply the parish boundary from Buckingham]. This is retained in the new BNDP 2025/26. It is understandable that this was not considered even as an emerging plan, but it is uncertain as to why one half of the Development Plan for the proposed Zone A was ignored – there is no explanation even in the extensive Methodology section.

3.1.4 The PPG states that: “Charging schedules should be consistent with, and support the implementation of, up-to-date relevant plans.” [Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 25-011-20190901] It further identifies relevant plans as “any strategic policy, including those set out in any spatial development strategy” [Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 25-012-20190901]. Not all the policies in the BNDP are strategic, but the site allocations and the affordable housing are. Thus not all relevant policies for the area have apparently been considered in the DSP Report.

3.1.5 The outcome is the possibility of challenge by developers as to the viability of 35% affordable homes as the charging schedule for CIL which has to be paid, is calculated on assumption of 25% affordable homes. This omission may mean less affordable housing for Buckingham. In addition, it would need to be reviewed as the emerging Local Plan is proposing 40% affordable homes. A charging schedule for CIL which does not reflect this, may lead to under delivery of affordable homes on the basis of viability.

3.1.6 The above would apply to 10 -399 home developments as 400+ are assessed at £0 across the county.

3.1.7 Indirectly, the DSP Report does provide some justification for the difference in the proposals for North & Central in comparison to other areas of the county already under CIL. This is through noting the extra costs developers have to shoulder in recent times. These include:

- **Building Safety Levy** scheduled from October 2026 “The BSL cost is assumed at the locally advised rates of £38.78/sq. m for greenfield developments and £19.39/sq. m for PDL [Previously Developed Land ie brownfield] developments in this case.” [para. 2.12.12 DSP Report]
- **Biodiversity Net Gain** – mandatory requirement of at least 10% from the Environment Act 2021. It should be noted that the Manor Farm development was able to offer 30% BNG without issues of viability.
- **New environmental costs such EVCs and heat pumps in new builds required by central government**
- **New accessibility requirements**
- **Water efficiency standards**
- **Parking standards**
- **Space standards**

3.1.8 It is suggested that these recent new costs have pushed up building costs and thus have an effect on viability. PPG states that the land value has to be taken as that at which there is an incentive for the landowner to sell. There is an assumption of a profit in the margins of 15-17% for the development. It does not seem to consider whether profit margins might have to be lower due to the new standards being applied to the industry. It is known that the UK requires more homes to be built, but it is interesting that an industry wishes to maintain [and be supported] in maintaining levels of profit that are perhaps not protected in other industries. This appears to be the assumption that this is the necessary motivation.

3.1.9 The DSP Report also considers a buffer to allow for economic conditions when setting the rate for the charging schedule. It is noted that this is in addition to the adjustment made by the RCIS each year for annual calculations of CIL rates for inflation and market conditions. This may appear to be industry standard, however.

3.1.10 The DSP Report states that house sales (although not always to be considered as the best indicator in other parts of the Report) attract lower prices in Buckingham and Aylesbury, thus reducing the overall profit of the project and a high CIL rate might threaten viability. This is the basis of the Zone A rates for Buckingham

and Aylesbury. There is not much evidence as to why other strategic sites for housing such as Winslow and Haddenham are not included, except that the sale receipts may be higher in these settlements. The strategic sites on the Milton Keynes border might also have been included but as they will be of strategic size, there appears to be anticipation of the 400+ homes £0 rate applied throughout Buckinghamshire Council area, as well as drawing margins successfully.

3.1.11 It is noted that previously developed land is more expensive to develop than greenfield and thus attracts lower rates.

3.1.12 The distinction between 1-9 homes and the 10+ homes, is the main one in terms of size of development (this is not noted in the other existing charging schedules) on account of 1-9 homes size not being liable for the cost of providing affordable homes.

3.1.13 The key questions are thus: location – Zone A or B; size of development & is site previously developed land (brownfield) or greenfield.

3.1.14 This leads to the proposed charging schedule here:

[https://yourvoicebucks.citizenspace.com/planning/cil/user\\_uploads/02-buckinghamshire-council-nc-area-cil-cil-charging-rates---map.pdf](https://yourvoicebucks.citizenspace.com/planning/cil/user_uploads/02-buckinghamshire-council-nc-area-cil-cil-charging-rates---map.pdf)

#### **(4) Key Points of the Proposals:**

- Buckingham will be a “main area” as will Aylesbury – Zone A. This means generally lower rates of CIL as DSP Report suggests that building and associated costs are higher [contrast the approach taken in Wycombe for example]
- All Flats development will be £0 as again DSP Report cites higher costs due to “non-saleable” areas of the sq m such as communal areas [this does not seem to consider ground rent income via leasehold]
- Development of between 1-9 homes will have a rate that reflects the lesser amount of s106 costs such as affordable homes: Zone A  
Brownfield - £50 **per sqm**      Greenfield **£250 per sqm**
- Development of 10+ but under 400 will have CIL at following rates:  
Brownfield -£0 Greenfield £ 80 **per sqm**
- Buckinghamshire overall CIL policy precludes CIL on 400+ developments because of higher return on s.106 agreements.
- DSP Report states an agreed working figure of £14,200 for a dwelling in the 10+ development and £1000 for a dwelling in 1-9 dwelling development as a s.106 cost per dwelling number.
- Large convenience based supermarkets and superstores and retail warehousing (net retail selling space of over 280 sq. metres) -£100 per sqm
- All other non-residential development - £25 per sqm
- Development by a predominantly publicly funded or not- for-profit organisation including medical and health services, social care, education, emergency services, waste facilities, community facilities, sport and leisure facilities. - £0 per sqm

#### 4.0 What it means

4.01 Buckingham is given the status of “Main Area” alongside Aylesbury in the recommended charging schedule. The Main Area figures are used in the worked examples below.

#### *4.02 Example 1 – 3 bedroom semi-detached on new estate of under 400 homes*

##### **Off Lincoln [Moreton Road iii]– approx. 130 homes.**

- This is a greenfield site. It is under 400 homes, so would be charged at the proposed rate of £80 per sq m.
- If taking the average of a 3 bedroom semi detached house [plot 113 “The Harper”- 1010 sq. ft [ approx. 93.8sqm] – this would yield £7,504 [BTC CIL @25% =£1,876].
- A very approximate calculation using this figure as an average [partly based on the fact that BNDP evidence need for 3 bedroomed homes in the majority] = £975,520 in CIL yield for the development [BTC CIL @ 25% = £243,880]
- DSP Report figures are based on VALP requirement of 25% affordable homes and not BNDP requirement of 35%.
- The DSP Report takes an agreed figure of £14,200 per dwelling for development of 10+ homes for s.106 agreements
- Possible Total of Developer Contributions - £975,520 + £1,846,000 = £2,821,520 [including affordable homes] or £ 21,704 per home

#### *4.03 Example 2 – small development of executive homes*

##### **Benthill – 5 bedroom house in development of two – 3,200sqft [approximately 297 sq m]**

- This would be charged at £50 BF or £180 GF so yielding £14,850 [BTC CIL @ 25% =£3712.50] or £53,460 BTC CIL @25%=£13,365]
- Overall a CIL yield of £29,700 [BTC CIL @ 25% = £7,425]
- The DSP Report takes an agreed figure of £1000 per dwelling for developments of 1-9 homes for s.106 agreements
- Total Developer contributions of CIL & s.106 - £29,700 + £2,000 = £31,700 [no affordable homes] or £15,850 per home

#### *4.04 Example 3 – HP3 Development – proposed 800 homes – large development*

- There would be no CIL charged as the development is 400+ homes.
- The working figure for s.106 agreement is £14,200 per dwelling = £11,360,000 and obviously a figure of £14,200 per dwelling. It could be assumed that the figure here would be higher as there would be greater necessary provision of s106 infrastructure.

4.05 It is interesting to note that before any adjustment for s106 money in relation to scale of development [except as already provided for in charging schedule proposals for 1-9 homes] that a small development will provide £15, 850 per dwelling; a small-

medium development £21,704 per dwelling; and a large development exempt from CIL £14,200; £7504 less than a small to medium development and £1,650 less than a small development. This is a significant sum for adjustment in provision, and is in danger of discouraging small and small-medium development. It is also possible to view this as an incentive for large developments which greatly assist housing targets. It would be useful here to have the higher end of the s106 money for large scale development that led to the agreed figure of £14,200 per dwelling in order to assess whether the 400+ dwelling exemption is justified by the higher return on s106 agreement money.

#### 4.06 Example 4 – Employment land Policy EE2 of BNDP

- If retail as described - £100 per sqm
- Otherwise £25 per sqm
- Land is 1.7 ha = 17,000 sqm Obviously not all would be chargeable as there would be access and landscaping to consider but
- Retail = 17,000 x 100 = £1,700,000 – Buckingham @25% = £425,000
- Other = 17,000 x 25 = £425,000 – Buckingham @ 25% = £106,250

#### 4.1 Why it matters

4.1.1 It is clear that the getting the rate correct in the charging schedule is essential as it is the basis of CIL charging going forward until another major review. It is not clear whether North and Central would be reviewed again with the emerging Local Plan, but there are very clear discrepancies between current charging schedule for Wycombe and the proposed figures for Zone A in North & Central; too much perhaps for simple explanation of different land values.

4.1.2 In addition, new development in the intervening period will yield significantly less for North & Central than for Wycombe. It will be difficult to assess whether this will result in more s106 gain for North & Central, as it would appear that the agreed working figures for s106 costs per dwelling are for across the county and not just for North & Central.

### **(5) Infrastructure Provision**

5.0.1 PPG states: "...In meeting the regulatory requirements, charging authorities should be able to show and explain how their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area (see [regulation 14\(1\)](#), as amended by the [2014 Regulations](#))." [ PPG paragraph 010]

5.0.2 A relevant plan is defined as " any strategic policy, including those set out in any spatial development strategy." [PPG paragraph 012]

5.0.3 PPG also suggests: "Where practical, there are benefits to undertaking infrastructure planning for the purpose of plan making and setting the levy at the same time. A charging authority may use a draft plan if they are proposing a joint examination of their relevant plan and their levy charging schedule." [paragraph 012]

The current local plan is VALP for the area and is soon to be replaced by the new Buckinghamshire Local Plan – the new Local Plan can only really be referenced when there is a joint examination planned – this is not the case here. The rate set will be linked effectively to an old plan for delivery of infrastructure and not the new plan, especially if Neighbourhood Development Plans are not to be referenced. This does raise the question as to what is the benefit of bringing this in now, and not with the Local Plan when all charging schedules can be prepared and examined together to deliver the new infrastructure in the new Plan?

5.0.4 Buckinghamshire Council has supplied outstanding infrastructure under VALP as the infrastructure to be supported by this charging schedule.

## **(6) Issues Identified**

### *6.0 Prematurity*

- Little mention is made of how this will meet the infrastructure requirements from relevant plans, especially the BNDP which contains strategic policies and is the up-to-date section of the Development Plan. In creating Zone A has any consideration been given to the fact that Buckingham provides key infrastructure for the surrounding parishes, which benefit from a higher rate of CIL.
- Infrastructure is taken from VALP which is losing weight as the Buckinghamshire Local Plan emerges.
- Lack of clear assurance that all CIL Charging Schedules will be reviewed at the adoption of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan as otherwise there is an enormous disparity between the rate of levy in the North & Central and other areas.
- The transition period between the adoption of North & Central up-to-date charging schedule and any review could be seen as unfair. A clear undertaking to ensure that financially equivalent s.106 agreements are secured fall short as that money can only be used for site specific responses to the need generated by that development.

### *6.1 Evidence*

- Report does not mention any Neighbourhood Development Plans in the North & Central area. Assumption that affordable housing is a minimum of 25% as set by VALP – not acknowledging that BNDP did and does set 35% affordable housing as a minimum. As the draft Local Plan suggests 40% affordable housing will be the minimum, it may be that this will result in the need for review of all charging schedules. If not CIL will have to be applied, and the argument as to viability will move to s.106 agreements and the possible reduction of percentage of affordable homes on the grounds of viability. In terms of this consultation, the absence of NDPs may have an impact in terms of potential challenge by developers. There are caveats in the DSP Report but it seems a glaring omission. It may work as an error in the Town Council's favour in terms of CIL receipts but does risk the 35% affordable homes that

the Town Council fought to retain when VALP was adopted if arguments re overall viability are raised.

- Has there been any challenge in relation to viability in other areas? Has Buckinghamshire Council had to reduce s.106 agreements on the basis that the agreement plus the CIL renders the development non-viable?
- If CIL is kept low, how will the existing infrastructure gap be met, due to the more restrictive requirements of s106 agreements. Acknowledgement that low or £0
- The £0 rate on 400+ home development applied by Buckinghamshire Council. This does not seem to have featured in the DSP Report as the model given is simply 1-9 homes [no requirement for affordable homes so lower s.106 agreement charge] and 10+ homes. This was already a controversial feature so therefore was knowable. Would the lack of the cap at 399 homes have affected the calculations as to rates and viability in the DSP Report?
- The justification of the £0 rate on flats proposed by DSP Report on the basis that the non-saleable areas such as communal areas reduces viability is debatable as apparently no consideration is given to the payment of ground rent to landowner through leasehold tenure unless flats are being marketed with share of freehold?
- Acknowledgement that concentration of delivery of developer contributions through s.106 agreements limits the form of infrastructure that can be provided. It also reduces the spending power of parish/town councils to deliver locally needed infrastructure, recognized in the NPPF and PPG. This might be more acceptable if Buckinghamshire Council was more open in inviting town and parish councils to the table in relation to s106 agreement negotiations or even ahead of such negotiations.
- Not clear from the map provided if the Zone A around Buckingham is the parish boundary or whether it is the BNDP Area boundary.

### **(7) Recommended Consultation Responses**

The following are the consultation questions:

1. Do you support the council proposal to introduce the proposed CIL charging schedule in the north and central areas of Buckinghamshire?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

**Buckingham Town Council supports the introduction of CIL in principle but not this proposal. It is concerned that due to the above the proposed charging schedule will not assist in meeting a stated aim in the PPG that CIL is “an**

important tool for local authorities to use to help them deliver the infrastructure needed to support development in their area.” [Paragraph 001 - Reference ID: 25-001-20190901]. It considers the proposal to be premature ahead of the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan and a county wide review of charging schedules.

It is indicated in the DSP Report that the first stage of the exercise was to decide the approach out of four options, from do-nothing to full review of all areas. The resulting decision taken by Buckinghamshire Council has no reasoning attached in the DSP Report [pp.20/21 paragraphs 10 & 11]. If there is a review planned for the West and East & South areas alongside or immediately after the adoption of the Local Plan, then to achieve consistency of infrastructure planning base, there would also need to be a review of the North & Central. To review the charging schedule so soon after this exercise seems somewhat wasteful of resources.

The PPG places emphasis on the balance between viability [which is assessed in DSP Report] and the delivery of necessary infrastructure, the setting of a charging schedule when the supporting Infrastructure delivery plan for the emerging Local Plan which is not yet released seems premature. The DSP Report is based on VALP, the existing local plan, which is widely viewed as out of date, and in terms of Buckingham, the allocated development is delivering homes to the market, so that delivery of infrastructure has already been settled via s.106 agreements.

The Buckingham Neighbourhood Development Plan “made” in January 2026 does indicate needs and preferences for future infrastructure via developer contributions as well as the allocation of one strategic site (taking the definition for current purposes as 400+ homes) but has not been referenced in the DSP Report although it contains strategic policies which would meet the “relevant policy” test in PPG.

To illustrate a potential arising problem the example of the minimum rate for provision of affordable homes is deployed. VALP states a minimum of 25%; the BNDP which was emerging during the DSP Report’s preparation and which is now made so part of the Development Plan, states minimum of 35% for BNDP Area, and the emerging Local Plan states 40% as a minimum. The DSP Report states at it is assumed that the full 25% is applied [DSP Report paragraph 3.3.3] at the same time acknowledging that s.106 agreements keep viability arguments open [paragraphs 3.3.1 & 3.3.2] Therefore the given agreed figures of £14,200 [for 10+ homes] and £1000 [1-9 homes] for working s.106 costs for each home, may not reflect the higher rate of provision of affordable homes, and the balance between CIL contributions and s106 agreement costs may be tilted potentially leading to less affordable housing being provided due to viability issues, than is assessed as required for the emerging Local Plan period.

Buckingham Town Council is concerned that Buckinghamshire Council as the charging authority has overall for its area has 7 different zones – West (Zone A

**& B); Central & South; North and Central (Zones A, B, C & D) even before sub classifications such as previously developed land/greenfield (North & Central) or planning use are considered. Buckingham Town Council believes that this is unnecessary “undue complexity” especially as the charging schedules were set as such varied times [2012; 2020 & now 2026]. The charging authority is required to avoid such undue complexity [ PPG Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 25-022-20230104], which it is submitted could be achieved by reviewing (and introducing) all charging schedules as an Unitary authority with, or in light of, the forthcoming Buckinghamshire Local Plan.**

2. Do you agree that, taking account of the supporting evidence, the proposed CIL rates (£/square metre) set out in the draft Charging Schedule strike an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

**Little evidence is provided to show how necessary infrastructure from the relevant plan, especially the BNDP [or other neighbourhood plans in the North & Central area] will be met with this rate. The evidence seems focussed on viability for developers. There seems little evidence to show how additional resources will be generated, especially if because the charging schedule is based on an almost out of date local plan, VALP, viability issues are raised via s106 agreements leading to delivery of less affordable homes, which cannot be delivered via CIL. Nor does it consider how the infrastructure gap which cannot be delivered under the restrictions of s.106 will be adequately delivered with £0 rate on 400+ homes – the DSP Report seems lacking in assessing this policy and its implications. The new Local Plan is expected in 2027, in about a year's time – so what is the point of setting a charging schedule for infrastructure delivery that will be out of date so soon. There is a fear that the charging schedule rates will not deliver new infrastructure adequately once the Buckinghamshire Local Plan is adopted.**

3. Do you agree with the different CIL rates that are proposed to apply to different zones and different types of development?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

ol don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed

### **Zone A:**

**The DSP Report states “Aylesbury is the largest settlement in the area and is the focal point for housing, employment, retail and community services and facilities. Buckingham is the second largest town and there are over 80 larger, medium and smaller settlements across the area.” [Paragraph 1.2.2] having noted that Winslow, Wendover and Haddenham are also main and strategic settlements.[paragraphs 1.2.2 & 1.2.3 DSP Report]**

**In selecting Buckingham and Aylesbury as different enough in terms of developer costs to merit lower rates as Zone A, there is no indication that similar towns such as Winslow, with the new East-West railway station, or Haddenham, with an existing direct train link to London have been considered or why they may have been rejected for inclusion in Zone A. Speculative development applications are growing, which may be to avoid CIL or that there is no real industry concern with viability issues in the vicinity of Buckingham. What seems to be implied is that houses do not command such high prices in these two areas compared to the surrounding area, and thus the developers make less profit so therefore requiring a lower CIL rate to ensure viability continues. Yet there is also the statement that house prices alone are not determinative of fixing land values. It may be naïve to think that if the end product has a lower market value then so would the price paid for the land initially not reflect this factor. The reduced prices in Buckingham do not seem to be affecting the market unduly given the number of recent speculative development applications.**

**Rejection of the area bordering Milton Keynes for inclusion in Zone A is apparently on the basis that development is all of a strategic nature in size. Again, the policy proposed is that strategic sites of 400+ should be charged at £0. When the BNDP is considered in terms of strategic allocation of sites, Policy HP3 allocates 800+ homes alongside brownfield and a smaller green field site. When the new HELAA is considered with major development proposed to the south, it is not clear that this distinction is that clearcut. This also touches on whether now is the correct time to produce a charging schedule under VALP when it is soon to be replaced.**

**Buckingham Town Council suggests that the relevant PPG evidential requirements for such zonal rates for “strategic sites” has not been provided [Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 25-026-20190901]. It should have been possible to anonymise a more specific and detailed account of evidence from stakeholders working in the specific areas. It is not stated which of the many listed stakeholders did in fact respond, thus assessing actual local knowledge.**

**It also questions whether the “fine-grained” sampling has been undertaken fully as required by the PPG [“Charging authorities that decide to set differential rates may need to undertake more fine-grained sampling, on a**

**higher proportion of total sites, to help them to estimate the boundaries for their differential rates” [Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 25-023-20201116]**

**In recognising that there is a balance to be struck between delivery of infrastructure and viability of the development, there is concern that less infrastructure is delivered overall in these areas, which are also stated to be the main settlements identified for further growth. Buckingham services many surrounding rural areas; developments in those areas will still rely on Buckingham to provide essential services, but CIL will be directed to the appropriate councils at a higher rate than in development within Buckingham, which will still have to deliver these resources to a wider area. There does not seem to have been any discussion or consideration as to how this could be reflected in the charging schedules.**

**There is an argument that CIL provides certainty for developers in calculating project costs, whereas s.106 agreements alone make for less certainty.**

4. Do you agree with the proposed exemption from CIL for developments by a predominantly publicly funded or not-for-profit organisation including medical and health services, social care, education, emergency services, waste facilities, community facilities, sport and leisure facilities.

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

5. Do you agree with the proposal to charge a nil rate of CIL for the development of strategic sites? Strategic sites are large sites of 400 homes or more (gross) or 10 hectares or more (gross) that are allocated in the Local Plan and including any parcel within a large site irrespective of the size of the parcel, and all uses within allocations.

These sites would be expected to provide infrastructure directly and through s106 planning obligations.

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

There is concern that the proposed rates for 1-9 home developments ( £50 per sqm as opposed to £0 for 10+) may result in higher costs for small development, which has supplied Buckingham with a significant number of homes previously, and could potentially in the future under the BNDP. When the agreed amounts for s.106 agreements from the DSP Report are applied to examples, the smaller development is paying more overall. More evidence is required to ensure that there is significant uplift in s106 agreements on strategic sites to ensure that this does not breach current PPG [Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 25-024-20240219].

A rough application of the proposed rates to known developments within Buckingham, produced a discrepancy of £7000 in strategic developments of 400+. There is a lack of evidence to show how that will be reflected in higher s106 contributions.

**Benthill – 5 bedroom house in development of two – 3,200sqft [approximately 297 sq m]**

- This would be charged at £50 BF or £180 GF so yielding £14,850 or £53,460
- Overall a CIL yield of £29,700
- The DSP Report takes an agreed figure of £1000 per dwelling for developments of 1-9 homes for s.106 agreements
- Total Developer contributions of CIL & s.106 - £29,700 + £2,000 = £31,700 [no affordable homes] or **£15,850 per home**

**Off Lincoln [Moreton Road iii]– approx. 130 homes.**

- This is a greenfield site. It is under 400 homes, so would be charged at the proposed rate of £80 per sq m.
- If taking the average of a 3 bedroom semi detached house [plot 113 “The Harper”- 1010 sq. ft [ approx. 93.8sqm] – this would yield £7,504.
- A very approximate calculation using this figure as an average [partly based on the fact that BNDP evidence need for 3 bedroomed homes in the majority] = £975,520 in CIL yield for the development
- DSP Report figures are based on VALP requirement of 25% affordable homes and not BNDP requirement of 35%.
- The DSP Report takes an agreed figure of £14,200 per dwelling for development of 10+ homes for s.106 agreements
- Possible Total of Developer Contributions - £975,520 + £1,846,000 = £2,821,520 [including affordable homes] or £ 21,704 per home

**BNDP HP3 Development – proposed 800 homes – large strategic development**

- There would be no CIL charged as the development is 400+ homes.
- The working figure for s.106 agreement is £14,200 per dwelling = £11,360,000 and obviously a figure of £14,200 per dwelling. It could be assumed that the

figure here would be higher as there would be greater necessary provision of s106 infrastructure.

It is interesting to note that before any adjustment for s106 money in relation to scale of development [except as already provided for in charging schedule proposals for 1-9 homes] that a small development will provide £15,850 per dwelling; a small-medium development £21,704 per dwelling; and a large development exempt from CIL £14,200; £7504 less than a small to medium development and £1,650 less than a small development. This is a significant sum for adjustment in provision, and is in danger of discouraging small and small-medium development. It is also possible to view this as an incentive for large developments which greatly assist housing targets. It would be useful here to have evidence of the higher end of the s106 money for large scale development that led to the agreed figure of £14,200 per dwelling in order to assess whether the 400+ dwelling exemption is justified by the higher return on s106 agreement money.

**How are general infrastructure requirements which do not fall within s106 agreement specifications to be met without CIL on larger developments – s106 can only address the specific requirements generated by the development. The existing infrastructure gap will continue to widen if s106 agreements are the only source of contribution on larger developments because of these restrictions.**

6. Do you agree with the proposed boundaries of the different CIL charging zones?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

**In selecting Buckingham and Aylesbury as different enough in terms of developer costs to merit lower rates as Zone A, there is no indication that similar towns such as Winslow, with the new East-West railway station, or Haddenham, with an existing direct train link to London have been considered or why they may have been rejected for inclusion in Zone A. Speculative development applications are growing, which may be to avoid CIL or that there is no real industry concern with viability issues in the vicinity of Buckingham. What seems to be implied is that houses do not command such high prices in these two areas compared to the surrounding area, and thus the developers make less profit so therefore requiring a lower CIL rate to ensure viability continues. Yet there is also the statement that house prices alone are not determinative of fixing land values. It may be naïve to think that if the end product has a lower market value then so would the price paid for the land initially not reflect this factor. The reduced prices in Buckingham do not seem**

to be affecting the market unduly given the number of recent speculative development applications.

Rejection of the area bordering Milton Keynes for inclusion in Zone A is apparently on the basis that development is all of a strategic nature in size. Again, the policy proposed is that strategic sites of 400+ should be charged at £0. When the BNDP is considered in terms of strategic allocation of sites, Policy HP3 allocates 800+ homes alongside brownfield and a smaller green field site. When the new HELAA is considered with major development proposed to the south, it is not clear that this distinction is that clearcut. This also touches on whether now is the correct time to produce a charging schedule under VALP when it is soon to be replaced.

Secondly, this leads to inconsistency with the Buckinghamshire Council area. In the West, Zone B, Wycombe built-up area is a higher rate. As this charging schedule was made in 2012, it may be that the DSP Report more accurately reflects the current situation in large settlements, but in absence of overall review an apparently inconsistent approach arises, which would suggest that there are viability issues in the West Zone B.

7. Do you agree that the viability evidence (set out in the report prepared by Dixon Searle Partnership) provides a suitable evidence base for the introduction of the CIL rates as proposed?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed

***Lack of transparency of evidence for verification:***

The main objection is that the stakeholder consultation [apparently wide-ranging and not confined to landowners/developer etc within the North & Central area] is not published on grounds of commercial sensitivity/confidentiality. The Report assures the reader that Dixon Searle Partnership [DSP] has extensive experience and can sense check the evidence. It is difficult to evaluate evidence objectively as a result especially in relation to developers' costs, and also whether there is a land price adjustment in Buckingham and Aylesbury due to the lower priced house sales or whether it is the same or similar value to surrounding areas. There is no indication that Buckinghamshire Council officers have been able to view and evaluate the basis of the recommendations.

***Weight of planning documents:***

As noted, the report is based on VALP as the Local Plan. VALP is losing planning weight as the Buckinghamshire Local Plan emerges. In terms of the

North and Central there are a number of neighbourhood development plans which supplement strategic policies within VALP eg Buckingham which indicates that the VALP minimum of 25% affordable homes would need to be considered at a starting point 35% due to assessed needs. Such policies mean that associated plans are “relevant plans” for the purposes of PPG. The most recent Buckingham Neighbourhood Development Plan was made in January, 2026 and so is the most-up-to-date part of the Development Plan. This and the updated strategic policies referencing VALP strategic policies eg affordable homes are not assessed but could be seen as relevant policies under PPG [Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 25-012-20190901]

***Absence of full assessment of £0 on 400+ home developments:***

It also appears that implications of the application of the 400+ home rate of £0 have not been considered as to whether this would affect the calculations of viability. Presumably it is assumed that Buckinghamshire Council will be robust in s106 agreements to deliver significantly more, such that would be notably at the top of the figures providing the working figure of £14,200 per home in s106 agreement delivery.

There is confusion within the evidence as to government policy – a Written Ministerial Statement from the previous government in 2024 is quoted – this indicates that local authorities should not charge either rates for CIL on small build projects – yet the proposed charging schedule shows a higher rate for developments of 1-9 than 10+. A worked local example shows that when the given figures for s106 agreement costs are applied – small development seem to be paying more in developer contributions than major developments. It is noted that the DSP state that changes were not made to PPG [paragraphs 8 & 9 at .29 of the DSP Report] but it must be considered on general principles to be undesirable, evidenced by the fact that this is still referenced in the PPG itself [Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 25-024-20240219]

8. Do you agree with the proposed instalments policy?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

9. Do you agree that the evidence (set out in the Infrastructure Funding Gap statement) demonstrates a significant funding gap and hence the desirability of introducing CIL?

Please tick (✓) one option

Yes

No

I don't know

If you answered No, please say why, and what you think should be changed.

10. Please provide any further comments you have concerning the proposed introduction of a CIL in North and Central planning areas of Buckinghamshire Council (corresponding to the area of the former Aylesbury Vale district)

**Clarification required as to whether Zone A around Buckingham is the parish boundary or the BNDP Area – there is a difference. If development occurs within the Gawcott-cum-Lenborough Parish land within the BNDP Area, the Zone B rates applicable will potentially be significantly different.**

11. Do you wish to speak at the public examination of the draft CIL Charging Schedule? Please tick (✓) one option Yes, I wish to speak at the public examination No, I do not want to speak at the public examination If you answered Yes, please provide your name and an email address so that we can contact you.

**Yes**

<b>North &amp; Central Buckinghamshire Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule</b>					
<b>Residential development Not within the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC's zone of influence</b>					
<b>Fewer than ten dwellings</b>			<b>Ten or more dwellings</b>		
Previously Developed Land*	Aylesbury and Buckingham (Zones A)	£50/sq. m	Previously Developed Land*	Aylesbury and Buckingham (Zones A)	£0/sq. m
	Other areas (Zones B)	£180/sq. m		Other areas (Zones B)	£100/sq. m
Greenfield	All areas	£250/sq. m	Greenfield	Aylesbury and Buckingham (Zones A)	£80/sq. m
				Other areas (Zones B)	£200/sq. m
Development comprising all flat	All areas	£0/sq. m	Development comprising all flats	All areas	£0/sq. m
<b>Residential developments within the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC zone of influence (All areas and site types that are required to make a contribution to SANG &amp;/or SAMMS)</b>					
<b>Fewer than ten dwellings</b>			<b>Ten or more dwellings</b>		
Previously Developed Land*	Aylesbury (Zone C)	£0/sq. m	Previously Developed Land*	Aylesbury (Zones C)	£0/sq. m
	Other areas (Zones D)	£100/sq. m		Other areas (Zones D)	£20/sq. m
Greenfield	All areas	£170/sq. m	Greenfield	Aylesbury (Zones C)	£0/sq. m
				Other areas (Zones D)	£120/sq. m
Development comprising all flats	All areas	£0/sq. m	Development comprising all flats	All areas	£0/sq. m
<b>Strategic housing allocation sites</b>					
Large sites of 400 homes or more (gross) or 10 hectares or more (gross) that are allocated in a Local Plan, and including any parcel within a large site irrespective of the size of the parcel, and all uses within sites allocated in a Local Plan.				£0/sq. m	
<b>Non-residential / Commercial / Other development uses</b>					
<b>All North &amp; Central Buckinghamshire Areas</b>					
Large convenience based supermarkets and superstores and retail warehousing**(net retail selling space of over 280 sq. metres)**				£100/sq. m	
All other forms of development				£25/sq. m	
<b>Not-for-Profit and Publicly Funded Uses</b>					
<b>All North &amp; Central Buckinghamshire Areas</b>					
Development by a predominantly publicly funded or not-for-profit organisation including medical and health services, social care, education, emergency services, waste facilities, community facilities, sport and leisure facilities.				£0/sq. m	

**Notes**

\*Previously developed land - as defined in Annex 2 to the NPPF.

\*\*Superstores/supermarkets are shopping destinations in their own right where weekly food shopping needs are met and which can also include non-food floorspace as part of the overall mix of the unit.

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.

**Abbreviations**

**SAC:** Special Area of Conservation

**SANG:** Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace

**SAMMS:** Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy

### North & Central Buckinghamshire Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Zones 2026

#### Legend

##### Areas not falling in Chiltern Beechwoods Zone of Influence

- Zone A - Aylesbury and Buckingham Areas
- Zone B - Other Areas

##### Areas falling within Chiltern Beechwoods Zone of Influence

- Zone C - Aylesbury Area within Chiltern Beechwoods Zone of Influence
- Zone D - Other Areas within Chiltern Beechwoods Zone of Influence

