Wokingham Borough
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Statement of Representations
And
Main Issues Raised

November 2026

WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Contents

1. Purpose of report 3

2. Draft Charging Schedule Consultation 4

3. Summary of main issues raised 6

Residential Development: 6

Sheltered Housing: 14

Residential institutions and Extra Care Housing: 14

Retail: 14

Purpose built market student accommodation: 15

Hotels: 17

Industrial and warehousing: 18

General: 18

Appendices 24

Appendix 1: Statement of Representations Procedure 25

Appendix 2: Summary of representations 27

1. Purpose of report

1.1. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a locally set charge on new development that authorities can choose to introduce across their area. It is based on the size and type of development and once set is mandatory to pay and non-negotiable. The funds raised through CIL must be used to provide infrastructure, which is required to support new development across the area. Levy rates are set out in the CIL Charging Schedule.

1.2. This statement has been produced to respond to and fulfil the requirements set out in The CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), related to the submission of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule to the examiner. In doing so, Regulation 19(1)(b) state a local planning authority should submit:

> a statement setting out -
>
> if representations were made in accordance with regulation 17, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised by the representations, and a summary of how the representations received were taken into account, or that no such representations were made.

1.3. This statement outlines the consultation process undertaken, presents a summary of the representations received, alongside Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC) response; and summarises how the representations were taken into account in finalising the Draft CIL Charging Schedule submitted for examination.

2. Draft Charging Schedule Consultation

2.1. WBC undertook consultation on a partial review of some of the rates within its adopted CIL Charging Schedule in accordance with Regulation 16 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).

2.2. Consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule ran for six weeks from 23 July to 7 September 2026.

2.3. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), the documents listed below were made available on the council's website and for inspection at the council offices and at Wokingham Library:

- Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule (July 2026)
- Background Paper (July 2026)
- Statement of Representation Procedure (July 2026)
- Funding Gap Statement (May 2026)
- CIL Viability Assessment (April 2026)
- Loddon Valley Garden Village Financial Viability Assessment (August 2025)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (August 2025)

(See https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/planning-policy-and-developer-contributions/developer-contributions/cil-partial-review/draft-cil-charging-schedule-consultation for all documents)

2.4. In accordance with Regulation 16 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), the relevant consultation bodies were made aware of the consultation by email or letter. This included the following:

- Local community groups and organisations
- Residents
- Development industry / landowners
- Statutory bodies
- Infrastructure and service providers

2.5. Notifications included all organisations and individuals who had registered on the council's database to receive updates on planning policy matters.

2.6. The Statement of Representation Procedure (Appendix 1) produced in accordance with Regulation 16 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), advised that:

- The Draft Charging Schedule and supporting documents were available on the council's website, and also at the council offices and Wokingham Library;
- Representations could be made by email or post; and

- Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified on the submission of the Draft Charging Schedule to the examiner; the publication of the examiner's report; and the approval of the Charging Schedule.

2.7. WBC received 14 representations to the Draft Charging Schedule consultation. 6 representations were from town / parish councils, 6 from the development industry / landowners and 2 from statutory bodies. A summary of the main issues / points raised in the representations is provided in Section 3.

Clarification on CIL Viability Assessment

2.8. Table 7.3.1 of the Viability Assessment has informed the charging rates and zones set out in the Draft Charging Schedule, reflecting the evidence and justification presented in the assessment.

2.9. A formatting error has affected Table 1.10.1 within the Summary of the Viability Assessment. The formatting error affected the order of the proposed rates and zones.

2.10. For the avoidance of doubt, Table 1.10.1 has not been used to inform the charging rates and zones.

2.11. All representations received to the Draft Charging Schedule referred to the correct rates in Table 7.3.1.

3. Summary of main issues raised

3.1. There were 14 individual representations received.

3.2. A summary of the key issues raised is shown in the table below. These are grouped by the development types and proposed changes to the charging zones set out in Table 1 of the Draft Charging Schedule. Where relevant, WBC's response is provided.

3.3. A fuller summary of the representations received is set out in Appendix 2. These are set out alphabetically by representor.

Residential Development:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Loddon Valley Garden Village	Two landowners supported the proposed zero-rating of CIL for the Loddon Valley Garden Village as essential to the site's viability and delivery. Charging CIL on Loddon Valley Garden Village could duplicate infrastructure costs and undermine delivery.	Support noted and welcomed.
South Wokingham SDL	No changes were proposed by WBC to the existing Charging Schedule for this charging zone. Landowners for the SDL raised concerns that the retained indexed rate of £494.21/m^2 is not supported by up-to-date viability evidence. The CIL Viability Assessment (April 2026) indicates that the retained rate	The charging rates for the South Wokingham SDL charging zone is not included within the partial review and consequently the adopted rate will be carried forward with indexation. As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone.

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
	exceeds the maximum viable rate for relevant strategic development typologies.	Nevertheless, the Viability Assessment has tested the capacity of development typologies to absorb alternative rates of CIL rates to those in the adopted Charging Schedule. The assessment indicate that the maximum potential residential rates are broadly similar to the indexed adopted CIL rates being charged.
	No viability buffer has been applied to the proposed CIL rates, which means the CIL rates for South Wokingham have been set at the limits of viability. This does not provide a contingency for market changes or site-specific circumstances, and sensitivity testing is therefore required.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone. Notwithstanding, the Viability Assessment shows the indexed rates can be charged whilst not adversely impacting on the viability of development. Further, planning permission has been granted and is being delivered on the existing South Wokingham SDL that has been capable of paying the adopted CIL rates, demonstrating development remains viable.
	Section 106 costs for the site are claimed to be understated as the assessment assumes £18,000 per dwelling compared to permitted and live planning applications in the SDL assuming £30,000 per dwelling.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone. Paragraph 4.25 of the Viability Assessment states the allowance for on-site infrastructure costs is an average of £18,000 per dwelling. Section 106 costs are site-specific, and actual amounts will vary through negotiations in the planning application process. As set out above, development has been granted planning permission and is being delivered on the existing South

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
		Wokingham SDL that is capable of paying the adopted CIL rates and the secured Section 106 obligations, demonstrating development remains viable.
	Seek a separate charging zone for land south of Waterloo Road as currently it would be charged against the higher 'Rest of the Borough' rate.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone. The emerging masterplan for the extension of the South Wokingham SDL shows the majority of residential development is located within the South Wokingham SDL charging zone. Only a small parcel is shown within the Rest of the Borough charging zone, which has a marginally higher CIL rate. This is not anticipated to significantly affect the viability of development.
	Different affordable housing requirements are not adequately addressed or assessed in the viability assessment.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone. Disagree. Appendix 5 and 6 of the Viability Assessment clearly shows typologies can viably deliver up to 50% affordable housing, depending on the sales values and approach to securing community infrastructure. Paragraph 5.2 of the assessment clarifies that it has focussed on the outputs reflecting the 35% to 40% affordable housing requirements, in line with the requirements for the South Wokingham SDL set out in the adopted Core Strategy local plan and the Local Plan Update which is at examination with hearings complete.

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
	The viability assessment's conclusion that BLV3 and BLV4 broadly align with current rates does not address South Wokingham SDL's scale or demonstrate that the site-specific rate is viable. WBC should identify: a) Which typology represents the remaining South Wokingham SDL b) Relevant sales value c) Appropriate benchmark land value d) Applicable affordable housing percentage e) Robust section 106 and infrastructure costings f) Resulting maximum CIL rate g) Charging rate with buffer applied	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the South Wokingham SDL zone. Notwithstanding, the Viability Assessment shows the indexed rates can be charged whilst not adversely impacting on the viability of development. Further, planning permission has been granted and is being delivered on the existing South Wokingham SDL that has been capable of paying the adopted CIL rates, demonstrating development remains viable.
Arborfield SDL	No changes were proposed by WBC to the existing Charging Schedule to include the proposed allocation at Barkham Square in the Arborfield SDL charging zone. The landowner for Barkham Square objects to the Draft Charging Schedule. This is because there is a viability study that justifies applying a nil residential rate at Loddon Valley Garden Village, but no similar assessment that justifies retaining an indexed rate for Arborfield Green SDL.	The charging rates for the Arborfield Green SDL charging zone is not included within the partial review and consequently the adopted rate will be carried forward with indexation. As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the Arborfield Green SDL zone. It is unnecessary to undertake site-specific viability testing for the Arborfield Green SDL. A Local Plan and CIL Viability Study supported the emerging Local Plan Update and provides a robust and proportionate

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
		assessment suitable to the plan-making stage. The Local Plan Update is at examination, with the Inspectors' post hearing published which indicates the plan is capable of being found sound. No concerns have been raised regarding the supporting viability evidence. All of the adopted SDL has planning permission, with significant infrastructure having already been delivered or under construction. The majority of the additional development at the Arborfield Green SDL is at Barkham Square which forms a greenfield extension to the SDL. The site has limited on-site constraints. Its location adjacent to an existing SDL, where significant infrastructure has been delivered, means the infrastructure costs associated with delivery of the additional site are not abnormally high for the type and scale of development proposed. There is nothing unusual or unique about the Arborfield Green SDL that would warrant site-specific testing.
	Viability assessment should carry out sensitivity testing on a range of alternative CIL rates to demonstrate whether zero rating is necessary to maintain viability at Loddon Valley Garden Village and whether the existing rate for the Arborfield Green SDL is appropriate.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the Arborfield Green SDL zone. Notwithstanding, the Viability Assessment has tested the capacity of development typologies to absorb alternative rates of CIL to those in the adopted Charging Schedule. This has included site typologies similar to both Loddon Valley Garden Village and the Arborfield Green SDL (see

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
		Table 4.1.1). The results are presented in Table 6.6.1 and Table 6.6.3 to Table 6.6.19. A detailed site-specific analysis was also undertaken for Loddon Valley Garden Village to support plan-making. Based on this analysis, the Viability Assessment has recommended that on-site infrastructure requirements for the Loddon Valley Garden Village are secured through planning obligations, rather than CIL. The Draft Charging Schedule therefore proposes a nil rate for Loddon Valley Garden Village. By contrast, the additional development at Barkham Square forms a greenfield extension with limited on-site constraints. Its location adjacent to an existing SDL allocation, where significant infrastructure has and is continuing to be delivered, means the infrastructure costs associated with delivery of the site are not abnormally high for the type and scale of development proposed. The Viability Assessment also shows the indexed rates for the Arborfield Green SDL can be charged whilst not adversely impacting on the viability of development. Further, development has been granted permission and is being delivered on the existing Arborfield Green SDL that is capable of paying the adopted CIL rates, demonstrating development remains viable.

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
	There is a potential inconsistency between Figure 1 of the Draft Charging Schedule and the emerging allocation at Barkham Square. Clarify the boundary of the charging zone and the proposed rate for Barkham Square.	There is a very marginal difference between the CIL rates applicable to the Barkham Square site and the Arborfield Green SDL shown in Table 7.3.1 of the Viability Assessment and Table 1 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule. For residential development specifically, the proposed allocation at Barkham Square is included in the 'Rest of Borough' charging zone with a rate of £563.71 in the Draft Charging Schedule. The Arborfield Green SDL zone has the same rate. It is therefore not necessary for Barkham Square to be included in the Arborfield Green SDL charging zone.
	Information should be provided to demonstrate how WBC has considered the same issues and benefits that justify nil rating Loddon Valley Garden Village, and applied to other SDLs. The IDP identifies strategic infrastructure requirement that are proposed to be developer funded.	As noted above, the partial review does not include the CIL rates for the Arborfield Green SDL zone. The only residential CIL rate included in the partial review of the adopted Charging Schedule is the Loddon Valley Garden Village. All of the adopted Arborfield Green SDL has planning permission, with significant infrastructure having been delivered or under construction (e.g. the district centre). The majority of the planned development at Barkham Square forms a greenfield extension with limited on-site constraints. The site's location adjacent to the existing SDL, where significant infrastructure has been delivered, means the costs associated with delivery are not

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
		abnormally high for the type and scale of development proposed. By contrast, Loddon Valley Garden Village will be a new garden settlement, supported by a substantial and comprehensive package of infrastructure including new connections over the M4 and the River Loddon, schools, district and local centres, community infrastructure, SANG and open space, as set out in the Local Plan Update and supporting evidence. The garden village does not currently benefit from planning permission. The majority of on-site infrastructure at Loddon Valley Garden Village will be delivered directly by the developers. WBC's approach to CIL for Loddon Valley Garden Village therefore reflects the scale and complexity of the site, whereby comprehensive Section 106 agreements and other legal mechanisms will secure extensive on-site and directly related off-site infrastructure. The proposed approach provides a more appropriate and flexible mechanism than CIL for ensuring the timely delivery and phasing of infrastructure that aligns with masterplanning and delivery. Further, charging CIL on Loddon Valley Garden Village could duplicate infrastructure costs and undermine site delivery.

Sheltered Housing:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Loddon Valley Garden Village	Two landowners supported the proposed zero-rating of CIL for the Loddon Valley Garden Village as essential to the site's viability and delivery. Charging CIL on Loddon Valley Garden Village could duplicate infrastructure costs and undermine delivery.	Support noted and welcomed.

Residential institutions and Extra Care Housing:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Loddon Valley Garden Village	Two landowners supported the proposed zero-rating of CIL as essential to the site's viability and delivery. Charging CIL on Loddon Valley Garden Village could duplicate infrastructure costs and undermine delivery.	Support noted and welcomed.

Retail:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Loddon Valley	Two landowners supported the proposed zero-rating of CIL for the Loddon Valley Garden Village as essential to	Support noted and welcomed.

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Garden Village	the site's viability and delivery. Charging CIL on Loddon Valley Garden Village could duplicate infrastructure costs and undermine delivery.	

Purpose built market student accommodation:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Borough wide	University of Reading raised concerns to the proposed £500/m^2 rate for the following reasons: 1. The evidence in the viability report does not reflect the different market conditions. Latest evidence in the Savills Housing Market Update (September 2026) indicates annual growth was 1.6%, and not the 3.5% as assumed in the CIL Viability Assessment (April 2026) prepared by Quintic Advisory LLP. 2. The viability assessment concludes that the £500 student accommodation CIL rate would be directed to private operators – not to the University of Reading's	Disagree. The 3.5% figure quoted in the Viability Assessment is Savills' predicted increase to C3 residential sales values in the southeast market, which is not relevant to purpose-built market student accommodation. The Viability Assessment inputs are specific to the borough and based on up-to-date research on market conditions and industry standards. Furthermore, the growth forecasts referred to at paragraph 2.15 of the Viability Assessment were provided for information only; they were not reflected in the appraisals or the outputs. WBC agrees that clarification to the Draft Charging Schedule is necessary and has made changes as set out within the Statement of Modifications.

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
	provided accommodation. This is different to the CIL Draft Charging Schedule which is not limited to specific providers of accommodation.	The Viability Assessment utilises market rent based on the lower end of the range charged by Unite (£225 per week). The University of Reading's published accommodation charges range from £166 to £254 depending on the hall, room type, and contract length. This excludes accommodation with a meal plan.
	3. The viability assessment acknowledges uncertainty around need for section 106 contributions to this type of accommodation. It would be appropriate to focus on section 106 rather than imposing a higher CIL rate which risks delivery of student accommodation.	An addendum to the Viability Assessment has been produced to consider below market student accommodation rents. This demonstrates broad viability of rents charged by the University of Reading, however, to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding from CIL and the potential effects on development viability, the definition of 'market' has been clarified as set out in the Modification Statement to exclude schemes in which rents charged are below market rents, where secured through a planning obligation. This approach would allow all providers to deliver purpose built student accommodation at rents that are below market rented accommodation, where they wish to benefit from a nil CIL liability.
	4. The viability assessment does not acknowledge the higher-educational financial pressures, rising costs and falling incomes which have been experienced in the higher education sector.	The financial status of higher education institutions is not relevant to the economics of development of student housing by private sector developers (which are driven by rents, investment yields and development costs).

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
		The proposed CIL rate seeks to strike an appropriate balance between securing funding for infrastructure and viability. This is enhanced through the clarifications set out in the Statement of Modifications. Paragraph 6.17 of the Viability Assessment notes that a much higher rate could be achieved, and the proposed rate is set below the maximum rate to allow this development typology to absorb any potential changes to economic conditions over the lifetime of the charging schedule. The viability assessment has therefore taken account market conditions and economic circumstances.
	Earley Town Council supported the proposed introduction of a CIL charge on market student accommodation.	Support from Earley Town Council noted and welcomed.

Hotels:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Borough wide	Support from Earley Town Council to extending CIL liability to hotel uses.	Support noted and welcomed.

Industrial and warehousing:

Charging zone	Summary of main points	Council response
Borough wide	Support from Earley Town Council to extending CIL liability to industrial and warehousing uses. Seek clarity that this also applies to data centres.	Support noted and welcomed. Paragraph 4.5 of the CIL Draft Charging Schedule Background Paper (July 2026) explains that a new CIL rate is not proposed for data centre development due to the difficulties of applying the CIL regulations. The Viability Assessment explains the difficulties at paragraph 6.26 as the floorspace potentially being classified as floorspace where people to do not normally go or which people go only intermittently for the purpose of maintaining or inspecting machinery, which are excluded for the purpose of calculating a CIL liability. Infrastructure improvements necessary to support data centre development will be secured through Section 106 agreements.

General:

3.4. The table below sets out general points raised in representations which do not relate specifically to the Draft Charging Schedule but relate to the proposed approach to securing infrastructure improvements.

Topic	Summary of main points	Council response
Overreliance on Section 106 contributions	Issues were raised by town / parish councils to the proposed approach to nil rating the Loddon Valley Garden Village, including the following: 1. Reliance on Section 106 may not be equivalent to CIL in terms of the financial contributions apportioned to the town / parishes. 2. Further clarification is sought on infrastructure costs alongside risks relating to delivery triggers, monitoring, enforcement for Loddon Valley Garden Village. Infrastructure burden cannot simply be transferred to Section 106. 3. Proposed changes to CIL will also provide less flexibility in identifying and responding to local infrastructure priorities and the long-term nature of strategic development in addressing changes in infrastructure needs over the lifetime of the development at Loddon Valley Garden Village. 4. CIL provides a greater degree of local democratic accountability and is more transparent than Section 106 for allocating funds to infrastructure and so disagreed with the zero rating of CIL at Loddon Valley Garden Village. 5. Zero rating of CIL at Loddon Valley Garden Village could set a wider precedent for future strategic developments to be excluded from CIL.	The issues raised by town / parish councils relate to the use of Section 106, rather than the use of CIL, to secure necessary infrastructure. WBC's approach to CIL for Loddon Valley Garden Village reflects the scale and complexity of this particular site, including the type and nature of necessary infrastructure. The change from CIL to place emphasis on Section 106 does not reduce infrastructure requirements or expectations of the site. The deliverability, including the viability of Loddon Valley Garden Village, have been robustly tested through the preparation of the Local Plan Update. This has included a site-specific viability assessment, which was produced with the engagement of the site promoters / landowners, and shows the scheme to be viable. The Local Plan Update is at examination, with the Inspectors' post hearing published which indicates the plan is capable of being found sound. No concerns have been raised regarding the supporting viability evidence. The majority of on-site infrastructure at Loddon Valley Garden Village will be delivered by the site developers, with requirements and triggers set out in Section 106 agreements as part of each individual planning application. WBC has successfully used site-specific

Topic	Summary of main points	Council response
		IDPs linked to phases of development for the existing SDLs. WBC acknowledge that the regulations governing CIL provide a mechanism for passing a proportion of CIL receipts to the relevant parish council to support their local infrastructure priorities and that this would be removed for the Loddon Valley Garden Village. CIL receipts from development elsewhere in the local parish would continue to be passed to the parish councils to use. WBC welcomes parish councils highlighting local infrastructure needs through engagement on the Loddon Valley Garden Village. These will be carefully considered through the planning application process. The regulations governing CIL do not require CIL receipts to be spent locally to the originating development but allow spend more widely to support infrastructure needs arising from growth. Notwithstanding, local impacts are a key consideration for WBC when identifying and prioritising infrastructure projects. WBC publishes annual Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS), which provide transparency by setting out CIL and Section 106 income, expenditure and types of infrastructure intended to be funded.

Topic	Summary of main points	Council response
		The proposed zero rating of Loddon Valley Garden Village does not establish a general policy that will automatically apply to future strategic developments. Any future amendments to CIL rates or charging zones would need to be supported by appropriate evidence and follow the statutory process for reviewing the Charging Schedule. As set out above, WBC's approach reflects the scale and complexity of Loddon Valley Garden Village by responding to the scale, specific infrastructure requirements, delivery period and viability characteristics of the site. The proposed approach provides a more appropriate and flexible mechanism than CIL for ensuring the timely delivery and phasing of infrastructure that aligns with masterplanning and delivery of the site.
Parish funding	Several issues were raised by town / parish councils to the prioritisation of infrastructure funding and local mitigation. Further clarification was also sought on their involvement in decisions related to the spending of CIL monies.	The issues raised by town / parish councils are relate to the prioritisation of infrastructure funding and not the rates proposed CIL charges in the partial review. WBC acknowledge that the regulations governing CIL provide a mechanism for passing a proportion of CIL receipts to the relevant parish council to support their local infrastructure priorities and that this would be removed for the Loddon Valley Garden Village. CIL receipts from development elsewhere in the local

Topic	Summary of main points	Council response
		parish would continue to be passed to the parish councils to use. Whilst the Loddon Valley Garden Village would be zero CIL rated; there are several mechanisms to ensure the impacts on nearby communities are mitigated. This will be achieved through policy and Section 106, including the provision of on-site infrastructure. WBC welcomes parish councils highlighting local infrastructure needs through engagement on the Loddon Valley Garden Village. These will be carefully considered through the planning application process. The regulations governing CIL do not require CIL receipts to be spent locally to the originating development but allow spend more widely to support infrastructure needs arising from growth. Notwithstanding, local impacts are a key consideration for WBC when identifying and prioritising infrastructure projects. WBC publishes annual Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS), which provide transparency by setting out CIL and Section 106 income, expenditure and types of infrastructure intended to be funded.
Implications for future strategic development	Some town / parish councils were concerned that affected communities could lose direct developer funding and would lead to a greater dependence for funding decisions to be made at the borough-level.	The issue raised by town / parish councils are not related to the rates proposed CIL charges in the partial review.

Topic	Summary of main points	Council response
		The proposed zero rating of Loddon Valley Garden Village does not establish a general policy that will automatically apply to future strategic developments. Any future amendments to CIL rates or charging zones would need to be supported by appropriate evidence and follow the statutory process for reviewing the Charging Schedule. The regulations governing CIL do not require CIL receipts to be spent locally to the originating development but allow spend more widely to support infrastructure needs arising from growth. Notwithstanding, local impacts are a key consideration for WBC when identifying and prioritising infrastructure projects. WBC publishes annual Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS), which provide transparency by setting out CIL and Section 106 income, expenditure and types of infrastructure intended to be funded.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Statement of Representations Procedure

WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Partial Review of the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule 23 July 2026

Statement of Representations Procedure

In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (as amended) Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) intends to submit a Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for public examination, under Section 212 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended by Section 114 of the Localism Act 2011).

In accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), WBC has published the following documents for public consultation:

- The CIL Draft Charging Schedule, July 2026;
- Evidence to support the Draft CIL Charging Schedule including:
  - CIL Viability Assessment, April 2026.
  - Funding Gap Statement, May 2026.

The public consultation will take place between: 23 July and 23:59 on 7 September 2026.

The published documents may be viewed:

Online at:

- https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/planning-policy-and-developer-contributions/developer-contributions/cil-partial-review/draft-cil-charging-schedule-consultation

At the following places:

- Wokingham Borough Council, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN – 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday.
- Wokingham Library, Carnival Hub, Wellington Road, Wokingham, RG40 2AF – view the library opening hours.

Any representations must be made in writing during the public consultation period and must be received no later than the close of consultation at 23.59 on 7 September 2026.

Comments on the CIL Draft Charging Schedule and any of the evidence documents may be made by email or post to the below addresses.

Email: developer.contributions@wokingham.gov.uk

Post: Planning Policy & Infrastructure Team, Wokingham Borough Council, Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN.

If you, or anyone you know who would be interested in the consultation, needs support to access the consultation materials or if you have any questions about this consultation, please e-mail developer.contributions@wokingham.gov.uk.

The CIL Draft Charging Schedule must undergo a public examination by an independent person, before WBC can formally adopted it. In accordance with Regulation 21 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended), anyone who has submitted a response to the consultation has a right to request to be heard by the examiner. Such a request must be made in writing before the end of this consultation.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified (at a specified address) of any of the following:

- that the CIL Draft Charging Schedule has been submitted to the Examiner in accordance with Section 212 of the Planning Act 2008;
- the publication of the recommendations of the examiner and the reasons for those recommendations; and
- the approval of the CIL Charging Schedule by the charging authority.

Any person who has made representations about the CIL Draft Charging Schedule may withdraw those representations at any time by giving notice in writing either by e-mail or by post at the addresses given above.

The information provided in response to this consultation will be used by WBC and the examiner for the purpose of considering and examining the CIL Draft Charging Schedule, as required by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). By submitting this survey, you are giving WBC and the examiner permission to hold your details.

Representations will be available to view online, but address, signature and personal contact details will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, they cannot be treated as confidential. Data will be processed and held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and WBC's Privacy Notice.

Appendix 2: Summary of representations

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
1	Neighbourhood CIL and parish funding.	Arborfield and Newland Parish Council	Objection. • Affected parishes will receive no neighbourhood CIL. • Existing residents would experience long-term construction, traffic, service, landscape and community impacts without guaranteed neighbourhood CIL or flexible local mitigation. • Seek a positive rate for CIL, a ring-fenced parish allocation through section 106 equivalent to neighbourhood CIL, or another guaranteed community fund to affected parishes.
2	Loddon Valley Garden Village – Over reliance on section 106.	Barkham Parish Council	Objection. • Over reliance upon section 106 to secure infrastructure. • WBC should demonstrate the infrastructure costs attributed to the policy, and if those costs satisfy the legal tests. • Infrastructure Delivery Plan costs are indicative and insufficient to establish enforceable liabilities. • Concerns on the loss of neighbourhood CIL and setting a precedent for future strategic developments.
3	Arborfield SDL rates and charging zone	Crest Nicholson	No objection in principle, however: • Mapped extent and treatment of Barkham Square in context of the Arborfield SDL rate is unclear. • Claim there has been no comparable current viability assessment to justify rate setting, for example £0/m^2 at LVGV and £563.71/m^2 at Arborfield SDL. • Seek clarification on the boundary, comparable appraisal, sensitivity testing and review of the Arborfield SDL rate.

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
			• WBC should explain why the same approach to CIL is not proposed for other strategic allocations with substantial site-specific infrastructure needs, such as Arborfield Green SDL. • Existence of infrastructure funding gap does not provide sufficient justification for the geographical distinction between rates at LVGV and Arborfield Green SDL.
4	New chargeable uses.	Earley Town Council	General comment. • Limited receipt of CIL as Earley town is largely developed. • Support extending liability to purpose-built market student accommodation, hotels, industrial and warehousing development. • Seek clarification that CIL charge on industrial buildings includes data centres.
5	Loddon Valley Garden Village – Approach to CIL and parish funding.	Finchampstead Parish Council	General comment. • Seek assurance that the nil rate for LVGV is site-specific and not a wider move away from neighbourhood CIL for strategic development. • Seek clarification on how affected parishes would be compensated and involved in identifying, funding and delivering parish priorities through section 106.
6	Support for Loddon Valley Garden Village CIL rate.	Gleeson Land	Support. • Zero-rating essential to viability and delivery of LVGV. • Consider the allocation carries exceptional strategic infrastructure requirements for the site and wider borough. Local plan Policy SS13 and the live planning application provide a clear basis for section 106 obligations. • Charging CIL in addition to section 106 would duplicate costs and render the site unviable.
7	South Wokingham SDL viability.	Lightwood Strategic	Objection to retaining the indexed rate of £494.21/m^2 based on the following points: <u>Retained rate is not supported by the current viability evidence</u>

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
			• Evidence does not demonstrate that residential development can accommodate a CIL rate of £494.21 per square metre alongside a 35% or 40% affordable housing requirement on a low-density strategic development. Higher sales values would be needed to produce additional headroom <u>No viability buffer has been demonstrated</u> • No viability buffer has been applied to the proposed CIL rates, which means the CIL rates for South Wokingham have been set at the limits of viability, which do not provide a contingency for market changes or site-specific circumstances. • If based on the corrected Section 106 costs of £30,000 per dwelling, maximum CIL rate would fall below the retained rate (£494.21m^2) • WBC should identify and justify a viability margin and publish sensitivity testing for application of a 20%, 25% and 30% margin <u>The infrastructure cost allowance is inadequate</u> • Viability assessment understates assumed section 106 costs for infrastructure compared to planning permissions and live planning applications. • At least £30,000 per dwelling for a 2,000-4,000-home scheme based on strategic infrastructure costs • Viability assessment should be rerun based on a minimum Section 106 allowance of £30,000 per dwelling

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
			<u>Inadequate infrastructure allowance compounds viability</u> • Understated section 106 costs would reduce CIL capacity by approximately £118 per square metre • Retained rate for the revised charging zone is not justified at either 35% or 40% affordable housing, once realistic assumptions for Section 106 and infrastructure delivery are applied. <u>Charging zone</u> • Mapped extent of the South Wokingham SDL CIL charging zone does not cover extension proposed in the Local Plan Update. • Seek a separate charging zone for land south of Waterloo Road as currently it would be charged against the higher 'Rest of the Borough' rate. <u>Partial CIL review does not reflect viability evidence</u> • WBC has commissioned and published new viability evidence, including strategic typologies relevant to South Wokingham. Evidence is inconsistent with the retained rate <u>Impact on affordable housing and plan delivery</u> • Not sufficient to assume that section 106 can be reduced to preserve an existing CIL rate. Underestimating section 106 costs transfers the viability pressure to affordable housing, infrastructure delivery and scheme deliverability.

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
			• Evidence indicates that the existing CIL rate may exceed viability based on affordable housing requirements of 35% and 40%.
8	Not applicable.	Natural England	No comments on the Draft Charging Schedule.
9	South Wokingham SDL viability.	Nicholas King Homes	Endorse Lightwood Strategic's objection: • Request review of appraisals and sensitivity testing • Separate charging zone for the proposed extension of land south of Waterloo Road • Reduced CIL rate for the existing zone.
10	Loddon Valley Garden Village - Effectiveness of section 106 in existing SDLs.	Shinfield Parish Council	Objection. • Concern towards section 106 approach based on experience of the South of M4 SDL where development has delivered over 3,300 dwellings with increased pressure on highways and infrastructure. CIL has provided an important mechanism to invest in infrastructure and facilities, and its removal from Loddon Valley Garden Village will affect future communities • CIL is considered more transparent, predictable and flexible for smaller and evolving community needs. • Less discretion with Section 106 in directing funds towards local infrastructure priorities • Removal of CIL reduces uncertainty in addressing local impacts • S106 does not cover all costs associated with delivery and operation of community infrastructure • Delivery can be delayed, varied or dependent on complex triggers • CIL should be charged on Loddon Valley Garden Village due to long-term vision and flexibility to reflect change in circumstances and needs.

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
11	General support	Sport England	Support for proposals in the Draft Charging Schedule.
12	Support for Loddon Valley Garden Village CIL rate.	University of Reading (Savills)	Support. • Zero-rating for LVGV is essential to the viability and delivery of the site. • Policy SS13 and the live planning application secures extensive strategic infrastructure, where section 106 provides appropriate delivery control. • Additional CIL charge would duplicate the infrastructure burden and undermine viability of the site.
13	Purpose-built student accommodation rate.	University of Reading (Stantec)	Objection. • Market evidence to support a £500/m^2 rate set for purpose-built student accommodation is outdated. • Viability report distinguishes private market operators from university-provided accommodation at sub-market rents; however, the charging schedule is not limited to specific providers of accommodation. • Viability assessment does not acknowledge the higher-education sector financial pressures. • Higher CIL rate risks precluding delivery of student accommodation.
14	Loddon Valley Garden Village – effectiveness of S106 and neighbourhood CIL	Winnersh Parish Council	Objection. • Affected communities/parishes would receive no neighbourhood CIL. • Existing residents would experience long-term construction, traffic, service, landscape and community impacts without guaranteed neighbourhood CIL or flexible local mitigation. • Seek clarification on the proportion of infrastructure funding identified in the Viability Assessment (£3 million) that will be allocated to the Parish Council, and the method of apportionment between the affected parishes.

Rep. number	Topic	Respondent	Summary of comments
			• WBC should compare infrastructure funding with the neighbourhood CIL that LVGV would otherwise generate. • Seek assurance that the rate for LVGV is site-specific and not a wider move away from neighbourhood CIL for strategic development.