

From: Tim Ross [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 August 2025 14:03
To: localplan@york.gov.uk
Cc: Eamonn Keogh
Subject: RE: Representations on behalf of Helmsley Group - City of Yorks CIL statement of modifications Consultation
Attachments: CYC Revised CIL DCS Mods Consultation 2025 - Helmsley Securities Representation (CBRE 15.08.25).pdf; ylp2508.CIL reps.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear sir/ madam, please find the attached representations on behalf of Helmsley Group in response to the Council's CIL Statement of Modifications Consultation

Attached submission includes:

- 1) Over arching representation prepared by O'Neill Associates
- 2) Technical representation prepared by CBRE

Contact details set out below and within the submission.

Many thanks,
Tim

Tim Ross [REDACTED]
O'Neill Associates
Chartered Town Planning Consultants
[REDACTED]

www.oneill-associates.co.uk

This email may contain confidential information. It is intended for the recipient only. If an addressing error has misdirected

this email, please notify us – if you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, copy, print or rely on its contents.

O'Neill Associates do not accept any liability for viruses. O'Neill Planning Associates Limited Registration Number 4604201

City of York Community Infrastructure Levy Statement of Modifications Consultation

15 August 2025

Response on behalf of Helmsley Group

INTRODUCTION

- i. These representations are submitted in response to:
 - a. the consultation on the Statement of Modifications, Revised draft CIL Charging Schedule, and City of York CIL Viability Study Addendum (June 2025) by Porter Planning Economics.
 - b. they should be read in conjunction with previous representations made on behalf of Helmsley Group in response to the City of York Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Consultation March 2023 and January 2024.
- ii. ***This representation is supported by and should be read in conjunction with the Technical Representation prepared by CBRE and submitted with this representation.***
- iii. ***Helmsley Group requests to be heard at the examination of the City of York's CIL Charging Schedule, as an independent stakeholder organisation, and to be notified by the Council/ programme coordinator of all future events and proceedings. The notification should be provided to Helmsley Group, CBRE and O'Neill Associates.***
- iv. The proposed £150/m² flat residential CIL rate—excluding certain strategic allocation sites—would be the highest in Yorkshire and the Humber. By contrast, other authorities adopt zone-based rates to reflect local market values:
 - Leeds: £7.55, £34.72, £67.93, or £135/m² (index-linked)
 - Sheffield: £0, £46.18, £76.97, or £123.15/m² (index-linked)
- v. York's blanket rate ignores value variation and disproportionately impacts lower-value areas, as well as sites with significant development constraints/ risk requiring costly mitigation.

- vi. The CIL charging schedule should exempt conversion and extensions to existing buildings within the city centre to promote its regeneration, viability and vitality.
- vii. The CIL charging schedule should exempt all listed buildings in recognition of the significantly higher development costs associated with their restoration and redevelopment, and to incentivise their ongoing use and safeguard their future as a heritage asset.
- viii. The Council has failed to consider the effect of the proposed CIL charging schedule of potential **Grey Belt sites**, which national policy recognises as an important source of housing land. York is likely to depend on these sites to meet both overall housing and affordable housing targets. However, many Grey Belt sites delivering family housing with high affordable content also face **substantial S106 education contributions**—driven by child yield assumptions—which can vary significantly in scale.
- ix. When these S106 obligations are combined with a £150/m² CIL rate, the result is a serious threat to scheme viability, particularly for the very developments the Local Plan seeks to promote.
- x. This runs counter to the **NPPF requirement to significantly boost housing supply**. York is already falling far short of its Local Plan housing targets after more than a decade of undersupply. A charging schedule that imposes the highest rate in the region, without sensitivity-testing realistic policy and s106 contribution scenarios, risks suppressing both market and affordable housing delivery—undermining the objectives of the adopted Local Plan and the *One City, for All* Council Plan (2023–2027).
- xi. The proposed CIL charging schedule may unintentionally discourage traditional residential development (C3 use) in favour of serviced apartments and short-term lets (C1 use) which are zero rated. This creates a financial incentive for developers to prioritise short-term rental developments over permanent housing, as C1 schemes avoid both significant CIL payments and affordable housing obligations tied to residential projects. This shift reduces the supply of permanent and affordable homes, and would exacerbate local housing shortages.

Local plan targets

- xii. The adopted Local Plan 2025 spans the period 2017/18 to 2032/33 — a 16-year framework for delivery. Policy SS1 commits York to a minimum average annual net

provision of **822 dwellings**, ensuring at least **13,152 new homes** by 2032/33. Crucially, it also requires that **at least 45%** of the city's identified need for **9,396 affordable dwellings** is met during the plan period. This equates to **4,228 affordable homes**, or an average of **264 per year**.

Housing delivery

- xiii. The Council's *Annual Housing Monitoring Update* (July 2025) shows that by the local plan's halfway point, only **5,740 dwellings** had been delivered — **836 short** of the number needed to be on track.

Below - Extract from the Council's Annual Housing Monitoring Update (July 2025)

Table 2.9: Summary of data between 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2025

Year	Completions	New Build	Net Conversions/ COU	Net Conversions	Net Change of Use	Demolitions	Net Dwelling Gain	Communal Establishments	Overall net gain in Local Plan period
2015-2016	1171	908	219	1	218	6	1121		
2016-2017	996	420	564	21	543	7	977		
2017-2018	1336	1111	195	12	183	10	1296	35	1331
2018-2019	481	299	155	18	137	5	449	2	451
2019-2020	596	437	134	11	123	11	560	67	627
2020-2021	643	469	159	14	145	6	622	21	643
2021-2022	419	350	58	18	40	6	402	258	660
2022-2023	494	411	55	1	54	7	459	392	851
2023-2024	569	390	146	3	143	8	528	-63	465
2024-2025	675	395	262	4	258	8	649	63	712
Local Plan delivery 2017-2025	5213	3862	1164	81	1083	61	4965	775	5740
10 year delivery 2015-2025	7380	5190	1947	103	1844	74	7063		

- xiv. The Council has fallen short of its local plan targets for housing delivery for many years which, as a direct result of the draft CIL Charging Schedule, is likely to worsen rather than address the existing backlog.
- xv. The proposed rate or rates would seriously undermine the deliverability of the local plan, particularly with regards to residential completions, PBSA completions, delivery of affordable PBSA and housing, new open space delivery, and brownfield first principles, amongst others.

Affordable Housing delivery

- xvi. The Council's *Annual Housing Monitoring Update* (July 2025) paints a stark picture: every year since the local plan period began, affordable housing delivery has fallen well short of the adopted local plan target. By the plan's halfway point, only **993 affordable dwellings** had been delivered — less than half of the **2,114** needed to be on track. At the current pace, York will deliver just **1,986 affordable homes** by 2032/33 — meeting only **21%** of the identified need, and missing the Local Plan's affordability commitment by a wide margin. This shortfall risks deepening the city's housing crisis, leaving thousands of residents without access to the secure, affordable homes they need.

Below - Extract from the Council's Annual Housing Monitoring Update (July 2025)

Affordable housing completions

- 2.19 During the course of the monitoring year, 129 affordable homes were completed. Over the duration of the plan period so far (2017-2015) a total of 993 affordable dwellings have been completed.
- 2.20 The housing mix in relation to delivery over the last year and over the monitoring period mirror each other with the majority of completions shown to be 1/2 bedroom flats followed by 2/3 bedroom houses¹⁰.

Table 2.12: Affordable Housing Completions – Housing Mix

Year	1-bed flat	2-bed flat	1-bed house	2-bed house	3-bed house	4-bed house	Total
2017/18	25	32	0	6	10	1	74
2018/19	5	24	2	14	15	0	60
2019/20	31	47	5	18	16	7	124
2020/21	41	27	6	29	22	5	130
2021/22	68	57	0	40	44	10	219
2022/23	38	0	0	32	42	9	121
2023/24	11	26	0	61	33	5	136
2024/25	37	34	0	26	27	5	129
Total 2017-2025	256	247	13	226	209	42	993
% split for 2024/25	29%	26%	0	20%	21%	4	100%
% split over 2017-2025	26%	25%	1%	23%	21%	4%	100%

¹⁰ "Houses" includes a small number of bungalows.

- x. In practical terms what this means is that where a residential scheme liable for CIL has higher development costs that affect viability, and given that CIL is non-negotiable, it is the section 106 requirements such as affordable housing, that will be negotiated down. Delivery of affordable housing is a key objective of the emerging

local plan and 'One City for all: Council Plan' which will be severely threatened by the introduction of the draft CIL Charging Schedule.

- xi. Grey Belt sites are likely to become vital to York's housing and affordable housing delivery, as recognised in national policy. CIL should not be set at a level that undermines their viability.
- xii. Current S106 education contributions—driven by high child yield assumptions—are highly variable (as shown in the table extract below) and, when combined with a £150/m² CIL rate, risk making family and affordable housing schemes unviable.
- xiii. The CIL evidence base must **sensitivity-test** realistic education contribution scenarios to avoid a charging schedule that inadvertently blocks the very schemes the Local Plan seeks to deliver.

Below – Extract from City of York CIL Viability Study Addendum (June 2025) by Porter Planning Economics.

Table 4.13 Policy DM1/s106 costs per unit tested in this Addendum

Site	S106	Supplementary Education	Other key Infrastructure	Total cost	Cost per unit
Not Strategic Site specifics	£3,208,800	£3,112,461	£0	£6,321,261	£8,274
SS8 Land Adj Hull Road (ST4)	£886,200	£1,054,611	£1,000,000	£3,419,116	£13,000
SS9 Land East of Metcalf Lane (ST7)	£3,549,000	£9,992,240	£2,500,000	£16,041,240	£18,984
SS10 Land Nth of Monks Cross (ST8)	£4,065,600	£15,274,420	£3,000,000	£22,340,020	£23,079
SS11 Land Nth of Haxby (ST9)	£3,087,000	£12,955,738	£2,000,000	£18,042,738	£24,548
SS12 Land West of Wigginton Rd (ST14)	£5,661,600	£21,568,055	£11,900,000	£39,129,655	£29,028
SS13 Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15)	£14,023,800	£52,300,000	£74,900,000	£141,233,800	£42,295
SS14 Terry's Extension Sites (ST16)	£466,200	£0	£0	£466,200	£4,200
SS16 Land at Tadcaster Rd (ST21)	£663,600	£1,210,685	£0	£1,874,285	£11,863
SS18 Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33)	£630,000	£1,777,059	£0	£2,407,059	£16,047
SS20 Imphal Barracks (ST36)	£3,229,800	£9,093,293	£0	£12,323,093	£16,025

Source: CYC, Key Infrastructure Requirements Updated Gantt [Exam doc: EX/CYC/70]

- xiv. The lack of sensitivity testing, particularly for potential grey belt sites is highly concerning and undermines the robustness of the evidence base to justify such a high CIL rate compared to other areas in the Yorkshire region. It is essential that the CIL rates are set at a level which ensures that most developments remain robustly viable over time as development costs change – most likely upwards. As such CIL rates should not be set at a marginal viability point. It is vital for the Council to build in a significant degree of flexibility to ensure durability of the CIL charging schedule.

- xv. The reality and specific context of developing in York have not been properly considered. This is particularly pertinent within the context of a brownfield first context which is the thrust of the recent national policy statements, and the Local Plan spatial strategy. The majority of the city centre is located within an area of archaeological importance, and historic core conservation area. Both of these designations, and associated local plan policies increase development costs and have significant viability implications which are overlooked.
- xvi. Helmsley Group has two important schemes, that will deliver comprehensive regeneration of the Coney Street riverside area:
 - 1. 3 - 7 Coney Street York (reference: 23/00420/FUL & 23/00421/LBC) for Internal and external works to include extensions to roof to create additional storey, partial demolition of No.5 Coney Street to form connection to riverside and new shopfronts in association with redevelopment of site to create commercial, business and service floorspace, residential units and public realm space.
 - 2. Site Of 19 To 33 Coney Street York (reference: 22/02525/FULM & 22/02526/LBC) Redevelopment of 19 to 33 Coney Street, land to rear of 35 to 37 Coney Street and 39 Coney Street to 2 Spurriergate comprising conversion of retained buildings and new build elements of 3 to 5 storeys to create commercial/business/service floorspace (use class E), purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) and public realm works including riverside walkway, landscaping and access further to partial demolition of buildings.
- xvii. Both highlight the complexity of developing within York which has significant impacts in terms of viability. Both involve the restoration and conversion of listed buildings. Securing the long-term future of York's heritage for future generations is a key objective of the local plan, and the NPPF. The draft CIL charging schedule would prevent such development because it would not be viable. Both PBSA and residential accommodation above shops makes an important contribution to housing supply but its delivery is seriously threatened by the draft CIL charging schedule.
- xviii. A more sophisticated approach to the proposed rates would be setting a distinct city centre zone given the city centre commands the high values but also is subject to significant development cost because it is within an area of archaeological importance (huge risk/ cost for developments historically and in the future), the city

centre is all in the historic core conservation area, the extremely high concentration of listed buildings, and most is high flood risk. The rest of the city commands lower values but lower development costs (typically).

- xix. Without CIL relief (e.g. 'zero' rated) for listed building and the conversion and upward extension of city centre buildings the draft CIL charging schedule threatens the restoration and long-term future of York's heritage, and comprehensive regeneration schemes in the city centre.
- xx. The adopted local plan's policy requirements for most developments, particularly major developments have a cumulative cost impact when taken together. The Council does not appear to have fully considered how sites can also bear CIL given this demanding policy context. A full viability review and justifiable evidence of the modified policy requirements will be necessary. Policy requirements include (not exhaustive), the majority of which are not considered in the City of York CIL Viability Study Addendum (June 2025) by Porter Planning Economics.
 - a) 75% carbon reduction aspirations – policy CC2 (modification) (this is considered within CIL Viability study)
 - b) 10% Biodiversity net gain (this is considered within CIL Viability study)
 - c) Accessible Housing Standards (this is considered within CIL Viability study)
 - d) Archaeology – much of the city centre is within an archaeology area of importance which, taken on its own, gives rise to considerable risk, delay and development costs
 - e) H10(i) states:

"higher rates of (affordable housing) provision will be sought where development viability is not compromised".

This implies that development may be subject to additional affordable housing if it can be viably provided, and that a viability assessment will be required for all applications over 5 units which will delay the determination period significantly, particularly given to limited capacity of the District Valuer. Policy H10 requires all viability assessments to be reviewed by the District Valuer.

- f) Changes to policy H7 and the requirement for nominations agreements.
- g) Air Quality assessments/mitigation for all major applications
- h) Flood mitigation measures. Policy requires a 30% betterment for surface water runoff which typically requires attenuation or SuDS, and much of the city centre is within high flood risk area. Again, taken on its own, flood mitigation gives rise to considerable risk and significant additional development costs.
- i) Heritage policy. The vast majority of the city centre is within the York Historic Core Conservation Area and contains amongst the highest concentration of listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments in England. These heritage constraints arising from national and local heritage policies, taken on their own, gives rise to considerable risk and significant additional development costs.
- j) Travel Plan obligations e.g. car clubs, free bus travel, cycle equipment contributions, travel plan coordinator.
- k) Green infrastructure/ on-site open space provision – the local plan including its evidence base prescribes totally undeliverable targets with regards for open space as part of new development and currently S106 payments are sought for any shortfall. Will this now be provided through CIL and does this mean no on site provision is required? If not, on site provision has significant viability impacts.

For example, draft local plan policy G16 seeks on-site open space provision for all residential developments, except in exceptional circumstances or for small sites. The amenity open space requirement is typically around 40.5sqm **per bedroom** depending on the level of local open space deficit (by electoral ward) – this spatial requirements is set out in the 2017 open space & GI update - https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/14274/open_space_and_green_infrastructure_update_2017.

Cumulatively, the requirement for 40.5sqm per bedroom has significant implications for the viability of proposals, particularly large city centre schemes. A significant proportion of land within a development site would have to be given over to open space. This requirement does not seem to have been properly considered as part of the Council's draft CIL charging schedule evidence.

END

City of York CIL Statement of Modifications Consultation

Technical representation prepared by CBRE UK Ltd on behalf of:

Helmsley Securities Ltd

August 2025

Contents

Introduction..... 2

 Procedural Matters.....2

Matters of Representation 5

 Purpose.....5

 Significance of Proposed Revised CIL DCS Rates.....5

 Illogical Timing..... 6

 Outdated Evidence..... 8

 Lack of Transparency11

 Technical Deficiencies.....12

 Results & Re-Appraisal19

 Failure to Strike an Appropriate Balance.....22

Conclusions and Recommendations 24

Enclosures25

 Enclosure 1: Schedule of Proposed & Adopted CIL Rates in Yorkshire & Humber Region.....

 Enclosure 2: RICS BCIS – Rebased to York (Q3 2025).....

 Enclosure 3: CBRE Residential Appraisal – Typology 17.....

Introduction

Procedural Matters

Instruction Purpose

1. CBRE UK Ltd ('CBRE') has been instructed by Helmsley Securities Ltd ('Helmsley Securities'), which has land and property interests in York, to prepare a formal representation document setting out a technical response to the City of York Council ('CYC') Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Draft Charging Schedule ('DCS') Statement of Modifications ('SoM') consultation ('the consultation').
2. CBRE's technical representations focus upon the evidence base underpinning the CYC CIL DCS Proposed Modifications – specifically the City of York CIL Viability Study Addendum ('CIL Viability Addendum') produced by Porter Planning Economics ('PPE') and dated June 2025.
3. An overarching representation has been prepared by York-based town planning consultancy O'Neill Associates.

The Consultation

4. CYC has published the following documents:
 - Draft CIL Charging Schedule (June 2025)
 - Statement of Modifications (June 2025)
 - Notice of Submission (June 2025)
 - Consultation Statement (June 2025)
 - CIL Consultation Spring 2023 Representations
 - CIL Consultation Winter 2023 Representations
 - CIL Viability Assessment Update (June 2025)
 - CIL Sensitivity Test Viability Report (November 2023)
 - CIL Sensitivity Test Viability Report Errata Addendum (December 2023)
 - CIL Viability Assessment Study (December 2022)
 - CIL Infrastructure Funding Gap Assessment (July 2025)
 - Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (July 2025)
5. The CIL DCS SoM consultation ran to 15 August 2025.
6. Independent examination of the CIL DCS is scheduled for Tuesday 2nd September 2025, following the close of the CIL DCS consultation.

Prior Representations

CBRE was previously instructed by Helmsley Securities to prepare representations on the previous CIL Viability Study evidence base produced by PPE on behalf of CYC, as published as part of the CYC CIL DCS Spring and Winter 2023 consultations.

The previous representations highlighted technical issues with the evidence base, which undermined the validity of this to inform CYC's proposed CIL charging regime.

Many issues remain unresolved in CYC's latest published evidence base.

In summary, CBRE's previous representations identified the following issues:

- Illogical timing of implementation of CIL during a period of economic deterioration and challenge.
- Outdated evidence, in particular relying on unrealistically low construction costs that fail to reflect the recent inflationary environment.
- Absence of testing for the conversion of existing non-residential floorspace for residential use (e.g. upper floors in existing premises, which are prevalent in York).
- Unduly simplistic core/non-core residential pricing approach.
- Lack of evidence in supporting proposed Benchmark Land Values ('BLV').
- Lack of transparency by not providing corresponding viability appraisals for stakeholders to analyse.

CYC and PPE have provided a formal set of responses to the CIL Viability Study consultation representations within the 'CIL Consultation Statement'. This provides a summary of the main issues raised in both the Spring 2023 and Winter 2023 consultation and outlines CYC's response.

However, these responses lack robust justification and do not suitably detail why the issues raised within the representations have not been addressed within the CIL Viability Addendum.

As such, within this representation, CBRE has referred to and provided responses back to PPE's and CYC's responses set out within the CIL Consultation Statement and CIL Viability Assessment Update.

Helmsley Securities' Background

7. Helmsley Securities is a long-standing investor and developer in York, working across a variety of property sectors. Helmsley Securities intends to bring forward a major redevelopment scheme in York city centre and has a resolution to grant planning application (ref: 22/02525/FULM) for the redevelopment of land and premises at Coney Street, York.
8. This proposed development scheme comprises the provision of high-quality Purpose Built Student Accommodation ('PBSA') containing 358 no. rooms with generous communal amenity space including a shared lounge on each floor, cinema room, gym, yoga studio, quiet study rooms and café space.
9. The proposal will also deliver a new riverside public square providing flexible space for events and public riverside walkway with restaurants featuring outdoor seating. Retail space will also be provided offering a range of unit sizes supporting both independent retailers and large high street names. This will include provision of new retail frontages along a new route to the riverside from Coney Street and improved shop fronts on Coney Street.
10. In December 2024, Helmsley Securities had another planning application approved at 3 - 7 Coney Street York (ref: 23/00420/FUL & 23/00421/LBC) for Internal and external works to include extensions to the roof to create an additional storey, partial demolition of No.5 Coney Street to form connection to riverside and new shopfronts in association with redevelopment of site to create commercial, business and service floorspace, residential units and public realm space.
11. The latter proposal will convert empty space in listed buildings to residential use, and will create an upward extension to gently increase density and optimise the efficient use of the properties in the city. However, this form of development is costly, and will not gain relief from CIL.
12. CYC should give consideration to exempting conversion and upward extension to existing buildings within the city centre from CIL (by applying a £NIL rate) to promote its regeneration, viability, and vitality, and to

exempting all listed buildings from CIL (by applying a £NIL rate) in recognition of the significantly higher development costs associated with their restoration and redevelopment, incentivising their return to use and safeguarding the future of such heritage assets.

Helmsley Securities' Stance

13. Helmsley Securities has fundamental concerns regarding:
 - a. CYC's proposal to introduce CIL charging on residential dwellings within the City of York in the Revised CIL DCS.
 - b. The absence of CIL relief from CYC's proposed CIL charging on residential dwellings for conversion developments, particularly listed buildings.
14. It is Helmsley Securities' firm view that the introduction of the proposed CIL rates will undermine the viability of new development in an environment where recent long-term construction cost inflation, softened funding investment yields, and increased debt servicing costs have placed increasing pressures on development significantly since mid-2022. This is exacerbated by the limited availability of suitable sites in what represents a highly constrained urban context.
15. In light of above Helmsley Securities does not accept the validity and reliability of the published viability evidence base upon which the proposed residential charging rates within the Revised CIL DCS relies, and hence the legal compliance of the published Revised CIL DCS with the relevant legislation and guidance.
16. On this basis, Helmsley Securities cannot agree with CYC that there is an appropriately evidenced and legally compliant basis upon which the Revised CIL DCS (as published) could be found sound by an independent Examiner, which should unavoidably lead to the rejection of the Charging Schedule in accordance with Section 212A(2) of the 2008 Act.
17. Should CYC determine not to rectify the issues identified in this representation and O'Neill Associates overarching representation, Helmsley Securities will be left with no choice but to seek that the Examiner rejects the Charging Schedule via the examination process.

Request to be Heard and Notification Requests

18. It is stated on the consultation page of CYC's website that representations must clearly state a request to be heard at the examination of the CIL DCS. It also states that representations must clearly state a request for notification of the submission of the CIL DCS for examination, receipt of the Examiner's Report, and CYC's approval of the Charging Schedule.
19. This constitutes Helmsley Securities formal request to be heard at the examination of the CIL DCS, as an independent stakeholder organisation, and to be notified by CYC of the events listed in paragraph 12 above. This notification should be provided to both O'Neill Associates and CBRE, as instructed joint agents.

Matters of Representation

Purpose

20. This section of the document sets out the matters of representation that Helmsley Securities determine must be raised with CYC and ultimately, if left unresolved by CYC following the consultation, are for the consideration of the appointed Examiner.

Significance of Proposed Revised CIL DCS Rates

21. The Revised CIL DCS proposes a significant increase in the costs on development via the introduction of CIL charging on multiple uses for the first time.
22. Notably, the Revised CIL DCS introduces a revised residential CIL rate, and the reinstatement of strategic sites ST1 and ST5:

Modifications are represented as new text in **yellow highlighted bold text (December 2023 modifications)** and **blue highlighted bold text (July 2025 modifications)**

Development type		CIL rate per sqm	Modification Proposed Explanation
Residential dwellings within the City of York		£150	Amend the CIL rate to £200 from £150 to reflect revised viability.
Residential dwellings within the City of York Local Plan strategic sites ST4 , ST7, ST8, ST9, ST14, ST15, ST31 and ST33		£0	To include ST4, ST31 & ST33 as £0 to reflect revised viability.
Residential dwellings within the City of York Local Plan strategic sites ST1, ST5, ST16 and ST36		£100	No change to CIL rate. ST1 and ST5 have been reinstated in this section rectifying an omission from the December 2023 modifications.
Sheltered/ Retirement accommodation		£0	All sheltered/ retirement accommodation now proposed to be £0 rated to reflect revised viability.
Extra care accommodation		£0	All extra care accommodation now proposed to be £0 rated to reflect revised viability.
Purpose Built Student Accommodation	Off Campus	£150	Removed original categories. New split categories to differentiate geographically between on and off campus purpose built student accommodation to reflect revised viability.
	On Campus	£0	
Convenience ¹ retail with up to 450 sqm gross internal area		£0	Amend the CIL rate to £0 from £100 to reflect revised viability.
Comparison ² retail built outside the City Centre boundary		£0	Amend the CIL rate to £0 from £100 to reflect revised viability.
Comparison retail built inside of the City Centre boundary		£0	No change proposed
All other development		£0	No change proposed

¹ Convenience retail provides lower value good purchased regularly to meet day to day needs such as food, newspapers, petrol etc.

² Comparison retail provides higher value goods purchased less often, such as household items, electrical goods, clothes, shoes etc

23. These are not incremental changes, but rather represent a fundamental shift to introduce substantial rates of CIL charging across multiple uses on both a city-wide and a zonal basis.
24. It is notable that the rates proposed are amongst the highest, if not the highest, across the entirety of Yorkshire and the Humber, even when allowing for indexation since adoption in other Charging Authorities.

CBRE has provided a full schedule of proposed and adopted rates across the region as a comparison within **Enclosure 1**¹

25. Due to the challenging economic backdrop, only Calderdale Council has pursued the adoption or revision of a CIL charging schedule in Yorkshire and Humber, since Harrogate adopted their CIL Charging Schedule in July 2020.
26. CBRE is aware that other Local Authorities such as Birmingham City Council has halted proposals to formally review their CIL Charging Schedule over this period due to the challenging economic and property market context. CYC's proposition to introduce high charging rates for the first time is contradictory to decisions being made by other major regional cities and district authorities across the North and Midlands.
27. As a result, such proposals by CYC must necessitate comprehensive, robust, and up-to-date available evidence of financial viability to provide appropriate justification that they will strike an appropriate balance in accordance with Regulation 14(1) of the CIL Regulations (as amended).
28. Further reference to the illogical timing of CYC's decision to introduce a CIL charging regime is set out in the following sub section.

Illogical Timing

29. As noted by CBRE in previous representations, the UK property market is experiencing a prolonged and highly challenging period, which has been driven by substantial economic and geo-political uncertainty nationally and globally since 2022. This has led to a high inflationary environment against a backdrop of tightening monetary policy and a UK-wide cost of living crisis. Whilst the Bank of England base rate has contracted steadily under the current Labour government, development and investment across a wide range of sectors continue to face headwinds, which commenced in mid-2022 and are expected to prevail into early 2025.
30. Specifically:
 - a. The UK economy remains challenged with numerous headwinds. Most notably, inflation remains elevated, driven primarily by regulated gas price increases. As at June 2026, CPI was 4.1% and had remained in excess of the Government's target of 2% since 2021. This inflation has contributed to falling real household incomes throughout 2025.
 - b. Labour markets have also softened as nominal and real wage growth have slowed, and business taxation has increased. CBRE estimates that unemployment has increased 30bps to 4.7% since the Autumn Budget, and forecast the labour market to continue loosening through the remainder of 2025.
 - c. Global uncertainty and risks, driven by continued conflict in Ukraine and the Middle East coupled with U.S. Trade Policy, have stunted activity across the global economy. Despite the UK reaching a trade deal with the U.S., there remains a 10% tariff on most goods and 25% on exports of steel and

¹ Note: this information was obtained from Planning Resource and is understood to have been correct as at August 2025. The rates presented are not indexed, but represent those rates either proposed (latest) or at the date of adoption of relevant Charging Schedules.

aluminium. The ongoing geopolitical conflicts and potential escalation remains a threat to energy markets and medium-term price stability.

- d. For businesses, the prolonged period of high inflation and instability will continue to erode profit margins, reduce investment, and dampen activity. The increase in taxation via employer national insurance announced in the Spring Statement has placed further pressure on businesses.
- e. The consumer sector also remains volatile, showing month-to-month swings and remaining persistently negative. The GfK Consumer Confidence Index moved down to -19 in July 2025 from a six-month high of -18 in June, as household caution grows amid rising concerns over taxes and inflation.

31. Specifically, CBRE's baseline forecast for the residential market in 2025 is as follows:

- a. The residential sales market has gradually improved as mortgage rates have fallen, however volatile consumer confidence threatens to hinder this in the context of uncertainty looking forward to the Autumn Statement.
- b. Investment in the living sector in H1 2025 was 30% below the same period of 2024 and CBRE forecast this to be 7% lower for the year than 2024.
- c. A supply and demand imbalance persists, as new regulations have driven some landlords out. Persistent high and increasing construction costs, high debt costs, planning delays, new building safety regulations and associated delays are all contributing to challenges for residential developers.
- d. The anticipated introduction of Future Homes Standard and the Building Safety Levy in 2026 will add further cost burden upon residential developers, placing greater pressure on profit margins and compounding viability challenges.
- e. The inflationary climate coupled with macro-economic and geo-political instability and rising interest rates, has resulted in a softening of residential investment yields since 2023. This has stabilised during 2024 and 2025, but conditions remain challenging and subdued. The liquidity pool of investors seeking forward funding opportunities for Build-to-Rent assets is shallow and, due to the resultant viability constraints, there are few transactions occurring in this challenging market.
- f. In the context of this challenging backdrop, developers across the UK are relying upon grant funding to help support deliverability of residential schemes.

32. Against this backdrop, CBRE still questions the logic and rationale, and efficiency in use of public funds, for introducing a CIL regime at this juncture, given the wider challenges facing development and uncertainty in both the macro-economy and property market. CYC's proposals to increase the cost burden on development at this point will exacerbate uncertainty and slow or stall development and regeneration plans for residential development on sites across the city.

33. Under Section 5 of the CIL Consultation Statement, CYC & PPE address these concerns, stating that *"we acknowledge that markets do fluctuate over time, and even monthly, as they will after CIL is adopted, but it would be impractical to re-run the appraisals every month."* CYC & PPE state that *"instead, in setting the CIL rates, we have allowed for a significant buffer to accommodate such fluctuations."*

34. CBRE consider that CYC and PPE's response misses the point. Markets are in a prolonged challenging period. Any material upswing will likely take years, not months. The addition of a CIL regime will compound this and prolong the impact in York, deterring investment.

35. CBRE's critique of PPE's adopted viability buffer is provided within the 'Results & Re-Appraisal' sub-section of this representation.

Outdated Evidence

36. The published available evidence to inform the Revised CIL DCS is the CIL Viability Addendum produced by PPE dated June 2025. CBRE has reviewed the CIL Viability Addendum in detail.
37. PPE confirm, in paragraph 2, that the Viability Addendum *"sets out the evidence and summarises an update in sales values and build costs for new residential dwellings and student accommodations in the City of York at the current time, and their retested viability results based on the updated assumptions."*
38. PPE also confirm that *"all other viability assumptions that were tested in the City of York CIL Viability Study (Dec'22) and updated in the City of York CIL Viability Study Addendum (Nov'23) remain the same."*
39. This indicates that, of the information and assumptions underpinning PPE's viability assessment (as at June 2025), only sales values and build costs reflect up-to-date estimates. Therefore, PPE's Viability Addendum relies partly upon data dating as far back as December 2022.
40. As set out above, and well-documented, there have been significant macro-economic headwinds and property market adjustment issues over the period since, as well as substantive ongoing construction cost inflation, which are material considerations that any robust viability evidence base must account for.
41. Furthermore, there are a number of assumptions critiqued by CBRE in previous representations which have not been appropriately addressed or updated by PPE, and therefore, remain consistent with PPE's previous viability assessments. Notably, these are:
- a. **Garages:** The Viability Addendum includes a single garage cost of £9,000, which is maintained throughout both the CIL Viability Assessment Study (December 2022) and CIL Viability Addendum (November 2023). Under Section 5 of CDS4 'CIL Consultation Statement' (July 2025) PPE state that *"CBRE's technical note provides no evidence for us to check and/or challenge their opinion, and we consider that we have set an appropriate allowance for this strategic study in terms of separate garage spaces that may appear only on a minority of sites."* CBRE note that PPE's assumption has not been substantiated by evidence and the technical deficiencies of this are addressed within 'Technical Deficiencies' sub-section of this representation. Nonetheless, PPE's adopted rate of £9,000 per single garage is reflective of assessment of cost as at Q4 2022 and therefore does not account for the significant cost inflation that has occurred in the intervening period. These costs are, therefore, unreflective of those currently facing developers and risk overstating the viability of residential developments and associated headroom to accommodate a CIL charge.
 - b. **Demolition and land remediation:** The Viability Addendum does not provide a re-assessment of demolition and land remediation costs. Within the CIL Consultation Statement, PPE state that *"we therefore applied a widely used by the Homes England ready reckoner and have allowed inflationary increases."* As previously highlighted by CBRE, this remains reliant upon guidance dated 2015, which was withdrawn in 2022. It remains unstated and hence unclear how these costs have been calculated and what constitutes PPE's allowance for 'inflationary increases' and whether these have been allowed up to present day.
 - c. **M4(2), M4(3)(A), M4(3)(B):** Within CBRE's representation to the Winter 2023 Consultation, CBRE highlighted that the costs associated with accessibility and adaptability requirements were based upon a historic EC Harris report, dated 2014. CBRE requested that these rates should be indexed to present day to fully account for the impact of inflation. CYC & PPE acknowledge this point under Section 3 of the Consultation Statement, but it is not clear whether this has been reflected within

PPE's updated viability testing. Therefore, it appears that PPE's assessment remains reliant upon cost evidence which is more than 10 years dated, which risks overstating the viability of residential developments and associated headroom to accommodate a CIL charge.

42. In addition, New Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022 came into force on 23 January 2023 and under the new Regulations, a responsible person (usually a managing agent or similar) is required to provide information and carry out checks on fire safety for all buildings over 11m (or 5 storey) which contain at least two domestic premises.
43. In accordance with Approved Document B, there is also a requirement for firefighting lifts in buildings to offer additional protection and controls that enable it to be used by the fire and rescue service when fighting a fire. This is a requirement when the lift needs to travel more than 18m above or 10m below the fire service vehicle access level. The firefighting lift must have a secondary back-up power supply to ensure it continues to operate in the event of power failure in the building, a lift control system and a lift communication system.
44. The recent amendments to Approved Document B also introduces requirements for all new buildings of 30m (circa 10 storeys) or above from September 2026 to include a second separated staircase.
45. Developers and investors are factoring second staircases into plans for new development going forward in order that they can meet regulations, and be insurable, investable and deliverable. Specifically, Government states:

"58. Recognising that many schemes are in development, and this change would represent a significant change, we are proposing a very short transition period before implementing the changes.

59. The transition period will allow time for schemes to be completed but should not allow the opportunity for developments to get off the ground ahead of the new requirements coming into effect.

60. We would encourage all developments to prepare for this change now."
46. Based on the impact assessment conducted, the Government has publicly acknowledged that the implications of additional construction costs, and loss of build efficiency, will impact negatively on the financial viability of development and, as a result, is likely to reduce the propensity of higher density schemes to deliver affordable housing as a consequence:

"65. The costs of a second staircase will also impact the viability of high rise buildings, this is likely to reduce the amount of affordable housing that can be provided by developers."
47. The impact will be that gross to net build efficiency is reduced, meaning lower net lettable floorspace against a higher or equivalent gross internal area (GIA).
48. As previously critiqued by CBRE, in spite of recent confirmation and clarification relating to this requirement, it does not appear that the CIL Viability Addendum has accounted for the this or addressed the implication.

49. Furthermore, following technical consultation in 2024, the Government has announced the introduction of the Building Safety Levy², which introduces an additional charge on all new residential dwellings and purpose-built student accommodation (excluding affordable housing), following a methodology broadly consistent with CIL. Draft regulations ('The Building Safety Levy (England) Regulations 2025') were laid in Parliament on 10 July 2025, and whilst these remain subject to parliamentary approval, the Government has announced that the levy will come into operation on 1 October 2026. The confirmed levy rates for York are as follows:

- Previously Developed Land: £15.81/m²
- Non-Previously Developed Land: £31.61/ft²

50. Whilst development on brownfield land benefits from a 50% discounted rate, this nevertheless reflects an additional and non-negotiable capital cost to new development schemes with a negative impact on development viability, which should be considered within the CIL setting process.

51. Within paragraph 3 of the CIL Viability Addendum, PPE acknowledge the potential impact of the Building Safety Levy on viability headroom.

52. However, PPE simply state that *"these proposed regulatory changes will require secondary legislation, which we understand is planned for the end of 2025. These changes are therefore not yet considered certain and will not impact development viability at this current time."*

53. Considering the Government's intention is to introduce this charge from October 2026, with the BSL payment due prior to practical completion, CBRE considers it highly likely that this would impact development viability for a number of site typologies assessed.

54. It is also unrealistic to assume that CYC will review its CIL Charging Schedule in circa 12 months. Hence, the BSL will almost immediately act as a supplementary cost to CIL on development, which is not yet accounted for within the viability testing or the buffer allowance provided by PPE (as this buffer pre-dated the Government announcement of the BSL).

55. It is, therefore, recommended that:

- a. the published costs associated with BSL are incorporated with the viability assessment and/or sensitivity tested as a minimum to determine the impact on viability and CIL 'headroom'; or
- b. an alternative option would be to simply introduce a reduction in the proposed CIL rates commensurate to the additional cost of the BSL (on a £/m² basis), hence allowing an 'equivalence buffer'. It would be straightforward for the Inspector to recommend such a modification to the CIL DCS.

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/building-safety-levy-guidance>

Lack of Transparency

56. There is a lack of transparency in the CIL Viability Addendum that CBRE deems falls short of the requirements and expectations of PPG CIL (Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 25-019-20190901), PPG Viability (Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 10-010-20180724), the NPPF (para. 58), the RICS Guidance³ and RICS Professional Standards⁴, and which does not facilitate the viability evidence being genuinely 'available' for stakeholders to analyse.
57. The CIL Viability Addendum does not provide corresponding appraisals and cashflows to evidence PPE's revised advice.
58. Without appraisals, it is not clear which assumptions have been adopted, maintained, or updated since the previous CIL Viability Addendum (November 2023). Furthermore, without associated cashflows, stakeholders are unable to see stabilisation and exit periods corresponding to gross development value ('GDV'), monthly apportionment of construction and other costs and finance roll-up.
59. This means the actual viability testing evidence utilised to set proposed CIL rates is not published in its entirety, not available to the examination (i.e. Inspector or stakeholders), and cannot be interrogated appropriately.
60. As CYC's evidence has been produced by a professional 'expert' ('PPE'), then the principles applying to the role of an expert in civil litigation should apply equally to a CIL examination. In *The Ikarian Reefer* [1993] F.S.R. 563 Cresswell J confirmed (p.565-566) that an expert must make available the evidence that has informed their opinion with that data to be shared upon publication of the relevant reporting. This principle should also apply to the preparation of evidence to inform a CIL examination, and yet CYC and PPE has not provided the viability testing/appraisal evidence.
61. The Courts have also held that it is a basic requirement of a consultation, if it is to be fair and useful, for respondents to be given access to the evidence that has informed the consultation proposals such that stakeholders can understand why the consulting body has reached the decisions made, and in turn to examine the evidence and judgements arising. Withholding such evidence in the process of examining the CIL Draft Charging Schedule prevents stakeholders from undertaking this basic activity and hence undermines the effectiveness and fairness of the process. It follows that the Inspector will also be deprived of the ability to interrogate the evidence in the process of examination.
62. Should the Inspector move to recommend adoption of the Revised CIL Draft Charging Schedule, given the above failings, the subsequent adoption would present a risk of being found to have been unlawful having arisen from a consultation and examination process that is procedurally flawed.

³ RICS (2021) Assessing viability in planning under the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 for England, RICS Guidance Note

⁴ RICS (2019) RICS Professional Statement: Financial viability in planning: conduct and reporting, 1st Edition

Technical Deficiencies

Residential

63. There are a range of detailed technical issues identified, which render the CIL Viability Addendum as an unsound basis for setting the proposed CIL rates for residential development, and which Helmsley Securities advocate will require rectification prior to CYC proceeding with the Revised CIL DCS as presently published:
- a. **City Centre Development:** CBRE previously noted the unique characteristics of York City Centre as an archaeological area of importance, situated within the historic core conservation area, and suffering from widespread high flood risk, all of which constrain development and introduce additional costs. Under Section 5 of the CIL Consultation Statement, CYC & PPE state that *“a precise cost for archaeological allowance has not been included”* and reference allowances made for brownfield site clearance and remediation costs, professional fees, and contingency. CBRE has addressed these assumptions independently and do not consider these to adequately account for the elevated costs of development in the city centre, in comparison to the rest of the city.
 - b. **Repurposing Existing Floorspace:** CBRE has previously highlighted CYC’s longstanding ambition to see the City make better use of the spaces it has, notably conversion of upper floor retail space, which is generally redundant, into residential use. CYC’s ‘Our City Centre Vision’ (previously ‘My City Centre Vision’) explicitly sets out the objective to *“encourage re-use of the under-used upper floors of buildings through planning support and business rates approach”*. P.23 of the document also states: *“Floors above commercial units are significantly underused, dominated by storage for retail units and empty space. Introducing different and mixed uses to the centre will allow more of this space to be actively used, but conversions of these buildings are complex.”*
 - c. As the ‘My City Centre Vision’ document notes, conversion of these buildings are complex for a myriad of reasons. Some of the most notable being: planning challenges around bins / bikes / noise, City Centre access restrictions, achieving sound attenuation between commercial and residential uses and working in buildings of which a significant proportion are listed and all within a conservation area.
 - d. As outlined in paragraphs 7 – 12 of this representation, Helmsley Securities is an advocate of promoting residential development above retail with numerous projects delivered in the city, running through planning or in the pipeline. These projects illustrate the complexity of development within York, when involving the restoration and conversion of listed buildings and heritage assets.
 - e. Whilst development costs associated with conversion schemes are typically lower than new-build developments, there are additional costs associated with the difficulties of these projects. Moreover, policy requirements, notably those relating to sustainability, are likely to be more challenging and costly to meet when working with heritage assets. In addition, conversion developments would typically command lower values in comparison to new-build developments. This reflects a unique typology which cannot be accurately captured under PPE’s assessment of brownfield typologies and is, therefore, not reflected in the CIL Viability Study Addendum.
 - f. Upper floors for conversion represent an important part of the housing supply for the City going forward, particularly at this time when York, along with many City Centre retail destinations are going through a period of significant change given the ongoing effect that online shopping has had on physical retail offerings and the decline in large format retail generally. Furthermore, these conversion projects help secure the long-term future of York’s heritage assets, meeting a key objective of the Local Plan and the NPPF.

- g. It is not appropriate for CYC or PPE to infer that the in-use credit would be appropriate, as this would necessitate floorspace having been utilised for six continuous months in the three years prior to a planning permission being granted. Many such buildings and upper floor spaces are redundant and will have been empty for considerable periods, meaning they will not qualify from in-use credit from CIL liability.
- h. If upper floor residential conversions are to be encouraged to meet the undersupply of residential property in the City, this approach should be explicitly tested within the CIL evidence basis, fully accounting for the specific challenges of this development typology or should be excluded altogether from CIL liability (i.e. £0 rated).
- i. **Grey Belt Sites:** In December 2024, under the Labour Government's revision of the NPPF, the concept of 'grey belt' land was formally introduced to define land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land which does not strongly contribute to the following purposes of the Green Belt:
 - i. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
 - ii. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
 - iii. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- j. Paragraphs 156-157 of the NPPF set out the 'Golden Rules' for residential development in the Green Belt. In relation to affordable housing, this requires the provision of:
 - i. Affordable housing which reflects either development plan policies produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of the NPPF; or until such policies are in place, the policy set out in paragraph 157 of the NPPF.
- k. It is CBRE's understanding that, whilst the adopted York Local Plan does adopt differential affordable housing requirements for brownfield and greenfield developments, this was not produced in the context of, and therefore does not satisfy the requirements of, paragraphs 67-68. Therefore, affordable housing provision on Grey Belt sites in York must default to the policy set out in paragraph 157 as follows:
 - i. 15 percentage points above the highest existing affordable housing requirement which would otherwise apply to the development, subject to a cap of 50%.
- l. In the context of supply side constraints in the housing market in York, Grey Belt sites will be increasingly important in supporting housing delivery going forward. Based on the affordable housing requirements of Policy H10 of the adopted York Local Plan, and in accordance with paragraph 157 of the NPPF, Grey Belt sites in York will be subject to affordable housing requirements of 35%-45%. This has significant negative implications on development viability which has not been appropriately assessed as a specific typology within the CIL Viability Addendum. CBRE requests that this assessment is undertaken by PPE.
- m. **Residential Values:**
 - i. **Geographical Pricing:** CBRE previously critiqued the use of a fixed average sales values across both York city centre and areas outside the city 'core'. Within Section 5 of the CIL Consultation Statement, CYC & PPE state *"we understand that there will be variance at the lowest level given the proximity of schools, parks and other factors that drive differences in prices, but our understanding from our consultations informing the viability testing is that prices do not vary so much that this would require different value area zones across York."*

- ii. CYC & PPE reference the sales evidence provided within Appendix A1 of the CIL Viability Addendum, stating that *“the data indicates that over half (54%) of the transactions are within $\pm£500$ psm of the average figure of $\pounds 3,792$. 72% are within when the sample is extended to $\pm£750$ psm”* and therefore claim that *“such differences are unlikely to be of significance given the considerable headroom identified and the excess of a buffer that is used when setting the proposed CIL rates.”*
- iii. CBRE would argue that a difference in average value of $\pounds 500/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 47/\text{ft}^2$) to $\pounds 750/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 70/\text{ft}^2$) is not insignificant and could translate to significant viability impacts, likely eroding the entire identified CIL ‘headroom’ in most cases.
- iv. Without access to the supporting appraisals, it is not possible to determine the potential viability impact of more granular geographical pricing and CBRE requests that this sensitivity analysis is undertaken by PPE.

n. **Construction Costs:**

- i. **Flatted / Apartment Costs:** The CIL Viability Addendum adopts the RICS BCIS (median) midpoint rate between flats 1-2 storey and flats 3-5 storey over a 15-year (default) period at a cost of $\pounds 1,631/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 152/\text{ft}^2$) as at Q1 2025 for the construction of apartments across York. This reflects a 3.2% increase on construction costs adopted for the CIL Viability Addendum at Q2 2023. However, CBRE is of the opinion that this does not go far enough in fully reflecting inflation of construction costs during this period.
- ii. Based on recent experience, CBRE confirm that it is not possible to construct residential apartments within the city (and certainly not the city centre) at the cost rate adopted within the viability modelling. It will substantially overstate the financial viability of flatted apartment development typologies.
- iii. CBRE has reviewed the latest RICS BCIS data published at 26 July 2025, with tenders restricted to the last 5 years, which represents a more up-to-date sample of tendered costs. On this basis, the RICS (median) midpoint rate between flats 1-2 storey and flats 3-5 storey equates to $\pounds 1,885/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 172/\text{ft}^2$), which is an increase of 13% from PPE’s adopted rate. This supports CBRE’s view that the sample relied upon by PPE is overstating the financial viability of apartment developments within their assessment. The data is provided within **Enclosure 2**.
- iv. Furthermore, in the context of the unique characteristics of the City as an area of archaeological importance, within a historic core conservation area with a high concentration of listed buildings, and a vast high flood risk area, CBRE is of the opinion that the RICS BCIS Median rate underestimates the cost of development in the city centre. CBRE would advocate that the RICS BCIS upper quartile rate should represent the minimum base construction cost for generic viability testing developer-led residential typologies. On the basis of the RICS BCIS data published at 26 July 2025, with tenders restricted to the last 5 years, a midpoint between the lower quartile rates for flats 1-2 storey and flats 3-5 storey equates to $\pounds 2,222/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 206/\text{ft}^2$), which is an increase of 36% from PPE’s adopted rate.
- v. **House Costs:** The CIL Viability Addendum adopts the RICS BCIS Estate Housing – Generally (median) rate of $\pounds 1,441/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 134/\text{ft}^2$) for medium housebuilders (4-49 units) and the Estate Housing – Generally (lower quartile) rate of $\pounds 1,274/\text{m}^2$ ($\pounds 118/\text{ft}^2$) for large housebuilders (50+ units).

- vi. CBRE has also cross-checked these rates against the latest RICS BCIS data published at 26 July 2025, with tenders restricted to the last 5 years, which represents a more up-to-date sample of tendered costs. On this basis, the Estate Housing – Generally (median) rate equates to £1,643/m² (£153/ft²) and the Estate Housing – Generally (lower quartile) rate equates to £1,380/m² (£128/ft²).
- vii. This indicates that the cost rates adopted within the viability modelling for houses is also unrealistically low, skewed by tenders which are no longer reflective of costs currently facing housebuilders. As such, the sample relied upon by PPE is overstating the financial viability of housing developments within their assessment.
- o. **Garages:** As discussed within paragraph 38a of this representation, The CIL Viability Addendum maintains a single garage cost of £9,000/unit. As previously highlighted by CBRE, the latest information provided to CBRE by housebuilders places the current cost at approximately £15,000 per single garage in 2025. Evidence of this from Yorkshire and the North West of England, indexed to Q3 2025⁵, is summarised in Table 1 below.

Table 1: CBRE Garage Cost Benchmarking

Site	Region	Cost Date	Avg Cost (excl. Abnormals)	Indexed Avg Cost (excl. Abnormals)
Site A	Yorkshire and the Humber	Jan-25	£14,164	£14,306
Site B	North Yorkshire	Jan-25	£15,180	£15,333
Site C	North West	Jul-25	£14,331	£14,331
Average			£14,559	£14,657

Source: CBRE

- i. As a result, the cost allowance in the CIL Viability Study Addendum is considered unreasonably low and not reflective of the construction costs facing housebuilders in the current market.
- p. **Other development costs:**
 - i. **Contingency:** The contingency rate adopted within the CIL Viability Addendum is maintained at 4.00%. CBRE previously highlighted the elevated risk associated with the redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly in York where constraints are multiple. Under Section 5 of the CIL Consultation Statement, CYC & PPE respond to this, stating “*in line with PPG Viability, it is not necessary to include a contingency rate within high level viability studies such as this.*” This fails to address the concerns raised by CBRE in previous representations.

⁵ Indexed using BCIS All-in TPI

- ii. CBRE is aware of several recent evidence from Local Plan viability studies which adopt a contingency allowance of 5%. These are as follows:
 - a. Within the Oadby & Wigston Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study Stakeholder Workshop (June 2025), Aspinall Verdi adopted contingency at 5.0% for brownfield sites.
 - b. Additionally, within the Charnwood Borough Council Community Infrastructure Levy - Viability Study Stakeholder Workshop (May 2025), Aspinall Verdi adopted contingency at 5.0% for brownfield sites.
 - c. Birmingham City Council Birmingham Whole Plan Viability Assessment prepared by Aspinall Verdi in April 2024 adopts a contingency at 5.0% for brownfield sites.
 - d. Amber Valley Borough Council Local Plan Viability Assessment also prepared by Aspinall Verdi in February 2024 adopts a contingency at 5.0% for brownfield sites.
 - e. Durham County Council Local Plan Viability Testing Update prepared by CP Viability in October 2023 adopts a 5.0% contingency allowance for brownfield sites.
 - f. Ashfield District Council Whole Plan Viability Assessment prepared by NCS in March 2023 incorporates an allowance of 5.0% contingency with no differentiation between greenfield and brownfield sites.
- iii. Within Yorkshire specifically, the latest CIL viability evidence produced relates to the Calderdale Council DCS, produced by Aspinall Verdi in June 2023. Aspinall Verdi adopt a 5% contingency allowance for brownfield sites.
- iv. On this basis, there is clear evidence of consensus amongst professionals that 5% represents a reasonable contingency allowance for development of brownfield sites within the current market.
- v. Furthermore, CBRE notes that within the viability review of Helmsley Securities' application at 19 to 33 Coney Street (Ref: 22/02525/FULM), CYC's independent advisor, Stannybrook Property Consultants, accepted that a 5% contingency allowance was reasonable. This is a brownfield site within the City Centre, involving complex conversion of existing heritage assets. This indicates that CYC deem a 5% contingency allowance to be reasonable in site-specific circumstances on brownfield sites in York, and CBRE therefore questions why a reduced rate is advocated within this area wide assessment.
- vi. As such, CBRE maintains that the contingency rate for brownfield sites should be adjusted upwards from 4.00% to 5.00% to reflect an adequate allowance for contractor's and developer's risk.
- q. **Section 106 costs:**
 - i. The CIL Viability Addendum maintains the policy costs and Section 106 obligations assumed within the CIL Viability Study. These are extracted below for reference.

Table 4.13 Policy DM1/s106 costs per unit tested in this Addendum

Site	S106	Supplementary Education	Other key Infrastructure	Total cost	Cost per unit
Not Strategic Site specifics	£3,208,800	£3,112,461	£0	£6,321,261	£8,274
SS8 Land Adj Hull Road (ST4)	£886,200	£1,054,611	£1,000,000	£3,419,116	£13,000
SS9 Land East of Metcalf Lane (ST7)	£3,549,000	£9,992,240	£2,500,000	£16,041,240	£18,984
SS10 Land Nth of Monks Cross (ST8)	£4,065,600	£15,274,420	£3,000,000	£22,340,020	£23,079
SS11 Land Nth of Haxby (ST9)	£3,087,000	£12,955,738	£2,000,000	£18,042,738	£24,548
SS12 Land West of Wigginton Rd (ST14)	£5,661,600	£21,568,055	£11,900,000	£39,129,655	£29,028
SS13 Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15)	£14,023,800	£52,300,000	£74,900,000	£141,233,800	£42,295
SS14 Terry's Extension Sites (ST16)	£466,200	£0	£0	£466,200	£4,200
SS16 Land at Tadcaster Rd (ST21)	£663,600	£1,210,685	£0	£1,874,285	£11,863
SS18 Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33)	£630,000	£1,777,059	£0	£2,407,059	£16,047
SS20 Imphal Barracks (ST36)	£3,229,800	£9,093,293	£0	£12,323,093	£16,025

Source: CYC, Key Infrastructure Requirements Updated Gantt [Exam doc: EX/CYC/70]

- ii. This demonstrates a total cost per unit ranging from £11,863 to £42,295 across the residential strategic sites. For non-strategic sites, PPE assume a blanket rate of £8,274/unit.
 - iii. CBRE notes that a significant proportion of these costs are driven by education contributions, which are underpinned by estimates of child yield. Different sites will generate different child yields, depending on the provision of family housing. As such, CBRE deems it is not reasonable to apply a single assumption for S106 education contributions to all site typologies.
 - iv. Residential developments delivering family housing, typically on greenfield sites, will be subject to a significantly higher education contribution, in comparison to a higher density non-family housing development. Considering the concerns raised within paragraph 53g of this representation regarding the elevated affordable housing requirement on Grey Belt sites, it should be considered that these sites are also likely to be subject to higher education contribution requirements, placing further pressure on development viability. When combined with CYC & PPE's proposed residential CIL rate of £150/m², this risks undermining the viability of these typologies.
 - v. Considering the variability and scale of S106 costs across the strategic sites, CBRE requests that PPE sensitivity test a range of education contributions to reflect a realistic variation and to ensure that the CIL Charging Schedule does not inadvertently stifle housing delivery.
- r. **BLV:**
- i. **Residential Typologies:** PPE formed opinions of residential land BLVs for the Local Plan viability assessment undertaken in 2018. Subsequently, for the purpose of the CIL Viability Study (December 2022), PPE reportedly used Savills Residential Land Value Index as a proxy to determine the change in current BLVs since the preparation of the Local Plan viability assessment.

- ii. As previously noted by CBRE, it appears that the CIL Viability Study Addendum does not rely on any new land transactional evidence since 2018. PPE has not sought to obtain up to date transactional evidence, which CBRE considers a significant oversight by PPE.
- iii. CBRE therefore remains unclear on the logic and relevance behind the BLVs adopted in the CIL Viability Study Addendum. The BLVs have been extracted from the residential appraisals and reiterated in table 2 below.

Table 2: CIL Viability Study & CIL Viability Study Addendum | BLV

Typology	BLV per gross area (hectares)
Residential (City Centre)	£1,700,000
Residential (Urban & Suburban)	£1,120,000
Residential (Village/Rural)	£900,000
Residential Agricultural /Greenfield	£450,000

Source: CYC

- iv. In previous representations, CBRE gathered market transactional evidence for sites brought forward for residential use as set out below.
 - 1. Eboracum Way, York: In December 2022, the 0.57-acre site was acquired by Modernistiq (Layerthorpe) Ltd for £2,900,000 (£5,102,669/gross acre). Residential scheme comprising 62 units (planning ref: 19/01467/FULM).
- v. Under Section 5 of the CIL Consultation Statement, CYC & PPE state *“the sighted land value that CBRE provide for the Eboracum Way scheme does not inform us if the price paid is the minimum that the landowner would sell a site for after excluding hope value, as is the criteria for setting BLV within PPG Viability.”* However, CYC & PPE fail to provide up-to-date transactional evidence to justify maintaining the rates set out in Table 2.
- vi. CBRE recommends that CYC seek to source and consider such evidence in taking a ‘stand back’ approach and a York-specific market sense-check.
- s. **Summary:** Overall, CBRE would advocate a cautious approach is taken by CYC to setting CIL rates in what continues to be a volatile housing market in 2025, particularly if CYC is minded to seek to maintain or increase levels of affordable housing provision as part of the overall housing supply.

Results & Re-Appraisal

64. The CIL Viability Study Addendum sets out the results of the updated viability modelling within Table A3 on p.3. This is replicated below for ease.

Table A3 Viability of residential developments in CYC and their £psm CIL liable floorspace headroom

ID	Typology	Headroom per CIL liable sqm	
		Addendum Nov 2023	Addendum Jun'25
2	Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium - 50 dwellings - Greenfield	£347	£100
3	Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small - 20 dwellings - Greenfield	£531	£279
4	Urban - Large - 45 dwellings – Greenfield	£335	£100
5	Urban - Medium - 25 dwellings – Greenfield	£366	£130
6	Urban - Small - 10 dwellings – Greenfield	£554	£373
7	Suburban - Large - 140 dwellings – Greenfield	£362	£140
8	Suburban - Medium - 38 dwellings – Greenfield	£290	£54
9	Suburban - Small - 8 dwellings – Greenfield	£499	£318
10	Village - Village - 122 dwellings – Greenfield	£245	£23
11	Village - Large - 33 dwellings – Greenfield	£298	£62
12	Village - Medium - 7 dwellings – Greenfield	£514	£333
13	Village - Small - 4 dwellings – Greenfield	£561	£380
14	Centre/ City Centre Extension - Large - 95 dwellings - Brownfield	£458	£240
15	Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium - 50 dwellings - Brownfield	£514	£292
16	Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small - 20 dwellings - Brownfield	£561	£335
17	Urban - Large - 45 dwellings – Brownfield	£362	£150
18	Urban - Medium - 25 dwellings – Brownfield	£371	£158
19	Urban - Small - 10 dwellings – Brownfield	£487	£306
20	Suburban - Large - 140 dwellings – Brownfield	£421	£219
21	Suburban - Medium - 38 dwellings – Brownfield	£281	£68
22	Suburban - Small - 8 dwellings – Brownfield	£414	£233
23	Village - Village - 122 dwellings – Brownfield	£301	£99
24	Village - Large - 33 dwellings – Brownfield	£270	£57
25	Village - Medium - 7 dwellings – Brownfield	£416	£234
26	Village - Small - 4 dwellings – Brownfield	£463	£279
41	SS14 Terry's Extension Sites (ST16)	£310	£117
46	SS20 Imphal Barracks (ST36)	£363	£157

65. In paragraph 10, PPE state “despite the reductions in sales values and increases in build costs during the past 18 months in the City of York, all sites remain viable under the cumulative Local Plan policies in the current market.”
66. Table A3 presents PPE’s headroom analysis which concludes that all residential typologies can viably accommodate both CIL and the cumulative Local Plan policies, including 20% / 30% affordable housing, in the current market.
67. The headroom analysis maintains PPE’s previous conclusions that only Strategic Site 16 (‘SS14 Terry’s Extension Sites’) and Strategic Site 36 (‘SS20 Imphal Barracks’) can viably accommodate CIL.

68. It is evident that there has been a severe compression in the headroom based on PPE's updated viability evidence for almost all typologies tested.
69. This is notwithstanding representations that the conclusions within Table A3 and the CIL Viability Study Addendum are not reflective of the full deterioration in market conditions over the past 24 months. CBRE cannot support the levels of CIL headroom being identified within Table A3 for residential typologies, for the reasons set out earlier within this representation.
70. On the basis of the levels of CIL headroom identified within Table A3, PPE state *"an average rate of £200 psm remains the highest amount that the generic sites could afford in the bulk of cases."* PPE apply a viability buffer of 25% to this to arrive at a CIL rate of £150/m² for non strategic residential sites.
71. Firstly, it appears that PPE's identified headroom of £200/m² reflects an average of the headroom identified for each residential typology tested (2 to 26). PPE's suggestion that, in the majority of cases, this reflects the 'highest amount' of CIL that the non-strategic sites could support is therefore incorrect.
72. On the basis of this flawed methodology, PPE apply a blanket residential CIL rate across all non strategic residential typologies, which reflect varying sizes and market contexts. Table A3 presents a number of residential typologies which PPE determine to generate a CIL headroom of less than £150/m² – these site typologies are medium and larger scale. On this basis, these typologies, which would be expected to account for a high provision of CYC's housing land supply would be unable to viably support the CIL charge proposed by PPE and would be rendered financially unviable.
73. It appears that many of the site typologies that demonstrate CIL headroom within Table A3 are limited to very small scale – frequently being 10 units or fewer.
74. Secondly, PPE state that *"a buffer of 25% is considered appropriate for setting CIL within the context of Planning Policy Guidance, which provides standard inputs, including the developer return, which guidance suggests should be between 15% and 20% of GDV, adjusting for risk, when establishing plan policies, including CIL."*
75. CBRE notes that the PPG paragraph referenced by PPE (PPG Viability, Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 10-018-20190509) provides guidance only on a reasonable allowance for developer's return and provides no guidance on viability buffers. CBRE notes that PPG advocates the application of a buffer in relation to CIL, however, appropriate levels of viability buffers are not explicit in the NPPF / PPG and should be based on a number of factors including local market conditions and development / delivery risk.
76. CBRE notes that within PPE's initial CIL Viability Study (December 2022), PPE included a 60% buffer, stating that *"the City of York is likely to soon have a Local Plan that will place non CIL funding obligations on future developments including new costs for meeting the Climate Emergency and affordable housing rates, which the development industry will need to absorb, and this might take time to bed in."* PPE also consider the context that *"there is also uncertainty in the economy that is currently heading into recession, and uncertainty in the planning system due to the current Government's narrative for introducing significant reforms."*
77. PPE acknowledges in their initial CIL Viability Study that a cautious viability buffer enables the marketplace to *"easily adjust to the new form of infrastructure funding along with the new Local Plan policies without coming forward to negotiate on viability grounds or amending or delaying delivery until they feel certain that it is worthwhile progressing with their current development proposal"*.
78. It is evident in the CIL Viability Study that PPE view a higher viability buffer (60%) greater facilitates the delivery of homes, in the context of emergent legislation and Local Plan policy requirements. As such legislation and policies are now coming into effect, and PPE's CIL Viability Addendum (June 2025) indicates that viability has worsened through reduced values and rising costs, CBRE questions why PPE's stance on a

reasonable viability buffer has shifted. It appears highly contradictory and represents a wholesale reversal of PPE's prior professional advice to CYC.

79. CBRE is aware of a research study⁶ published by Lichfields planning consultants in August 2021, which presents analysis that indicates viability buffers ranged from 20-70% and noted higher buffers applied to larger and strategic sites.
80. CBRE considers that PPE's adopted viability buffer of 25% is beyond the lower end of expectations, particularly considering the trends in values and build costs observed by PPE, and given the technical deficiencies highlighted above. CBRE advocates that a viability buffer of 50%+ should be applied, in this context.
81. Regarding the two Strategic Sites assessed, PPE state that *"the updated viability results show them to have lower viability headrooms in the current market."* Following this, PPE state that *"the current proposed DCS rate of £100 psm would still result in viable developments, including a 17% viability buffer for ST16 and a 57% buffer for ST36."* On this basis, PPE claim that *"from this analysis, an appropriate rate for non strategic site delivery of residential dwellings at ST16 and ST36 remains at £100 psm."*
82. CBRE questions why, having stated that a 25% viability buffer is appropriate, PPE deems a 17% viability buffer to be acceptable for ST16. This is further undermined by PPE's view that a 57% buffer is appropriate for site ST36. Considering the underlying market dynamics and economic backdrop acknowledged both by PPE and CBRE, as outlined above, plus additional costs such as BSL, it is evident that a 17% viability buffer could easily be eroded and risk the viability of the scheme. As such, CBRE also advocates that a viability buffer of 50%+ should also be applied to all strategic sites, with any identified headroom for CIL adjusted downwards to accommodate this buffer, rather than the opposite.

CBRE Updated Appraisal Modelling | Residential

83. Given CBRE's analysis set out above firmly highlights both technical issues within the CIL Viability Addendum (2025) evidence base methodology and inputs, CBRE has independent viability modelling of a Residential typology to illustrate the implications for CIL headroom in the current market.

a. CIL Headroom Analysis | CBRE Modelling:

- i. CBRE has tested Typology 17 (Urban – Large – 45 Dwellings – Brownfield), against which PPE identify a CIL headroom of £150/m², reflecting an exact match of the recommended Residential CIL charge.
- ii. CBRE has increased the construction costs to reflect the BCIS Estate Housing – Generally (median) rate equates as published at July 2025, with tenders restricted to the last 5 years (£1,643/m² or £153/ft²). This is deemed an appropriate rate for medium housebuilders in the current market.

⁶ Lichfields (2021) Fine Margins, Viability Assessments in Planning and Plan-Making

- iii. Secondly, CBRE has increased the construction cost of garages adopted within the CIL Viability Addendum modelling from £9,000 per garage to £15,000 per garage, reflecting the up-to-date evidence provided by CBRE.
- iv. Thirdly, CBRE has adjusted the contingency allowance utilised in the CIL Viability Addendum modelling to reflect CBRE's professional opinion of a reasonable rate of 5.00%.
- v. Finally, CBRE has incorporated the cost of Building Safety Levy at the previously developed land rate (£15.81/m²) to the open market floorspace delivered from October 2026, in line with the Government's anticipated implementation timeline.
- vi. For all other aspects, CBRE has attempted to mirror the approach in the CIL Viability Study modelling. This should not be taken as an endorsement, but is deemed reasonable and rational for the purposes of comparison – given it is not the responsibility of Helmsley Securities to prepare CYC's evidence.
- vii. CBRE adjusted appraisal of Typology 17 generates a Residual Land Value ('RLV') of £735,131, which falls below PPE's identified BLV for this typology of £1,109,550. On this basis, Typology 17 is **unviable** and there is no headroom for CIL. A copy of CBRE's Residential Appraisal is provided within **Enclosure 3**.
- viii. Evidently, the same adjustments to the other residential typologies would have an equivalent effect on viability and the headroom available to accommodate CIL. Considering that 11 of the 25 tested typologies are assessed by PPE to have CIL headroom equal to or below the recommended CIL charge of £150/m², CBRE's modelling illustrates that a significant proportion of tested typologies would be unable to viably support CYC & PPE's proposed residential CIL charge, in the context of current market conditions.
- ix. On the weight of the above (and enclosed) evidence, CBRE is of the firm professional opinion that there is no financial viability headroom in the current market for Residential typologies to either meet the costs of CIL at any rate above £nil.

Failure to Strike an Appropriate Balance

- 84. In setting CIL rates, CYC must strike an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments. In accordance with CIL Regulation 14(1)⁷, CYC must be able to demonstrate and explain how the proposed CIL rate(s) will contribute towards the implementation of the Plan and support development across city.
- 85. As set out in PPG⁸, Charging Schedules should be consistent with, and support the implementation of, up-to-date relevant plans.

⁷ CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended)

⁸ PPG CIL: Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 25-011-20190901

86. The charging authority must take development costs into account when setting CIL rates, particularly those likely to be incurred on strategic sites or brownfield land. Importantly, development costs include costs arising from existing regulatory requirements, and any policies on planning obligations in the relevant Plan.
87. As also clearly set out in the RICS Guidance⁹, the impact on viability of a CIL, whether proposed or existing, should be considered alongside the policy requirements of the Plan. In simple terms, a 'policy-on' approach must be adopted with the full costs of Plan policies (including affordable housing) accounted for, and taking precedence over, the introduction of CIL rate setting.
88. Moreover, CBRE concludes that it is illogical and counter-intuitive for CYC to introduce the proposed CIL rates for residential use development for the published CIL Viability Study Addendum document does not constitute up-to-date appropriate available evidence to underpin the proposed rates within the Revised CIL DCS.
89. As a result, Helmsley Securities would strongly contend that the Revised CIL DCS is unsound and should not be endorsed by the Examiner for the above fundamental reasons and further technical deficiencies expanded upon below.
90. If non-compliance could not be rectified via modification(s) or by recommendation from the Examiner, the Examiner would be requested to reject the Revised CIL DCS in accordance with Section 212A(2) of the 2008 Act.

⁹ RICS Guidance Note (March 2021) Assessing viability in planning under the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 for England. Para. 3.7.14

Conclusions and Recommendations

91. Helmsley Securities cannot endorse or support the Revised CIL DCS, and its underpinning evidence base in the form of the CIL Viability Study Addendum, as presently published.
92. In fact, for the reasons set out in this document and its enclosures, Helmsley Securities has fundamental doubts regarding the appropriateness of the timing of this consultation on a new CIL DCS.
93. Helmsley Securities also has severe reservations regarding the questionable validity and dependability of the published viability evidence base upon which the proposed new charging rates for residential use development within the Revised CIL DCS is reliant, and hence the legal compliance of the published Revised CIL DCS with the relevant legislation and guidance.
94. On this basis, Helmsley Securities cannot agree with CYC that there is an appropriately evidenced and legally compliant basis upon which the Revised CIL DCS (as published) could be found sound by an independent Examiner, which should unavoidably lead to the rejection of the Charging Schedule in accordance with Section 212A(2) of the 2008 Act.
95. Helmsley Securities therefore hopes that this feedback prepared by CBRE, and the accompanying commentary from O'Neill Associates, is useful to CYC in reconsidering whether it is rational, prudent and justified to be proceeding with pursuing adoption of a CIL charging regime under the current circumstances.
96. To rectify the issues identified, Helmsley Securities advocate that the CIL rates proposed to apply to residential development should be reduced to £0/m² via modification to the published Revised CIL DCS or CYC's pursuing of a CIL regime altogether held in abeyance until economic and property market conditions demonstrably improve.
97. If CYC does not take account of these recommendations, Helmsley Securities will be left with no choice but to continue to pursue this matter and will seek that the Examiner rejects the Charging Schedule via the examination process.
98. Should CYC wish to engage directly with Helmsley Securities on the matter, CBRE will be able to facilitate such arrangements.

Enclosures

Enclosure 1: Schedule of Proposed & Adopted CIL Rates in Yorkshire & Humber Region

Local Authority	CIL status	Date	Residential Charges	Retail/Commercial Charges	Others
Barnsley	Draft Charging Schedule Published	17/10/2016	Four large residential charging zones with rates of £80, £50, £10, and £0 per square metre. Four small residential charging zones with rates of £80, £50, £30, and £0 per square metre.	Retail developments (A1) will be charged £70 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Bradford	Adopted	21/03/2017	Four residential development charging zones with rates of £100, £50, £20 and £0 per square metre. No charge for specialist older persons housing.	Two retail warehouse development charging zones with rates of £85 and £0 per square metre. Large scale supermarket developments will be charged £50 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Calderdale	Draft Charging Schedule Published	01/06/2023	Nine residential housing charging zones with rates of £0 to £50 per square metre for Greenfield residential sites. £0 per square metre for all brownfield residential sites. Residential institutions and care home development rate of £60 per square metre for both greenfield and brownfield sites. £0 per square metre charge for all other uses.	£0 per square metre for all other uses.	£0 per square metre for all other uses.
East Riding of Yorkshire	Draft Charging Schedule Published	23/01/2017	Five residential development charging zones with rates of £90, £60, £20, £10 and £0 per square metre.	Retail warehouse developments will be charged £75 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Hambleton	Adopted	17/03/2015	Private market housing (excluding apartments) will be charged £55 per square metre.	Retail warehouses are to be charged £40 per square metre. Supermarkets are to be charged £90 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Harrogate	Adopted	08/07/2020	Small scale residential developments will be charged £50 per square metre. Two charging zones for all other residential developments with rates of £50 and £0 per square metre. Two sheltered housing development charging zones with rates of £60 and £40 per square metre.	Three retail development charging zones for shops with rates of £120, £40 and £0 per square metre. Large supermarket and retail warehouse developments will be charged £120 per square metre. Small supermarkets will be charged £40 per square metre. Distribution developments will be charged £20 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Hull	Adopted	23/01/2018	Two residential housing development charging zones with rates of £60 and £0 per square metre. Residential apartment developments will be charged £0 per square metre.	Large scale supermarket developments will be charged £50 per square metre. Small scale supermarket developments will be charged £5 per square metre. Retail warehouse developments will be charged £25 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Kirklees	Abandoned	19/01/2021	Four residential charging zones with rates of £80,£20, £5 and £0 per square metre.	No charge for all commercial or industrial uses.	No charge for all other uses.
Leeds	Adopted	12/11/2014	Four residential charging zones with rates of £5, £23, £45 and £90 per square metre.	Two charging zones for supermarket developments with rates of £110 and £175 per square metre. Two charging zones for large comparison retail with rates of £35 and £55 per square metre. City centre offices will be charged £35 per square metre.	Publicly funded or not for profit developments will not be charged CIL. All other uses will be charged £5 per square metre.
Richmondshire	Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Published	24/10/2016	Three residential development charging zones with rates of £120, £50 and £0 per square metre.	Supermarket developments will be charged £120 per square metre. Retail warehouse developments will be charged £60 per square metre. Neighbourhood convenience retail developments will be charged £60 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Rotherham	Adopted	07/12/2016	Three residential charging zones with rates of £55, £30 and £15 per square metre. Retirement living developments will be charged £20 per square metre.	Large scale supermarket developments will be charged £60 per square metre. Large scale retail warehouse and retail park developments will be charged £30 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Ryedale	Adopted	14/01/2016	Two residential charging zones with rates of £85 and £45 per square metre. No charge for apartment developments.	Supermarkets will be charged £120 per square metre. Retail warehouses will be charged £60 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Selby	Adopted	03/12/2015	Three residential charging zones with rates of £50, £35 and £10 per square metre.	Supermarkets will be charged £110 per square metre. Retail warehouses will be charged £60 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Sheffield	Adopted	03/06/2015	Four residential (C3 and C4) charging zones with rates of £80, £50, £30 and £0 per square metre. Hotel developments will be charged £40 per square metre. Student accommodation developments will be charged £30 per square metre.	Large retail developments are to be charged £60 per square metre. Three retail development (A1) charging zones with rates of £60, £30 and £0 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.
Wakefield	Adopted	20/01/2016	Three residential charging zones with rates of £55, £20 and £0 per square metre.	Large supermarkets will be charged £103 per square metre. Retail warehouse developments will be charged £89 per square metre.	No charge for all other uses.

Enclosure 2: RICS BCIS – Rebased to York (Q3 2025)

£/M2 STUDY

Description: Rate per m2 gross internal floor area for the building Cost including prelims.

Last updated: 26-Jul-2025 07:30

Rebased to 3Q 2025 (403; forecast) and York (96; sample 20)

MAXIMUM AGE OF RESULTS: 5 YEARS

Building function (Maximum age of projects)	£/m² gross internal floor area						Sample	
	Mean	Lowest	Lower quartiles	Median	Upper quartiles	Highest		
New build								
810.1 Estate housing								
Generally (5)	1,667	774	1,380	1,643	1,843	3,346	183	
Single storey (5)	1,947	1,288	1,642	1,815	2,115	3,346	31	
2-storey (5)	1,615	774	1,360	1,628	1,804	2,568	148	
3-storey (5)	1,446	1,116	-	1,443	-	1,782	4	
810.12 Estate housing semi detached								
Generally (5)	1,773	1,063	1,535	1,696	1,899	3,346	51	
Single storey (5)	1,899	1,288	1,650	1,833	1,884	3,346	17	
2-storey (5)	1,709	1,063	1,338	1,660	1,909	2,568	33	
3-storey (5)	1,782	-	-	-	-	-	1	
810.13 Estate housing terraced								
Generally (5)	1,496	891	1,315	1,381	1,724	2,076	11	
2-storey (5)	1,534	891	1,346	1,455	1,760	2,076	10	
3-storey (5)	1,116	-	-	-	-	-	1	
816. Flats (apartments)								
Generally (5)	1,939	1,023	1,541	1,855	2,229	3,674	139	

Building function (Maximum age of projects)	£/m ² gross internal floor area						Sample	
	Mean	Lowest	Lower quartiles	Median	Upper quartiles	Highest		
1-2 storey (5)	1,929	1,023	1,539	1,890	2,298	3,399	29	
3-5 storey (5)	1,919	1,031	1,541	1,820	2,146	3,674	100	
6 storey or above (5)	2,167	1,448	1,845	2,304	2,475	2,899	10	
856.2 Students' residences, halls of residence, etc (5)	1,787	1,743	-	-	-	1,830	2	
Rehabilitation/Conversion								
816. Flats (apartments)								
Generally (5)	2,014	393	1,149	1,205	2,477	4,843	5	
1-2 storey (5)	1,205	-	-	-	-	-	1	
3-5 storey (5)	2,216	393	-	1,813	-	4,843	4	

Enclosure 3: CBRE Residential Appraisal – Typology 17

York CIL Representations

Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield

CBRE Appraisal

Development Appraisal

CBRE

15 August 2025

York CIL Representations
Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield
CBRE Appraisal

Appraisal Summary for Phase 3 Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25

Currency in £

REVENUE

Sales Valuation	Units	ft²	Sales Rate ft²	Unit Price	Gross Sales
Private Units	38	36,748	371.55	359,313	13,653,888
Social Rent	4	3,384	148.63	125,738	502,950
Affordable Rent	4	3,384	185.78	157,172	628,688
Intermediate	<u>2</u>	<u>1,709</u>	260.19	222,332	<u>444,665</u>
Totals	48	45,225			15,230,191

NET REALISATION

15,230,191

OUTLAY

ACQUISITION COSTS

Residualised Price		735,131	
			735,131
Purchaser's Costs	1.75%	12,865	
			12,865

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Construction	ft²	Build Rate ft²	Cost
Build Costs: Private Units	37,995	152.48	5,793,507
Build Costs: Affordable Units	<u>9,280</u>	152.64	<u>1,416,470</u>
Totals	47,275 ft²		7,209,977
Contingency		5.00%	410,274
			7,620,251
Other Construction			
16no. Garages (£15k per unit)			249,555
Externals	10.00%		745,953
Abnormals			378,000
Building Safety Levy			30,197
			1,403,705

Section 106 Costs

S106		397,152	
Policy G12a		48,000	
Policy G12: BNG		11,088	
Policy CC1, CC2 & CC3		720,000	
EV Charging Points		48,000	
Cat(3)(B)		54,480	
Cat(3)(A)		27,907	
			1,306,627

PROFESSIONAL FEES

Professional Fees	8.00%	656,439	
			656,439

DISPOSAL FEES

Private Disposal Fees		3.00%	409,617
Affordable Disposal Fees	10 un	500.00 /un	5,000
			414,617

FINANCE

Debit Rate 7.750%, Credit Rate 0.000% (Nominal)			
Land			133,920
Construction			119,870
Other			1,566
Total Finance Cost			255,356

TOTAL COSTS

12,404,991

PROFIT

2,825,200

Performance Measures

Profit on Cost%	22.77%
Profit on GDV%	18.55%
Profit on NDV%	18.55%

York CIL Representations**Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield****CBRE Appraisal**

IRR% (without Interest)	52.78%
-------------------------	--------

Profit Erosion (finance rate 7.750)	2 yrs 8 mths
-------------------------------------	--------------

York CIL Representations

Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield

CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page A 1

	001:Aug 2025	002:Sep 2025	003:Oct 2025	004:Nov 2025	005:Dec 2025	006:Jan 2026	007:Feb 2026	008:Mar 2026	009:Apr 2026	010:May 2026
Monthly B/F	0	(754,587)	(774,887)	(802,750)	(908,511)	(1,104,746)	(1,383,427)	(1,736,588)	(2,155,972)	(2,633,385)
Revenue										
Sale - Intermediate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,528
Sale - Affordable Rent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,195
Sale - Social Rent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,956
Sale - Private Units	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	568,912
Disposal Costs										
Private Disposal Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(17,067)
Affordable Disposal Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(208)
Unit Information										
Private Units										
Social Rent										
Affordable Rent										
Intermediate										
Build Costs: Private Units										
Build Costs: Affordable Units										
Acquisition Costs										
Residualised Price	(735,131)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Purchaser's Costs	(12,865)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction Costs										
Con. - Build Costs: Private Units	0	0	0	(39,280)	(85,971)	(128,692)	(167,442)	(202,222)	(233,032)	(259,871)
Con. - Build Costs: Affordable Units	0	0	0	(9,604)	(21,019)	(31,464)	(40,938)	(49,442)	(56,975)	(63,537)
16no. Garages (£15k per unit)	0	0	0	(1,692)	(3,703)	(5,543)	(7,213)	(8,711)	(10,038)	(11,194)
Externals	0	0	0	(5,058)	(11,069)	(16,570)	(21,559)	(26,037)	(30,004)	(33,460)
Abnormals	0	0	0	(2,563)	(5,609)	(8,397)	(10,925)	(13,194)	(15,204)	(16,955)
Building Safety Levy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S106	(6,592)	(15,426)	(22,890)	(28,983)	(33,704)	(37,054)	(39,033)	(39,641)	(38,878)	(36,744)
Policy G12a	0	0	0	(325)	(712)	(1,066)	(1,387)	(1,675)	(1,931)	(2,153)
Policy G12: BNG	0	0	0	(75)	(165)	(246)	(320)	(387)	(446)	(497)
Policy CC1, CC2 & CC3	0	0	0	(4,882)	(10,684)	(15,993)	(20,809)	(25,132)	(28,961)	(32,296)
EV Charging Points	0	0	0	(325)	(712)	(1,066)	(1,387)	(1,675)	(1,931)	(2,153)
Cat(3)(B)	0	0	0	(369)	(808)	(1,210)	(1,575)	(1,902)	(2,191)	(2,444)
Cat(3)(A)	0	0	0	(189)	(414)	(620)	(807)	(974)	(1,123)	(1,252)
Contingency	0	0	0	(2,782)	(6,088)	(9,113)	(11,858)	(14,321)	(16,502)	(18,403)
Professional Fees										
Professional Fees	0	0	0	(4,451)	(9,741)	(14,582)	(18,972)	(22,913)	(26,404)	(29,445)
Net Cash Flow Before Finance	(754,587)	(15,426)	(22,890)	(100,577)	(190,401)	(271,617)	(344,226)	(408,226)	(463,619)	106,911
Debit Rate 7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%
Credit Rate 0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
Finance Costs (All Sets)	0	(4,873)	(4,973)	(5,184)	(5,834)	(7,064)	(8,935)	(11,158)	(13,794)	(12,909)
Net Cash Flow After Finance	(754,587)	(20,300)	(27,863)	(105,761)	(196,235)	(278,681)	(353,160)	(419,384)	(477,413)	94,002

York CIL Representations
Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield
CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page B 1

	001:Aug 2025	002:Sep 2025	003:Oct 2025	004:Nov 2025	005:Dec 2025	006:Jan 2026	007:Feb 2026	008:Mar 2026	009:Apr 2026	010:May 2026
Monthly B/F	0	(754,587)	(774,887)	(802,750)	(908,511)	(1,104,746)	(1,383,427)	(1,736,588)	(2,155,972)	(2,633,385)
Cumulative Net Cash Flow Monthly	(754,587)	(774,887)	(802,750)	(908,511)	(1,104,746)	(1,383,427)	(1,736,588)	(2,155,972)	(2,633,385)	(2,539,383)

York CIL Representations

Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield

CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page A 2

011:Jun 2026 (2,539,383)	012:Jul 2026 (2,482,867)	013:Aug 2026 (2,455,477)	014:Sep 2026 (2,449,035)	015:Oct 2026 (2,454,828)	016:Nov 2026 (2,461,149)	017:Dec 2026 (2,473,162)	018:Jan 2027 (2,483,439)	019:Feb 2027 (2,484,734)	020:Mar 2027 (2,469,978)	021:Apr 2027 (2,431,604)	022:May 2027 (2,362,223)
18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528
26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195
20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956
568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912
(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(282,741)	(301,639)	(316,568)	(327,526)	(334,514)	(337,531)	(336,578)	(331,655)	(322,761)	(309,898)	(293,063)	(272,259)
(69,128)	(73,749)	(77,398)	(80,078)	(81,786)	(82,524)	(82,291)	(81,087)	(78,913)	(75,768)	(71,652)	(66,565)
(12,179)	(12,993)	(13,636)	(14,108)	(14,409)	(14,539)	(14,498)	(14,286)	(13,903)	(13,349)	(12,624)	(11,728)
(36,405)	(38,838)	(40,760)	(42,171)	(43,071)	(43,459)	(43,337)	(42,703)	(41,558)	(39,901)	(37,734)	(35,055)
(18,448)	(19,681)	(20,655)	(21,370)	(21,825)	(22,022)	(21,960)	(21,639)	(21,059)	(20,219)	(19,121)	(17,764)
0	0	0	0	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)
(33,238)	(28,361)	(22,113)	(14,494)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2,343)	(2,499)	(2,623)	(2,714)	(2,771)	(2,796)	(2,789)	(2,748)	(2,674)	(2,568)	(2,428)	(2,256)
(541)	(577)	(606)	(627)	(640)	(646)	(644)	(635)	(618)	(593)	(561)	(521)
(35,138)	(37,487)	(39,342)	(40,704)	(41,572)	(41,947)	(41,829)	(41,217)	(40,112)	(38,513)	(36,421)	(33,836)
(2,343)	(2,499)	(2,623)	(2,714)	(2,771)	(2,796)	(2,789)	(2,748)	(2,674)	(2,568)	(2,428)	(2,256)
(2,659)	(2,837)	(2,977)	(3,080)	(3,146)	(3,174)	(3,165)	(3,119)	(3,035)	(2,914)	(2,756)	(2,560)
(1,362)	(1,453)	(1,525)	(1,578)	(1,611)	(1,626)	(1,621)	(1,598)	(1,555)	(1,493)	(1,412)	(1,311)
(20,023)	(21,361)	(22,418)	(23,194)	(23,689)	(23,903)	(23,835)	(23,487)	(22,857)	(21,946)	(20,754)	(19,280)
(32,036)	(34,178)	(35,869)	(37,111)	(37,902)	(38,244)	(38,136)	(37,578)	(36,571)	(35,113)	(33,206)	(30,849)
68,734	39,164	18,203	5,849	5,284	(216)	1,521	10,494	26,704	50,151	80,834	118,754
7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%
0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
(12,218)	(11,775)	(11,760)	(11,642)	(11,605)	(11,797)	(11,798)	(11,788)	(11,949)	(11,776)	(11,452)	(11,158)
56,516	27,390	6,443	(5,794)	(6,321)	(12,013)	(10,277)	(1,294)	14,755	38,374	69,381	107,596

York CIL Representations
Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield
CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page B 2

011:Jun 2026 (2,539,383)	012:Jul 2026 (2,482,867)	013:Aug 2026 (2,455,477)	014:Sep 2026 (2,449,035)	015:Oct 2026 (2,454,828)	016:Nov 2026 (2,461,149)	017:Dec 2026 (2,473,162)	018:Jan 2027 (2,483,439)	019:Feb 2027 (2,484,734)	020:Mar 2027 (2,469,978)	021:Apr 2027 (2,431,604)	022:May 2027 (2,362,223)
(2,482,867)	(2,455,477)	(2,449,035)	(2,454,828)	(2,461,149)	(2,473,162)	(2,483,439)	(2,484,734)	(2,469,978)	(2,431,604)	(2,362,223)	(2,254,627)

York CIL Representations

Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield

CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page A 3

023:Jun 2027 (2,254,627)	024:Jul 2027 (2,101,107)	025:Aug 2027 (1,894,136)	026:Sep 2027 (1,626,338)	027:Oct 2027 (1,289,891)	028:Nov 2027 (877,127)	029:Dec 2027 (261,378)	030:Jan 2028 355,938	031:Feb 2028 973,254	032:Mar 2028 1,590,569	033:Apr 2028 2,207,885
18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528	18,528
26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195	26,195
20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956	20,956
568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912	568,912
(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)	(17,067) (208)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(247,484)	(218,739)	(186,023)	(149,337)	(108,681)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(60,508)	(53,480)	(45,481)	(36,512)	(26,572)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(10,660)	(9,422)	(8,013)	(6,433)	(4,681)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(31,865)	(28,164)	(23,952)	(19,228)	(13,993)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(16,147)	(14,272)	(12,137)	(9,744)	(7,091)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	(2,323)	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2,050)	(1,812)	(1,541)	(1,237)	(900)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(474)	(419)	(356)	(286)	(208)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(30,757)	(27,184)	(23,118)	(18,559)	(13,507)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2,050)	(1,812)	(1,541)	(1,237)	(900)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2,327)	(2,057)	(1,749)	(1,404)	(1,022)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(1,192)	(1,054)	(896)	(719)	(524)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(17,526)	(15,490)	(13,173)	(10,576)	(7,696)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(28,041)	(24,784)	(21,078)	(16,921)	(12,314)	0	0	0	0	0	0
163,910	216,303	275,933	342,799	416,902	617,316	617,316	617,316	617,316	617,316	617,316
7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%	7.750%
0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
(10,391)	(9,332)	(8,135)	(6,352)	(4,139)	(1,566)	0	0	0	0	0
153,520	206,971	267,799	336,447	412,764	615,749	617,316	617,316	617,316	617,316	617,316

York CIL Representations
Typology 17: Urban - Large - 45 Dwellings - Brownfield
CBRE Appraisal

Detailed Cash flow Phase 3 (Typology 17 - CBRE Aug 25)

Page B 3

023:Jun 2027 (2,254,627)	024:Jul 2027 (2,101,107)	025:Aug 2027 (1,894,136)	026:Sep 2027 (1,626,338)	027:Oct 2027 (1,289,891)	028:Nov 2027 (877,127)	029:Dec 2027 (261,378)	030:Jan 2028 355,938	031:Feb 2028 973,254	032:Mar 2028 1,590,569	033:Apr 2028 2,207,885
(2,101,107)	(1,894,136)	(1,626,338)	(1,289,891)	(877,127)	(261,378)	355,938	973,254	1,590,569	2,207,885	2,825,200

e