Broxbourne Community Infrastructure Levy

Consultation Statement - October 2026

A consultation on the draft Charging Schedule was carried in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Community infrastructure Regulations between 17 June and 20 July 2026.

Publicising the consultation

Website

A webpage containing the Draft Charging Schedule and relevant evidence, together with details of how to respond, and the availability of paper documents upon request, was made available on the Council's website throughout the consultation period: www.broxbourne.gov.uk/cil

Emails to relevant bodes

Email notifications of the consultation on the draft charging schedule, how to respond, and availability of documents were issued to the following:

- *Neighbouring Local Planning authorities:* East Hertfordshire District Council, Enfield Council, Epping Forest District Council; Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
- Hertfordshire County Council
- The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
- *Local organisations:* Love Hoddesdon Business Improvement District; the Goffs oak Community Association; Hertfordshire Futures.

Emails to other stakeholders

Email notifications were sent to all applicants for minor residential planning permission in the Borough for Broxbourne in the three years prior to the start of the consultation. This included planning agents, developers and landowners.

Social Media

The consultation was also publicised on the Council's social media accounts (Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter) throughout the consultation period.

Responses received

Three consultation responses were received.

- One response did not raise any relevant planning issues.
- One response, from Hertfordshire County Council, was supportive of the proposed CIL levy.
- One response (from a local planning agent) raised concerns about the financial burdens of the CIL upon small developments.

Issues raised

The response received from the local agent raised concerns about the disproportionate impact of viability on smaller developers to fund 'risky' developments; and recognition within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of the importance of small and medium sized sites to delivery. Hertfordshire County Council requested that explicit reference should be made within the documents to waste management.

Council Response – taking representations into account

1. Viability of smaller residential developments

The *Small Housing Sites Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment – Final Report* (March 2026) carried out by DSP Viability Consultants addresses these issues.

The viability assessment modelled the impact of a range of CIL level charges on different postcode areas/value levels across the Borough, including modelling a range of different small sites typologies (1 house, 3 houses, 5 houses, 5 flats, 7 houses, 10 houses, and 10 flats).

As a result of the typology-based modelling, DSP recommended that a Borough-wide charge in the range of £100 to £150/sqm reflecting the overview of outcomes, and after 'buffering' (which encompasses many of the uncertainties and 'risks' raised in the representations). DSP suggests that this level of charge should be viable for schemes involving all houses and those involving a mix of houses and flats at all scales of minor development in all areas of the Borough.

The draft charge level at the bottom end of this range i.e. £100/sqm reflects the Council's concern to ensure that the viability of smaller residential developments is not jeopardised, and balances this against the need to ensure funding to facilitate the infrastructure to support Local Plan growth.

Furthermore, in setting a very simple CIL charge for all types of minor residential development substantially reduces the risk when compared with a highly variable approach that would be necessary from extending a negotiated S106 approach across these types and scales of developments.

2. Compliance with the NPPF

Section 1.3 of the DSP Viability Study contains an overview of national policy, guidance and regulations. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and regulations remain the same as that referenced in the study. The NPPF was updated in August 2026. Policy PM12: Developer Contributions sets out the approach to this area. The NPPF paragraph referred to in the representations has been replaced by Policy HO6. The draft charge is consistent with both the old and new NPPF policies.

3. *Waste management*

The purpose of CIL fund is to facilitate infrastructure set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If funding is needed for other items necessary to support Local Plan development then this will need to be evidenced and agreed and reported upon in the Infrastructure Funding Statement.

Conclusion

Having considered the issues raised through the consultation, the submitted charging schedule remains sound and appropriate. No modifications are required.