Visitor Levy Consultation Government Response

The government response to the consultation on the design of a new power for strategic authorities to create visitor levies on overnight stays in England

Contents

1. Introduction

Ministerial foreword

England is one of the most centralised countries in the developed world. We live in a system that hoards power and opportunity. But all the evidence shows that we get better decisions when they are made locally, by people who know their communities. It’s obvious that the needs of Cornwall are not the needs of Greater Manchester, and the challenges facing London are not those facing the North East.

It is well-known that Britain suffers from a lack of investment, both in the private and public sectors. We have let our infrastructure crumble, homes go unbuilt, and our industries move offshore. In practice, the gap between public investment in Britain and comparable countries is the result of not enough investment at the local level – of the wrong turns we took in the 1980s to centralise power and funding into Whitehall.

This Government is determined to reverse those changes, and put power, responsibility and accountability back in the hands of local leaders across the whole of the UK. Within England, the Overnight Visitor Levy is our first step towards implementing the Blueprint we set out in the Cabinet Statement, to shift power out of Westminster. Along with our plans to devolve a portion of income tax and enable mayors to retain some of the business rates generated in their areas, the Levy represents our commitment to creating an accountable state, responsible to local people. This is about giving places the tools they need to drive good growth, in every part of the country. Tourism brings enormous benefits to communities across England. But successful destinations also face pressures and the need for investment – and it is only right that visitors contribute to the success of the places they enjoy. Just like in many neighbouring countries, a modest contribution from overnight visitors can help local places maintain and improve the attractions that make them successful in the first place.

Devolution must be about more than transferring funding. It must also create stronger accountability for how places grow and prosper. The Overnight Visitor Levy gives local leaders a new tool to invest in their areas, while ensuring that those decisions are taken transparently and are accountable to local residents, businesses and voters.

Throughout this consultation we heard a wide range of views. Many respondents highlighted the opportunities that a visitor levy could provide, while others raised legitimate concerns about complexity, costs and impacts on businesses. We have listened carefully and the final framework reflects that engagement, balancing local flexibility with a simple national approach.

We have valued the constructive engagement from business, local government, the public and other organisations throughout this process, and our Departments will continue to work closely with these groups as we bring forward legislation when parliamentary time allows.

Jim McMahon OBE MP
Minister for Local Government,
Devolution and Regional Growth

Rt Hon James Murray MP,
Financial Secretary to the Treasury

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. The government is introducing a discretionary visitor levy power for local leaders in England to unlock the economic potential of local areas. For too long, local leaders have lacked the fiscal levers needed to match the levels of investment seen in comparable countries, limiting their ability to respond to local economic needs and drive growth. OECD research has found that enhanced fiscal decentralisation is associated with higher economic growth and regional convergence – suggesting that doubling the share of tax or spending controlled by subnational governments is associated with an increase in national GDP per capita by 3% on average.[1] Yet England remains one of the most centralised countries in the developed world, with only a small proportion of taxes raised and retained locally. According to the latest OECD data, just 6% of national taxes are collected at the sub-national level in the UK – far below the EU average and the lowest in the G7.[2] In contrast, countries such as France, Japan, and the USA have much higher shares of local tax collection, enabling greater local investment and economic dynamism.

1.1.2. This centralisation has constrained the ability of local leaders to invest in the infrastructure, regeneration, and services that make places attractive for residents, businesses, and visitors. The government has already taken steps to deepen devolution through the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026 (EDCEA) but recognises that further progress is needed to provide local leaders with the tools to deliver growth.

[1] Blöchliger, H. and B. Égert (2013), "Decentralisation and Economic Growth - Part 2: The Impact on Economic Activity, Productivity and Investment", OECD Working Papers on Fiscal Federalism, No. 15, OECD Publishing

[2] OECD (2024), OECD Fiscal Decentralisation Database

1.1.3. The UK visitor economy is a vital strategic asset, contributing £64.3 billion directly to the economy, and directly employing 1.3 million people, in 2024.[3] In 2024, there were 42.6 million international visitors to the UK, spending £32.5 billion (latest full year available).[4] In 2024 residents of Great Britain took 105.6 million domestic overnight trips, spending £32.9 billion.[5] The benefits and pressures of tourism are felt locally, and until now local leaders have not had sufficient tools to capture and reinvest the proceeds. The visitor levy will be available to help remedy this by empowering strategic authorities to introduce a charge on paid overnight stays.

1.1.4. The visitor levy will be one of a growing set of fiscal powers that local leaders can use to support growth in their region. The government set out in its 31 July statement “Rewiring the State” that the Overnight Visitor Levy is only one step in a changed approach to funding local leaders. The government will shortly set out how it plans to go further still, through a Fiscal Devolution Roadmap to be published at Budget 2026. The long-term certainty of funding via the Overnight Visitor Levy, an overhauled approach to the way regional government is funded with a local share of income tax for every mayor, and greater local retention of business rates will provide more flexibility and enable greater investment to fund interventions that will deliver a return.

1.1.5. A national framework will support the administration of the visitor levy. This includes maintaining a standardised framework for the rate type and application of the levy, as well as limiting exemptions. In taking this approach, the government has sought to balance the devolution principle of local freedom and authority with requests for consistency from accommodation providers and other businesses operating across multiple areas.

1.2. About the Visitor Levy in England consultation

[3] ONS (2025), The provisional UK Tourism Satellite Account indicator (UK-TSA indicator)
[4] VisitBritain (2025), Inbound visits and spend: annual, UK
[5] VisitEngland (2025), Great Britain domestic overnight trips: latest results

1.2.1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and HM Treasury published The Visitor Levy in England on GOV.UK on 26 November 2025. The consultation closed on 18 February 2026, after running for a period of 12 weeks. It was conducted in line with the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles.

1.2.2. The consultation sought views on the design of a new discretionary power for strategic authorities in England to introduce a visitor levy on paid overnight stays. We tested views on how the levy could support local economic growth, including through strengthening the visitor economy. The consultation also sought evidence on how a visitor levy could be designed to operate in a fair, proportionate and affordable way, taking account of impacts on visitors and accommodation providers.

1.2.3. Throughout the consultation period and in the months since, the government has engaged extensively with stakeholders across various sectors, including mayors, local authorities, business representatives, visitor economy bodies and accommodation providers, alongside the formal online public consultation. We have also worked closely with Welsh and Scottish governments to learn from their experiences of introducing visitor levy powers. The government is grateful for the contributions received and has carefully considered all views in shaping its approach.

1.2.4. Our response addresses the issues raised in the consultation, ensuring that the design of the levy supports local priorities, is fair and transparent, and minimises administrative burdens for businesses.

1.3. Responses to the consultation

1.3.1. The 1223 unique responses received to this consultation have been considered alongside other representations made during the consultation period. A full breakdown of types of respondents can be found in Annex A.

1.3.2. The following table breaks down consultation responses by the type of respondent – both to improve interpretability of results, and to anonymise individual respondents, particularly where more granular groupings would risk exposing individual organisations' views.

1.3.3. These groupings have been determined on the basis that members of each group would tend to have similar interactions with the levy to one another – for example the accommodation sector will be liable for the levy and the public sector will have a role in collections and spending decisions, whereas the wider hospitality sector – such as restaurants, pubs, entertainment and event spaces – has a direct relationship with the visitors to an area, but will not all directly interact with the levy.

Respondent type	**Count**	**Share of total**
Accommodation and bookings sectors (including representative bodies)	365	30%
Wider hospitality / tourism sector and other businesses	114	9%
Public sector (strategic authorities, other local government organisations, and other public sector bodies)	103	9%
Civic, cultural interest groups, and non-profit organisations	85	7%
Professional & policy Services	14	1%

General public	542	44%
Total	**1223**	**100%**

1.3.4. Percentages presented in the next sections are calculated based on all 1223 consultation responses, and reflect the number of respondents who selected yes, no, indicated an answer from a predetermined list, or did not provide a response.

1.4. Summary of government response: main measures

1.4.1. The government’s decisions in response to the consultation questions are:

- **All mayoral and foundation strategic authorities (FSAs) will have Overnight Visitor Levy powers**. This recognises their role in driving local growth and ensures this fiscal power is available across England's devolved governance landscape.
- **Strategic authorities will be empowered to invest levy revenues in interventions in line with regional growth strategies. This can include interventions to support the visitor economy.**
- **Mayors and other local leaders will be required to consult locally before introducing a levy and must provide businesses with advance notice of its introduction or any subsequent changes.** The government will consider the right approach to voting arrangements ahead of Bill introduction. The government expects MSAs to consider the equalities, environmental and economic impacts of a levy in line with existing duties and practices.
- **The levy will apply to all short-term, visitor accommodation, bar certain national exemptions and discretionary local exemptions**. Accommodation or land uses not provided on a commercial basis will not be in scope; this could include, for example, registered gypsy and traveller sites, temporary accommodation, and charitable accommodation for shelter or refuge will be exempt nationally. Strategic authorities will have the power to exempt a small number of further accommodation types; this could include tent pitches, touring caravan pitches and dormitory-style accommodation like hostels in their areas, subject to local consultation. This approach balances respondents’ support for a broad, consistent approach alongside

calls for further exemptions for low-cost accommodation that offer social or educational benefits, such as camp sites.

- **The levy will be set as a percentage of the accommodation cost**, ensuring that charges are proportionate to the price of the stay. Non-accommodation costs, such as meals, should be excluded. A percentage rate model helps ensure that the levy is affordable, for example for lower-income families. Strategic authorities will set the levy rate but will not be able to vary rates by season, accommodation type or constituent authority, ensuring the system remains simple to administer and understand, and for businesses to take part.
- **Accommodation providers will be the persons liable for the levy**. This is consistent with visitor levy schemes in Scotland and Wales, and with international practice, where providers are generally responsible for collecting and remitting the levy. Providers will calculate and declare levy liabilities through a self-assessment process and, as with other business costs and taxes, may choose to pass some or all of the cost on to visitors through accommodation charges.
- **Strategic authorities will be the tax authorities for the OVL,** responsible for the administration and collection of the levy, supporting the government's wider devolution agenda.
- **The government will provide strategic authorities with proportionate powers to support the administration and collection of the levy, including measures to address non-compliance where necessary.** The framework for compliance, enforcement and appeals will be set out through legislation and guidance.

1.5. Next steps

1.5.1. The government will continue to engage with businesses and accommodation providers to finalise the technical design elements of the levy. These are important policy decisions which require comprehensive planning to make sure implementation is efficient and effective. In particular, the government is seeking engagement on the duty of providers to keep records of levy payable, the rules around apportionment of costs where accommodation is provided as part of an inclusive package, and third-party sales.

1.5.2. The government has already announced its intention to legislate for an Overnight Visitor Levy during the current Parliamentary session. Subject to Parliamentary approval, we expect local leaders to be able to set out plans for how revenues will be invested by March 2028.

2. Use of levy revenues

2.1. Summary of government proposals

2.1.1. The government proposed that:

2.1.2. Levy funds should be invested to drive economic growth, including in the visitor economy;

2.1.3. Mayors should consult locally on a published draft prospectus that should include proposals for what levy revenue would be spent on;

2.1.4. A portion of levy revenue be used to cover administration costs where relevant authorities are involved in managing the levy.

2.1.5. Views were also sought on:

2.1.6. Proposed standardised reporting requirements, including annual publication of levy income and expenditure, and

2.1.7. How a share of revenues should be allocated to local authorities.

2.2. Consultation responses

2.2.1. Respondents generally agreed (45%, 557 of 1223) that levy funds should be invested to support economic growth, including in the visitor economy, citing positive impacts on local communities and the opportunity to encourage investment in key services and tourist attractions. 40% (485) did not agree with this approach, 15% (181) provided no answer. Those who disagreed expressed concern that revenues may be used for general service pressures locally rather than to benefit growth and the visitor economy, and the need for clearer transparency rules, which were covered later in the consultation.

2.2.2. Most respondents (31%, 376 out of 1223) agreed with the proposed reporting requirements, providing they are accompanied by further mechanisms to protect revenue use. Suggestions for further mechanisms included an independent oversight body, regular review periods, and clear evidence of value for money before a levy is implemented. 19% (237) of respondents agreed with the proposed requirements without the caveat of further mechanisms, and only 17% of respondents (208) disagreed with the approach. Many of these did not raise specific objections to the transparency approach, instead expressing disagreement with the levy power in principle. More specific objections included insufficient transparency and accountability in the proposed measures and costly reporting requirements, as providers would spend money and time on bureaucratic tasks. Around a third (402) of respondents did not answer the question.

2.2.3. Around 43% (527 out of 1223) of respondents agreed that a portion of revenues should be retained by the relevant authorities to fund administration costs, if levies are administered locally. Responses noted the importance of allocating funds to administer the levy sustainably, while also stating that any allocations should be proportionate and transparent. Responses which opposed the government's proposals (28%, 338) generally preferred that all levy revenue be ringfenced to the visitor economy and expressed concern that a disproportionate share may be absorbed into administrative costs. 29% (358) did not answer this question.

2.2.4. Around 27% (332 out of 1223) of respondents preferred that revenue be distributed to relevant local authorities via proportion of overnight stays, citing proportionality of distribution and fair treatment of areas experiencing high tourist pressure. Around 25% (311) preferred revenue allocation be determined by strategic authorities, to avoid a 'one-size-fits-all' approach, while 18% (215) preferred distribution to be managed through another centrally defined metric. Around 30% (365) of responses did not answer the question.

2.2.5. Suggestions for future accountability mechanisms included revenue reporting requirements, mandatory stakeholder engagement, and clear rules on levy allocation.

2.3. Government response

2.3.1. The government's position is that strategic authorities will be responsible for decisions on the investment of levy revenues. This could include providing funding to local authorities in their areas, where the strategic authority decides to do so. In considering these choices, strategic authorities will want to consider the views of visitor economy businesses and other organisations like Local Visitor Economy Partnerships (LVEPs) in their area.

2.3.2. Strategic authorities are uniquely placed to ensure that investment of visitor levy revenues is aligned with regional growth strategies, such as those set out in Local Growth Plans. The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act, alongside other legislation, confers strategic authority powers and competencies, which include economic development, and encouraging visitors to their area.

2.3.3. The government is considering the most appropriate format for strategic authorities to set out spending plans, given spending priorities will necessarily shift over the course of a levy being in place – for example where a capital project is completed. To support local decisions on spending plans, the government will set out any requirements in due course.

2.3.4. It will be for mayors and other local leaders to consider how best to engage local stakeholders on these decisions, and the overall design of the levy. This could include, for example, accommodation providers, Local Visitor Economy Partnerships, local authorities, other hospitality businesses, the general public, and where practical visitors.

2.3.5. The government recognises the importance of strong governance and accountability when exercising devolved fiscal powers. To ensure spending decisions are transparent to businesses and individuals, strategic authorities will also be required to report annually on revenues collected and spending decisions, for example as part of their annual reports. Strategic authorities will also need to report information to central government on revenues and spending for the purposes of publishing national statistics and for monitoring and evaluation of the Overnight Visitor Levy.

3. Power to introduce a levy

3.1. Summary of government proposals

3.1.1. The government proposed that:

3.1.2. Mayoral strategic authorities (MSAs) and foundation strategic authorities (FSAs) should be required to formally consult before implementing a levy.

3.1.3. This would include a published prospectus detailing the area, rate, exemptions, planned use of revenues, and any revenue sharing arrangements, and would be followed by a summary of responses and an impact assessment;

3.1.4. Businesses and visitors be provided with a minimum notice period of twelve months before a levy is introduced or amended;

3.1.5. MSAs be required to follow statutory Budget voting processes before introducing or changing a levy, and that FSAs be required to obtain majority council votes before introducing or changing a levy if this power is devolved to them.

3.1.6. The government also sought views on:

3.1.7. Whether to extend visitor levy powers to FSAs as a stepping-stone to mayoral devolution and to maximise the economic opportunities generated by a levy.

3.1.8. The consent mechanism in FSAs where the levy is applied to a smaller area within the FSA's geography.

3.2. Consultation responses

3.2.1. 68% (834 out of 1223) of respondents agreed that a formal consultation process should be conducted before a levy is introduced, to support stakeholder engagement and ensure transparent decision-making. 11% (134) opposed, and 21% (255) did not answer. On the proposed components of the prospectus for consultation, responses showed no clear preference. 35% (422) agreed, 35% (432) opposed, and 30% (369) did not answer. Responses in favour noted the importance of the prospectus in ensuring transparency and local accountability, while those who opposed felt that a simpler approach would achieve greater local flexibility and reduce the administrative burden.

3.2.2. On notice periods, respondents were clear that it was important that businesses are given time to prepare between a decision to introduce a levy and stays becoming liable, noting that some bookings are made far in advance. 40% (487 out of 1223) of respondents suggested that 12 months would be sufficient notice ahead of the introduction of the levy, procure software and produce clear guidance, although some suggested that a longer period would be preferable. Those who opposed (36%, 436) argued that 12 months would be insufficient to ensure a smooth rollout. A small minority of responses argued that a shorter notice period would be preferable. 24% (300) did not answer.

3.2.3. Most respondents (53%, 651 out of 1223) agreed that the introduction of a levy, and any changes to core elements of the levy, should be subject to the relevant mayoral statutory budget voting process to protect transparent reporting requirements and ensure robust ringfencing of levy spend. 17% (205) opposed, and 30% (367) did not answer. Responses to the question of whether a simple majority council vote be required ahead of FSA consultation on the levy were mixed. 35% (428) opposed, citing a preference for business consultation over council votes and concern that objections from small localities may be overridden in an FSA-wide vote. 32% (388) agreed, and 33% (407) did not answer.

3.2.4. 53% (651 out of 1223) of respondents opposed extending visitor levy powers to FSAs, citing existing cost pressures, a lack of accountability and a negative impact on visitor numbers. Of the 28% (337) in favour, many noted the economic opportunities of a levy, including potential improvements to FSA areas. 19% (235) did not answer.

3.2.5. Respondents expressed mixed views on whether a levy should be applied only to part of a strategic authority's area. Some argued that geographical targeting would be confusing for visitors, burdensome for providers, and risk displacement of visitors between neighbouring communities. Others considered that it would enable a levy to be focused on locations experiencing the greatest visitor pressures.

3.3. Government response

3.3.1. Ahead of implementation of a levy, or making significant changes, the government's position is that strategic authorities should be required to consult on plans and provide notice of the decisions ahead of them coming into force.

3.3.2. Strategic authorities will consult on their proposal for a levy. The government will consider whether to prescribe any necessary details that must be included in those consultations, but expect that strategic authorities will want to include information such as:

- When and where the levy will apply including any exempt accommodation types
- The levy rate
- Expected levy revenues
- The objectives of the scheme and how that scheme will contribute to economic growth in the area, including in the visitor economy

3.3.3. Following consultation, strategic authorities will set out their levy plan through a final prospectus. In line with their existing duties and procedures, we expect strategic authorities to consider the equalities, environmental, and economic impacts of a levy as they consider their proposals.

3.3.4. Once a local decision has been taken to introduce a levy, strategic authorities will, necessarily, need to notify businesses of the date the levy will come into effect. Having considered consultation responses, the government has decided not to proceed with the proposal to prescribe a minimum national notice period. In considering the date at which a levy is introduced, we expect strategic authorities will want to consider the length of time both businesses and the strategic authorities themselves need to implement new systems and processes, including adjusting pricing where necessary. This approach reflects the appropriate notice period may vary between areas, and over time where levies become commonplace, and is consistent with the government's wider devolution principles. The government will work closely with strategic authorities as they develop levy proposals, including sharing best practice on providing businesses with sufficient notice and supporting effective implementation.

3.3.5. The government will continue to consider the right approach to voting arrangements ahead of Bill introduction.

3.3.6. The government has considered views about whether FSAs should also receive powers to introduce a visitor levy. Foundation strategic authorities are a stepping stone to mayoral devolution and currently represent important tourist destinations in England. Revenues from a visitor levy could make a substantial impact on local growth in these areas. The government judges that it is right that those living in FSA areas have the same access to the benefits from levy revenue-related investment as those living in mayoral areas. The government has therefore decided that FSAs should be eligible for levy powers.

3.3.7. The government recognises concerns that applying a levy only to part of a strategic authority’s area could create complexity for visitors and accommodation providers and may influence visitor behaviour between neighbouring areas. In some areas, visitor activity and its impacts may be concentrated in particular locations, while in others it may be appropriate to apply a levy across the whole strategic authority. However, the added complexity for businesses, and fragmentation of approaches that would be created if this flexibility were provided, have led the government to decide not to proceed with enabling strategic authorities to apply a levy to only certain parts of their area.

4. How the levy applies

4.1. Summary of government proposals

4.1.1. The government proposed that:

4.1.2. All types of commercially let short-term accommodation should be within scope of the visitor levy;

4.1.3. A small number of non-commercial accommodation types be nationally exempt, and that local leaders should have discretion to apply further, locally determined exemptions to certain types of accommodation.

4.1.4. The government also sought views on:

4.1.5. Whether there should be a national threshold below which providers are not liable for a levy.

4.2. Consultation responses

4.2.1. 45% (551 out of 1223) of respondents were not in favour of all commercially let visitor accommodation being in scope of the levy, citing potential damage to the visitor economy as well as the need for further exemptions, including for small businesses and charitable institutions. 37% (453) agreed with the government's proposal to support a level playing field across accommodation types and areas where a levy is in place. 18% (219) did not answer.

4.2.2. 43% (523 out of 1223) of respondents opposed introducing a threshold below which providers are not liable for a levy, citing the potential for avoidance, which would disadvantage compliant businesses, as well as a preference for simplicity. 33% (400) supported a threshold requirement, citing the need to reduce the administrative and financial burden on small businesses, with some noting the VAT threshold, annual turnover or accommodation capacity as suitable mechanisms for achieving this goal. 24% (300) did not answer.

4.2.3. 58% (710 out of 1223) of respondents agreed with the proposed national exemptions, with some raising health-related exemptions e.g. hospital stays, as another eligible category. Those in favour noted the necessity of clear definitions, guidance and enforcement rules to support a national model. 20% (247) opposed the proposed national exemptions, citing the importance of a level playing field and the risk of additional administrative burdens for accommodation providers. 22% (266) did not answer.

4.2.4. 47% (576 out of 1223) of respondents opposed giving mayors and other local leaders the power to introduce additional local exemptions, with many favouring a simpler, national model to avoid confusion for visitors and reduce the administrative burden for providers. 33% (401) supported additional local exemptions, noting flexibility to tailor the power to local circumstances, as well as the need to protect groups who were not listed as potential national exemptions, including small businesses or medical or educational travellers. 20% (246) did not respond.

4.3. Government response

4.3.1. The government aims to ensure administrative burdens on businesses are proportionate and do not hinder growth, while giving mayors and local leaders the tools they need to invest in their areas. The scope of the visitor levy will therefore include stays in all types of short-term, commercially let accommodation, with all types of visitor accommodation in scope. The government will apply a de minimis threshold below which providers will not be liable for the levy, with the intention that this exempts only occasional, informal providers where the administrative costs may outweigh the levy revenue generated.

4.3.2. This is a finely balanced decision. Broad application of the levy means a simpler, straight-forward design and helps ensure there is a level playing field for accommodation providers in the national design of the levy. Furthermore, limiting exceptions will improve understanding of and compliance with the levy rules (see 7.3.3).

4.3.3. The levy will not be payable where the accommodation is not commercially let to visitors, for example when family or friends are staying at someone's home. The levy will also not apply to dedicated Temporary Accommodation as these accommodation types are used as primary residences rather than visitor accommodation.

4.3.4. Government recognises that some strategic authorities may see a case for excluding accommodation types that are likely to be used for trips by youth groups and are often the lowest cost options for visitors. Strategic authorities will have the power to exempt certain types of visitor accommodation in their area – tent pitches, touring caravan pitches, hostels and potentially other similar types of accommodation, given these are often used for educational purposes or for social benefit, such as school or youth group trips, often at very low cost. This will be devolved as the decision whether to use these powers should be informed by local economic and market conditions. Strategic authorities will need to consider whether this is right for their region as part of their local consultation process, taking into consideration their local visitor economy and wider benefits that certain kinds of accommodation might bring to an area. Strategic authorities will also need to consider the subsidy control considerations of implementing any exemptions to the visitor levy and ensure compliance with international and domestic subsidy obligations. The government will continue to consider whether strategic authorities should have powers to exempt further accommodation types beyond those listed here. The levy will also not apply to registered gypsy and traveller sites.

4.3.5. Exemptions will only be based on accommodation type, rather than visitor characteristics, noting concerns about the administrative burden that it would place on accommodation providers and visitors to confirm eligibility for exemptions, especially where this would require personally sensitive information to be shared. The proportionate levy rate (see 5.3.1) will help to ensure that the levy amount reflects the visitor’s personal circumstances.

5. Setting the levy rate

5.1. Summary of government proposals

5.1.1. The government proposed that:

5.1.2. The rate be based on a percentage model due to its proportionality, as lower-cost stays would also incur lower charges, meaning that those who can afford it contribute the most;

5.1.3. Mayors and other local leaders should have flexibility to set the rate, and vary it for different types of accommodation, such as short-term lets.

5.1.4. The government also sought views on:

5.1.5. Which elements of a wider accommodation package should be liable to the levy, where the package may include additional components such as meals, entertainment or transport;

5.1.6. Whether additional safeguards or local flexibilities, such as seasonal variation in rates or variation across constituent authorities, would be appropriate, noting the need to balance responsiveness with administrative simplicity;

5.1.7. Whether a national cap should be placed on levy rates, and whether there should be a limit on the maximum number of consecutive nights to which a levy applies, to protect longer stays and ensure affordability.

5.2. Consultation responses

5.2.1. 60% (726 out of 1223) of respondents opposed a percentage rate model, with the strongest opposition coming from accommodation providers, who noted the potential for administrative complexity and market distortion. Of members of the public who responded, many agreed that simplicity, rather than rate type, was the biggest concern. 21% (260) of respondents agreed with a percentage model due to its proportionality, as less expensive stays would incur smaller charges, making this a fairer, less regressive option for low-cost family holidays. 19% (237) did not answer.

5.2.2. 47% (573 out of 1223) opposed giving mayors and other local leaders the flexibility to set the rate locally and 47% (573) opposed giving local leaders the flexibility to vary it for different types of accommodation. Respondents noted increased complexity as a key impact, as well as the importance of not unfairly advantaging/disadvantaging accommodation providers across different levy areas. 33% (403) supported giving mayors and other local leaders the flexibility to set rates locally and 29% (359) supported giving local leaders the flexibility to vary it for different types of accommodation. 20% (247) did not answer on local rate flexibility and 24% (291) did not answer on rate flexibility between different types of accommodation.

5.2.3. When asked how a percentage rate should work, 45% (550 out of 1223) preferred that a percentage rate be applied solely to the accommodation element of inclusive packages, with some suggesting that the inclusion of non-accommodation elements would exceed the scope of the levy. 16% (195) preferred a total cost model, and 39% (478) did not answer.

5.2.4. 43% (526 out of 1223) opposed giving mayors and other local leaders the flexibility to vary the rate seasonally and 48% (593) opposed giving local leaders the flexibility to vary the rate across constituent authorities in their region. Respondents noted a high administrative and compliance burden for providers, as well as the risk of reduced visitor numbers or visitor displacement, especially during peak seasons. 33% (407) supported seasonal flexibility and 29% (351) supported flexibility across constituent authorities, noting the need to reflect different needs across mayoral areas and balance tourism pressures during low and peak seasons. 24% (290) did not answer on seasonal flexibility and 23% (279) did not answer on flexibility across constituent authorities. Suggestions for additional rate-setting safeguards include periodic rate reviews, transparent notice periods and clear stakeholder involvement.

5.2.5. 58% (706 out of 1223) of respondents agreed that the government should put a cap on the maximum tax rate. These responses suggested aligning the cap with the VAT threshold or limiting the rate to £5 and under for a flat rate option. 19% (232) opposed a rate cap, and 23% (285) did not answer. 40% (486) opposed a cap on the number of nights to which a levy applies, citing additional complexity for providers and visitors. 35% (432) supported a night cap, and 25% (305) did not answer. Among those who supported a cap, suggested limits typically ranged from 5-7 days a week.

5.3. Government response

5.3.1. The government has carefully considered views on this proposal and maintains that a percentage rate is the fairest way to calculate the levy while supporting local growth.

5.3.2. A percentage rate helps protect affordability by charging less on lower-cost accommodation and more on higher-cost accommodation, ensuring the levy remains proportionate to the cost of a stay. A percentage rate also adjusts according to price variations, which are driven by seasons, inflation, regional dynamics and other market factors. This reduces the need for regular adjustments, which would be administratively burdensome for strategic authorities and accommodation providers.

5.3.3. The government acknowledges that there are complexities with implementing a percentage rate model. However, there are a number of examples of this being delivered successfully internationally such as in Amsterdam, Berlin and Vienna.

5.3.4. The government will continue technical engagement with the accommodation sector and strategic authorities on the detail of how the percentage basis should be calculated, including the point at which a provider becomes liable for the levy, and how a percentage-based levy should be applied to packages where accommodation is only part of the total cost. This will draw on their experience of preparing for the introduction of percentage levies in Scotland.

5.3.5. The government does not intend to set a cap on the visitor levy rate, however, this is a finely balanced issue and government will continue to consider the case for doing so. The government’s position is that strategic authorities will be empowered to determine the appropriate rate for their area, drawing on local expertise and engagement with affected providers to strike a balance between raising revenue to support local economic priorities, including tourism, and ensuring the levy remains affordable.

5.3.6. Giving local leaders the flexibility to determine the levy rate is central to ensuring that it operates as a genuinely devolved power. The government considers that local leaders are best placed to set rates that reflect local circumstances, while avoiding the market-distorting effects that a nationally imposed cap could create, such as the cap operating as a default rate regardless of local market conditions. The government expects local leaders to engage constructively with businesses through the consultation process when determining an appropriate rate.

5.3.7. The government does not intend to allow local leaders to place a cap on the number of nights for which the levy may be charged, locally, as this would be operationally and administratively burdensome.

5.3.8. Mayors and other local leaders will also not be granted the power to set rates seasonally, by accommodation type, or across constituent authorities. Maintaining a single rate in a strategic authority provides stability and certainty for businesses and supports public understanding of how the rate will operate.

6. Responsibility for paying the levy

6.1. Summary of government proposals

6.1.1. The government proposed that:

6.1.2. Accommodation providers would be the liable persons for Overnight Visitor Levies.

6.1.3. The levy should operate on a self-assessed basis, where accommodation providers calculate the amount due based on the value or number of chargeable overnight stays and remit the appropriate sum to the relevant authority.

6.1.4. The tax point – the point at which the provider becomes liable – should be the date of arrival, rather than the date of booking or payment.

6.2. Consultation responses

6.2.1. 28% (340 out of 1,223) agreed that visitor accommodation providers should be legally liable, citing administrative simplicity and ease of enforcement. However, 46% (566) disagreed, citing compliance risks because providers cannot control cancellations or enforce payment, alongside concerns about administrative burdens. 26% (317) did not answer.

6.2.2. 39% (477 out of 1223) agreed that a self-assessed model is the most appropriate approach for administering a visitor levy, as providers are best placed to register stays, understand exemptions and maintain records. 25% (311) opposed a self-assessed model, citing the administrative burden on providers and a risk of non-compliance. 36% (435) did not answer.

6.2.3. 36% (434 out of 1223) agreed that the tax point should be the point of arrival, citing certainty for customers, avoidance of refunds for no-shows, and the possibility of integrating payment with other check-in procedures. 35% (430) opposed setting the point of arrival as the tax point, citing additional burdens at check-in and the risk that a levy charged at arrival might not reflect the subsequent stay. These responses often preferred payment to be made at the booking stage, and/or for third party platforms to be responsible for collecting the levy. 29% (359) did not answer.

6.3. Government response

6.3.1. The government maintains the position that the accommodation provider should be the party liable for the levy and be required to conduct a self-assessment to establish liability. This approach would mean that providers would be legally responsible for calculating and collecting the levy, and for paying it to the relevant levying authority.

6.3.2. This approach is common across the world, as accommodation providers hold the relevant information needed to calculate the levy amount accurately and provide returns to the tax authority.

6.3.3. This approach will also enable providers to incorporate the levy into prices as part of wider dynamic pricing considerations if they choose to pass the costs of the levy on to visitors.

6.3.4. The government recognises the concerns raised on the point at which a stay becomes liable for the levy, and interactions with refunds. The government also recognises that while in principle applying a percentage levy is relatively straightforward, this may require changes in the way prices are set for some parts of the sector, particularly where there are business-to-business sales of rooms, such as for package holidays.

6.3.5. As such, as part of continuing technical engagement on applying the percentage rate, the government will consider the point in the transaction at which the liability should be calculated, the point at which a stay becomes liable, and what guidance can be developed to support providers to implement percentage levies.

6.3.6. This engagement will also consider whether booking platforms may be able to take a role in supporting the collection and remittance of the levy to the tax authority on the behalf of the accommodation provider, to help reduce burdens on individual providers through economies of scale.

7. Administration

7.1. Summary of government proposals

7.1.1. The government sought views on:

7.1.2. Whether the levy should be administered locally by relevant authorities, by central government, or through a combination of local and central authorities.

7.1.3. Further administrative support for businesses, and the use of digital booking platforms and intermediaries to streamline levy assessment, collection and tax returns.

7.1.4. Whether a registration scheme should be operated nationally or at local level.

7.1.5. The government also proposed that a registration mechanism be required to administer the levy.

7.2. Consultation responses

7.2.1. 27% (325 out of 1223) of respondents felt that the levy should be locally administered, citing integration with existing systems and the importance of local expertise. 20% (245) preferred a centralised approach to avoid a patchwork of administrative systems across levy areas. 17% (206) supported a combination of local and national administration with many advocating for a national collection system combined with local administration and support. 36% (447) did not answer.

7.2.2. Suggestions for further administrative support for businesses and providers included the creation of an accessible online portal, the processing of returns alongside existing taxes, and the provision of clear guidance and training, accessible digital tools, and compensation for administrative costs. Suggestions on the use of booking platforms or intermediaries highlighted the importance of uniform, industry-wide involvement, efficient software integration, including the use of a single digital platform to host remittance processes, and clear data sharing rules.

7.2.3. 40% (488 out of 1223) of respondents felt that the registration process should be operated nationally, citing consistency and ease for accommodation providers. 25% (305) preferred a local registration system and noted an opportunity to integrate with local licensing schemes and enforcement systems. 35% (430) did not answer.

7.3. Government response

7.3.1. The effective administration of the levy, and minimising burdens on business, has been a central consideration in the government's decisions on the design and proposed administration of the visitor levy. This includes maintaining a standardised national framework for the rate type and application of the levy, and limiting exemptions. In taking this approach, the government seeks to balance the devolution principle of local freedom and authority with requests from businesses operating across multiple areas for consistency.

7.3.2. The government will designate strategic authorities as tax authorities responsible for the administration of the levy. This is because where a local leader chooses to introduce a levy, it is right that their authority is accountable to local communities and businesses for its delivery.

7.3.3. However, the government will work with strategic authorities to reduce unnecessary complexity and fragmentation for accommodation providers, particularly those operating across multiple strategic authorities. This includes exploring opportunities for collective or shared delivery arrangements where multiple strategic authorities introduce a levy, as well as encouraging common approaches to system design, data standards and digital interfaces, and issuing non-statutory guidance.

7.3.4. The government considers that registration of accommodation providers should form part of the local tax administration system developed and operated by strategic authorities introducing a levy. Integrating registration into the local system used for tax returns will also streamline the process for businesses and support compliance and enforcement activity. Accommodation providers will need to notify the relevant authority of their liability to pay the levy, provide self-assessed returns and keep records. The government is considering whether a duty to register should be a mandatory part of the levy or should be left to the discretion of levy authorities, noting that this is connected to the need for those liable to the levy to notify their liability.

7.3.5. The government intends to pursue a clear and proportionate compliance framework for businesses, while enabling strategic authorities to design systems that reflect local circumstances and their approach to compliance and enforcement. The expectation is that core aspects of the compliance framework will be set nationally to drive consistency in the requirements on liable persons, such as accounting periods. The government will continue to work with mayors, accommodation providers and other stakeholders in developing these arrangements to ensure they are practical, deliverable and minimise administrative burdens.

7.3.6. The government also recognises that appropriate data sharing may support the effective administration of the levy and help strategic authorities identify and address non-compliance. There may be benefits for compliance activity and effective administration of the levy in enabling relevant information to be shared, where necessary, between different parts of local government and, where appropriate, between central and local government. Any such arrangements will need to be proportionate and carefully designed, and subject to proper safeguards. The government will consider these issues further as part of the development of legislation and the levy's compliance and administration framework.

8. Enforcement and appeals

8.1. Summary of government proposals

8.1.1. The government proposed that:

8.1.2. Tax authorities be granted enforcement powers to ensure compliance with the levy. Proposed powers include civil information and inspection powers, civil powers to charge interest and penalties, and discretionary debt relief powers.

8.1.3. An appeals process should be available for providers and should support disputes on liability, incorrect classification and in relation to enforcement action.

8.2. Consultation responses

8.2.1. 44% (538 out of 1223) of respondents agreed with the proposed tax powers, citing the importance of enforcement to ensure compliance. Responses also highlighted the need for careful targeting to avoid intrusive checks and supported discretionary enforcement when dealing with genuine errors or in cases of hardship. 25% (301) opposed the government’s proposals, citing a high compliance burden, especially for small providers, which was felt to be disproportionately intrusive. 31% (384) did not answer.

8.2.2. 60% (740 out of 1223) of respondents agreed with the proposed appeals process. Additional considerations include an independent appeals route, accessibility for small providers and necessary adjustments to ensure cases are heard in a timely manner. 8% (98) were in opposition, and 32% (385) did not answer.

8.3. Government response

8.3.1. As with other self-assessed taxes, the visitor levy will rely on a high degree of voluntary compliance, supported by a clear and proportionate compliance and enforcement framework. While the system is intended to operate on a trust basis, it is important that as tax authorities, strategic authorities have access to appropriate powers to monitor compliance and take action where necessary. The government therefore intends to provide strategic authorities with a suite of proportionate powers, including, but not limited to, information and inspection powers, as well as powers to charge interest and penalties where obligations are not met. As with other aspects of administration, strategic authorities may, in practice, deliver these functions with support from constituent authorities.

8.3.2. The government will establish the core framework for compliance, enforcement and appeals. As set out in paragraph 7.3.5, our intention is that this framework is clear proportionate. The government expects to use existing tax compliance powers as a basis for this framework.

8.3.3. In relation to appeals, the government maintains its position set out in the consultation that accommodation providers should have access to a clear and accessible appeals process in respect of liability decisions, classifications and enforcement actions. The government will establish an appeals framework that supports timely resolution of disputes and will set out further detail on this in due course.

9. Potential impacts of the levy

9.1. Summary of government proposals

9.1.1. The government sought views on whether there may be any disproportionate impacts on people sharing protected characteristics in the design of a visitor levy power. The government set out that mayoral strategic authorities and foundation strategic authorities will each also be required to carry out their own local consultations and produce their own Equality Impact Assessments in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty before introducing a visitor levy.

9.2. Consultation responses

9.2.1. 29% (357 out of 1223) of respondents noted some equalities impacts of the visitor levy proposals.

9.2.2. Around 13% (165 out of 1223) of respondents mentioned age equalities impacts of the visitor levy. Respondents felt that any negative economic impacts of the visitor levy could have a disproportionate impact on older independent accommodation providers, particularly female providers over 60. The government does not hold statistics on demographics of independent accommodation providers in England, but around 6% (70 out of 1223) of respondents have cited PASC UK's reporting that 45% of operators are aged 60+, with most being women.

9.2.3. Around 12% (141 out of 1223) of respondents felt the visitor levy may cause complexity and digital exclusion for older providers, which may lead to compliance risks. Respondents called for clear and thorough national guidance to mitigate any impacts to older people.

9.2.4. Around 12% (142 out of 1223) of respondents mentioned disabled travellers in their response. Percentage-based rates may result in higher charges where accessible rooms are larger and priced higher. The government does not hold data on the comparative pricing of accessible rooms versus non-accessible rooms in England. Respondents felt travellers who require carers and separate rooms for carers may also be disproportionately affected under both flat rate and percentage-based levy models.

9.2.5. Socioeconomic background is not a protected characteristic as defined in the Equality Act 2010, however, the government notes that around 16% (199 out of 1223) of respondents raised concerns about impacts on families. Respondents noted that a flat rate levy could disproportionately affect families, while a percentage-based levy could increase costs during peak school holiday periods. Overall respondents suggested that a visitor levy could reduce holiday affordability, deter overnight stays, or encourage UK travellers to choose destinations abroad.

9.3. Government response

9.3.1. The impacts of any levy will depend on local decisions by MSAs and FSAs. Before introducing a levy, strategic authorities will be required to consider and set out in their prospectus the anticipated impacts of both the levy and the proposed use of levy revenues. Strategic authorities will also be required to undertake impact assessments and consult locally before implementation.

9.3.2. The government notes that respondents indicated disproportionate impacts on women and older people. The government does not hold data on the demographic profile of independent accommodation providers, including the proportion of female providers and providers aged over 60. In relation to the wider workforce, 2025 employment data indicate women are proportionately represented in the hospitality sector.6 Women would therefore not be expected to be disproportionally impacted should the visitor levy affect employment outcomes.

[6] ONS Annual Population Survey from January – December 2025: economic activity rate – aged 16-64; employment rate – aged 16-64; G, I, Distributions, hotels and restaurants (SIC 2007). Women represent 48% of economic activity rate aged 16-64 and represent 48% of employees in hotels and restaurants.

9.3.3. Concerns relating to older female providers were often linked to potential increases in costs and impacts on visitor demand. The government has had due regard to these issues, and these factors have been considered alongside the potential for levy revenues to support investment in the visitor economy, which may mitigate or offset impacts over time.

9.3.4. The government notes respondents' concern of digital exclusion for over-60s accommodation providers. The government does not hold evidence to support the risk of the visitor levy causing digital exclusion to older accommodation providers but will continue to assess the impacts of new administrative obligations on business owners collectively as we prepare to legislate. More broadly, the government is committed to ensuring everyone, in every community, is able to benefit from technology. Part of this means public and private sector services being accessible and usable, so digital services work for everyone, while offline or assisted routes exist where needed. Last year the government also ran the £11.9 million Digital Inclusion Innovation Fund, supporting local projects across England, and showing why putting local communities in the driving seat to improve digital inclusion best helps people. These principles will continue to inform the development of the levy and its administration.

9.3.5. Strategic authorities will be expected to consider the potential impacts of the levy on disabled travellers and those requiring carers when developing their local levy schemes. Strategic authorities will be required to undertake impact assessments and carry out local consultations before implementing a levy, enabling these impacts to be considered alongside local circumstances and mitigation options where appropriate.

9.3.6. The government's position is that a percentage-based levy is the most proportionate and equitable method of calculating the charge. Unlike a flat-rate levy, a percentage-based approach ensures that the levy scales with the cost of accommodation, resulting in lower charges for lower-cost stays and reducing the relative impact on lower-income visitors and families. The government recognises concerns raised by respondents about affordability, including during peak travel periods when accommodation prices may increase through seasonal or dynamic pricing. However, a percentage-based model ensures that the levy remains proportionate to the underlying accommodation cost and avoids the regressive effects associated with a flat-rate charge. The government therefore considers a percentage-based model to provide the best balance between revenue generation, simplicity and fairness. Decisions on whether to introduce a levy, and at what rate, will be taken locally by strategic authorities following consultation and consideration of local impacts.

Annex A: Groups of respondents to the consultation

Respondent type	Count	%
Accommodation and bookings sectors (including representative bodies)	**365**	**30%**
Accommodation providers	*289*	*24%*
Booking platforms & Online Travel Agents	*6*	*0.5%*
Tour operators incl. coach companies	*5*	*0.4%*
Tourist boards and similar organisations	*42*	*3%*
Outdoor activity groups (scouting and guiding, mountain huts and clubs, etc.)	*23*	*2%*
Wider hospitality sector and other businesses	**114**	**9%**
Other hospitality businesses (pubs, entertainment and experience providers, and similar organisations)	*76*	*6%*
Business Improvement Districts (BIDS, including Accommodation BIDs)	*16*	*1%*
Non-hospitality businesses and related representative groups	*22*	*2%*
Public sector (mayoral strategic authorities, local government and other public sector bodies)	**103**	**9%**
Mayoral strategic authorities and foundation strategic authorities	*14*	*1%*
Members of Parliament	*5*	*0.4%*
Non-mayoral local government (local authorities and national park authorities)	*81*	*7%*
Other public sector	*3*	*0.2%*
Civic, cultural interest groups, and non-profit organisations	**85**	**7%**
Cultural and heritage organisations	*63*	*5%*

Charity sector	*3*	*0.2%*
Miscellaneous	*19*	*2%*
Professional & policy Services	**14**	**1%**
Think tanks and research organisations	*8*	*1%*
Tax, accounting and consultancy organisations	*4*	*0.3%*
Other policy and professional services	*2*	*0.2%*
Members of the public	**542**	**44%**
Total	**1223**	**100%**

Annex B: Process Map

Stage 1: Consultation process								
1. Mayor / strategic authority agrees to consult on introducing a visitor levy.	→	2. Mayor / strategic authority publishes a local consultation and prospectus.	→	3. Mayor / strategic authority considers responses.	→	4. Mayor / strategic authority publishes a final prospectus and impact assessment.	→	5. Mayor / strategic authority completes the formal decision making process.

↓

Stage 2: Notice period
6. Strategic authority provides a notice period for businesses, local communities and members of the public before the levy becomes live.

↓

Stage 3: The levy becomes live		
7. The levy becomes live for bookings made on or after a specific date.	→	8. All stays become liable for the levy.

↓

Stage 4: Ongoing levy operation		
9. Accommodation providers send tax returns to the strategic authority.	→	10. Strategic authority conducts enforcement activity as needed.

↓

Stage 5: Adjusting an existing levy
11. If a strategic authority wishes to make major changes to the levy, go back to step 1.

Strategic authorities are required to consult when making changes to the levy. This would include changes to the rate or exempted accommodation types.

Annex C: Acronyms

AI – Artificial Intelligence

EDCEB – English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill

FSAs – Foundation Strategic Authorities

GLA – Greater London Authority

HMRC – His Majesty's Revenue and Customs

HMT – His Majesty's Treasury

LAs – Local Authorities

MCAs – Mayoral Combined Authorities

MCIL – Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy

MHCLG – Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

MSAs – Mayoral Strategic Authorities

MSMEs – Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises

ONS – Office for National Statistics

PED – Price Elasticity of Demand

PSED – Public Sector Equality Duty

STLs – Short-Term Lets

VL – Visitor Levy

Annex D: Definitions

Accommodation Business Improvement District

A Business Improvement District focused on visitor accommodation. Accommodation providers within a defined area contribute to local projects such as marketing, public realm improvements and event promotion through a small mandatory levy, charged alongside business rates.

Cap

A limit on the cost of a levy. Either a maximum rate above which Mayors cannot increase the rate, or a maximum number of consecutive nights after which the visitor levy no longer applies to subsequent nights of the same stay.

Commercially let

Accommodation that is advertised and made available in exchange for payment or other consideration, as part of a visitor accommodation business.

Consideration

Any form of value received in exchange for accommodation, typically understood as money, but may include other forms of payment.

Constituent Authority

The councils that come together to form a Combined or Combined Authority are called constituent councils. They all provide at least one member of the authority's board who is able to vote on all decisions unless they are exercised exclusively by the Mayor.

Economic Displacement

The movement of economic activity from one area to another, for example an overnight stay by a visitor.

Exemption

A specific condition or category that is excluded from the visitor levy, wither nationally or locally, based on fairness or necessity.

Foundation Strategic Authority (FSA)

A Strategic Authority that includes non-mayoral combined authorities and combined county authorities, and any local authority designated as a Strategic Authority without a Mayor. A lower tier of devolved authority than MSAs, but receives some of the devolved funding that MSAs do and has a comparable responsibility of driving local economic growth, including through writing local growth plans.

Impact Assessment

A formal evaluation of the potential economic, social, and environmental effects of introducing or changing a policy.

Inclusive Package

A bundled offering that combines accommodation with other services such as meals, transport, or entertainment for a single price.

Local Authorities

Principal councils in England (e.g. county councils, metropolitan boroughs, unitary authorities) responsible for local governance and services.

Mayoral Strategic Authority (MSA)

A Strategic Authority with a directly-elected Mayor and access to a greater range of powers and funding than Foundation Strategic Authorities. MSAs include the Greater London Authority, all Mayoral Combined Authorities and all Mayoral Combined County Authorities.

Overnight Visitor Levy

A discretionary local tax charged on overnight stays in commercially let visitor accommodation, intended to support local services and infrastructure.

Precept

An amount added to council tax by certain authorities to fund specific local services or initiatives.

Price Elasticity of Demand (PED)

A measure of how sensitive demand for accommodation is to changes in price. A higher elasticity means demand is more likely to fall when prices rise.

Proportionate

A charge that reflects the cost or value of the service being provided, ensuring fairness in how a levy is applied.

Strategic Authority

A tier of government between local authorities and central government. In most cases this will be a combined authority or combined county authority, but it also includes the Greater London Authority and potentially individual local authorities which have been specially designated.

Sustainable Development

A process of improving economic, social, environmental, and cultural well-being in a way that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs.

Tax Authority

The public body responsible for administering and collecting the visitor levy. This could be a local authority or a central body such as HMRC.

Tax Point

The moment at which the liability to pay a levy arises – typically the date of arrival, when the details of the booking are confirmed.

Threshold

A defined minimum level of activity or value below which an accommodation provider is exempt from liability for the visitor levy, intended to reduce administrative burdens for small or infrequent providers.

Visitor

An individual staying temporarily in visitor accommodation, regardless of their reason for travel or place of origin.

Visitor Accommodation

Any room, building, or site (including land for tents, caravans, or houseboats) that is let commercially for temporary overnight stays and is not the visitor's usual place of residence.

Visitor Accommodation Provider

An individual or business that lets visitor accommodation commercially to visitors in exchange for consideration.