GREATER CAMBRIDGE CIL – REVIEW OF REPRESENTATIONS

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
Barnack Estates	CIL will be £3.25 per square foot. If the unit is worth £165 per square foot, that is 1.9%. This is a very high tax.	Although the representation is unclear, they are presumably referring to industrial uses. Their claimed value of £195 per square foot would need to be based on a rent of £8.25 per square foot, whereas local evidence indicates that rents for new build space are currently c £18 per square foot (with a resulting value of £362 per square foot. At this value, the proposed CIL would equate to only 0.89% of value.	None
Bidwells on behalf of Biomed Reality	Questions whether developer engagement has taken place as noted in paragraph 015 of the PPG. Asserts (without supporting evidence) that costs are too low and margins too low. Requests that exceptional circumstances relief be made available.	The Authority held a stakeholder workshop and attendees were invited to submit any evidence they wished us to consider. The consultation on the Draft CS is also an opportunity for stakeholders to submit evidence. The suggestion that consultation has not taken place is therefore wholly inaccurate. Not agreed. This is an option that the Authority can consider at any time.	None.
Bidwells on behalf of Brockton Everlast	Trinity Hall Farm and Cambridge Science Park would have had a CIL liability of £19 million. Land values in GC are higher than those in the viability study. Requests that exceptional circumstances relief be made available. £50 million of income from CIL is said to make a negligible contribution to strategic transport. Appendix 1 provides a Costar extract of industrial sales. Appendix 2 cites build costs.	This figure is meaningless without wider context. What were the GDV and costs the scheme? The representation indicates that the scheme extended to 112,345 square metres, which could have a GDV of over £1 billion. In this context, the proposed CIL would equate to 1.7% of total development costs, which is a relatively minor addition to cost. This therefore demonstrates that development in the area is more viable than elsewhere, given that land value is the product of scheme GDV less construction costs, fees, profit etc. This is why the PPG requires viability studies to use benchmark land values, not land transactions, as using the later would give all potential uplift in land value to landowners. This is an option that the Authority can consider at any time. This is almost a quarter of the funding gap and is not negligible. In London, the Mayoral CIL was introduced across all types of development and it generated funds of £300 million of the £18 billion cost of the Elizabeth Line. This was a far smaller contribution to the overall funding gap and this was never challenged on the same basis. In almost all cases, the sales cited are very secondary stock. Single figures are provided with no supporting information on what is included. This is not a robust source of evidence as it cannot be interrogated in its current form.	None
Bidwells on behalf of Brockton Everlast Technical Note	Typologies should include coliving and retirement housing. Strategic sites are often nil rated by other authorities. Given the variations in sales values, more than one residential CIL rate should have been set. Differences in rents between lab space and offices. Suggests yields of 6% for prime industrial.	Given that the proposed CIL is only £60 per square metre and the significant headroom in the City Centre (where these types of scheme would come forward) testing variations on a (residential) theme is not necessary. As noted elsewhere, other authorities set far higher CIL rates as this is their preferred mechanism for collecting the bulk of infrastructure costs. GC only intends to use CIL to collect strategic infrastructure funding with the bulk of onsite obligations sought through S106 (which can clearly be applied flexibly). This would be inconsistent with the Authority's intention to secure the bulk of contributions through S106. CIL is deliberately set at a modest level so that a single rate could be applied across the whole area. Had a variable approach been adopted, £60 per square metre would have been the minimum rate, not the top end. Considered in more detail in separate note on R&D and office rents. Prime yield guides produced by main agencies indicate 5% for south east estates.	None

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
	Provides claimed build costs for 6 new build lab/office developments. Contingency not allowed for. No indexation on Section 106 obligations. Building Safety Levy – report does not explain how they have been included Profit margin should be 20% of GDV. BLV – quotes land values for policy estimates industrial value of £20.15 million per hectare.	Further information would need to be provided for these figures to be capable to interrogation. Furthermore, no information on the expected rent levels at these six schemes has been provided. If these costs were correct, then they indicate that the developers involved will be expecting significantly higher rents than existing available stock and this should be clarified. Incorrect – this is included at 5% of costs. This is an odd comment given that appraisals are carried out on a current day cost and value basis (which they accept elsewhere). Why focus on cost inflation on one input when ignoring potential growth on values. The rates are noted in Table 4.27.1 of the report and paragraph 4.27. explains that these rates apply to the GIA of schemes, excluding the affordable housing. The appraisals assume that the full liability is paid at commencement. It is unclear what further explanation Bidwells are expecting? The profit margin applied to private housing developments in live FVAs in GC is 17.5% of GDV, which is also widely reflected across the south east. The 20% suggested by Bidwells exceeds the rate normally applied. This is based on transactional evidence of industrial land values, which demonstrates that there is significant surplus value in industrial development that is currently not being captured by the planning system. If industrial development is capable of generating residual values of £20.15 million per gross hectare and greenfield land values are circa £25k per hectare, then industrial development can readily absorb the proposed CIL of £35 per square metre and still leave significant surplus land value.	
Bidwells on behalf of Jesus College	No additional comments to those above. Indicates that the Authority should indicate how charitable relief will be applied.	This is a matter dealt with by the CIL regulations. Charitable relief is mandatory and not a matter that the Authority needs to opine on its documentation.	None
Bidwells on behalf of Pioneer Group	Seeks a nil rate for Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton area of change	Planning permission for this scheme has been granted so CIL will not apply. To justify a nil rate, the owners would need to submit a full Financial Viability Assessment, which the Authority would then need to commission a full review (including cost estimate). Both the FVA and the view would need to be made publicly available for the Examination.	None
Bidwells on behalf of Railpen	No additional comments to those above.	See comments in response to other Bidwells submissions	None
Bidwells on behalf of Stanhope	No additional comments to those above.	See comments in response to other Bidwells submissions	None
Bidwells on behalf of UK Research and Innovation	£6 million CIL liability.	Outline planning application submitted in December 2025. This is likely to have been determined prior to the introduction of CIL so this scheme will not be CIL liable. No context for this figure provided. What is the expected GDV? And costs?	
Bidwells on behalf of Wrenbridge	No additional comments to those above.	See comments in response to other Bidwells submissions	None
Boyer Planning on behalf of Waterbeach Dev Co	Lack of clarity on how CIL would be applied to sites which already benefit from planning permission. Consider that their site should be nil rated.	Waterbeach benefits from planning permission and will not be CIL liable. It is our understanding that only development sought in any new application which exceeds the original planning permission is CIL liable. The regulations are clear in relation to sites that benefit from permission and there does not seem to be any logical reason for nil rating this site.	None
Cambridge University Hospitals	Seeking an early review of CIL to enable it to collect contributions towards healthcare provision.	CIL is intended to collect funds towards strategic transport, not health. That could change in future, but presumably this would require a rebalancing between S106 (which includes health) and CIL. There would not necessarily be an increase in funds for healthcare overall, but an adjustment in how the funds are secured. Health and education could be explicitly stated as nil rated, following London Mayoral CIL approach.	

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
	Seeking specific confirmation that healthcare facilities would fall under the all other uses rate. Key worker housing should be identified as nil rated. Seeking nil rate on market housing developed to cross-subsidise the development of this key worker housing. Notes that affordable housing on sites in Huntingdon have been generally less than 20%. Concerned that the introduction of CIL will impact delivery of affordable housing.	Providing key worker housing meets the definition of 'affordable' in the NPPF and appropriately secured through a planning obligation, it would benefit from social housing relief. Market housing would need to pay CIL, but the rate proposed is very modest and would have very little impact on the viability of any proposal by the Hospital. If necessary, exceptional circumstances relief could be deployed in this one case to avoid the need for additional market housing to cross-fund key worker housing. CIL rates in Huntingdonshire are significantly higher than those proposed in GC (currently £152.47 per square metre compared to £60 per square metre for residential). In addition, sales values in GC are higher than those in Huntingdonshire, so there is no direct comparability between affordable housing in each area.	Consider explicit mention of education and health within 'all other uses' rate on CS.
Carter Jonas on behalf of Axis Land Partnership	The implication of introducing CIL is that developers would seek a reduction in affordable housing in order to pay for CIL alongside existing S106 contributions. At private values of £372 per square foot, affordable values in the BNP study would be close to 80% of market value.	This presupposes that residual land values incorporating S106 and the required level of affordable housing is exactly equal to benchmark land value. This is very rarely the case in GC and there is sufficient headroom above benchmark land value for developments to absorb the proposed CIL, alongside S106 and affordable housing requirements. From a 'standback' perspective, it is clear that a CIL of £60 per square metre will have very little bearing on affordable housing, which "costs" in the region of £3,000 per square metre to deliver (in terms of 'opportunity cost'). Affordable rented values are set by reference to the relevant Local Housing Allowance level in each Broad Rental Market Area. They are not determined by percentages of market value.	None
Carter Jonas on behalf of Bloor Homes	Same as Axis Land representation	Same as Axis Land representation	None
Carter Jonas on behalf of Jaynic Properties Limited	Most authorities set nil rates for B2/B8. CIL should only be charged where there is a clear relationship between the type of development and the infrastructure it is intended to help fund. B2/B8 developments already find significant infrastructure via S106.	The examples cited are now very historic at a time when B2/B8 values were significantly lower. More recent CIL charging schedules include rates on industrial and logistics (e.g. Ealing, Croydon). CIL rates are a marginal additional cost and development will not be "displaced" by CIL, as the market will require space in certain areas to respond to local needs. The proposed CIL equates to a very low proportion of development costs for B2/B8 development and the suggestions that introducing a CIL will stop development coming forward is incorrect. This is precisely NOT what CIL intends to do. Carter Jonas appear to describing S106 obligations, not CIL. There does not need to be a functional link between what CIL funds and the types of development that pay CIL. This is recognised in the Authority's approach, which is why the rates have been set at a deliberately low level.	None
David Lock on behalf of Welcome Genome Campus	Do not support CIL as a mechanism for securing contributions from emerging site allocations as receipts will only arrive at some point in the future. Same rents are assumed for lab space and offices and same costs. R&D should not incur the same charge as offices. CIL will yield limited funds and therefore they argue that there is no justification for introducing it in GC.	Unsure how this is different from S106, which will be the mechanism through which the bulk of infrastructure will be secured. Considered in more detail in separate note on R&D and offices. The same could have been said of the strategic CIL in London (Mayoral CIL) which collected contributions towards the Elizabeth Line. This line of argument was never accepted.	None
DP9 on behalf of Trinty College	Suggests that viability testing should incorporate net zero carbon requirements into the evidence base. Suggests that strategic sites be nil rated.	These are incorporated – there is a whole section on this in the report from paras 4.14 to 4.17. Whilst this might be an appropriate strategy in authorities which are seeking to use CIL to fund the bulk of infrastructure through CIL, this is not the case in GC, where there is an explicit approach of using CIL to	None

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
		collect contributions towards strategic transport. The proposed CIL is therefore analogous to the Mayoral CIL in London, which is set at a relatively nominal rate and is paid in addition to borough CILs and S106.	
	Construction costs too low – lab space costs are 40% to 50% premium to standard offices (in the region of £300 to £400 per square foot)		
	Rental values for R&D on third higher in Oxford than in Cambridge and yields 125 basis points stronger than those in Cambridge. These assumptions imply materially higher development values in Oxford, undermining the rationale for the same CIL rate in Cambridge.		
Gonville & Caius College – University of Cambridge	Concerned to avoid "double counting" of CIL.	There is no double counting – CIL is to be used to fund strategic transport projects.	
	Concerned that there is no reference in the consultation to mandatory charitable relief.	The Authority does not need to refer to mandatory charitable relief as it is mandatory. Assuming that G&CG meet the criteria set out for this relief in the CIL regulations, then they will be able to benefit from it. The Authority cannot seek to disapply mandatory charitable relief.	
	Offices, R&D and Mid-Tech should be reviewed as separate development types.	Considered in more detail in separate note on R&D and offices.	None
	Newsteer concerned that CIL would add to cashflow issues on major developments.	At the rates proposed, adding CIL at the proposed rates would not materially affect the viability of strategic developments. The impacts are already reflected in the viability study in any event. The bulk of infrastructure contributions will continue to be sought through S106 and the timing of this can be negotiated on a case by case basis, offering significantly more flexibility in comparison to authorities where CIL is the main mechanism for securing infrastructure funding.	
	Request to extend the final payment in the instalments policy for larger sites to 16 months.	This appears reasonable.	Consider extending final instalment.
	Argue for different rates for residential development.	GC has deliberately set a single rate for residential at a very modest level to preclude the need for differentiating between different sub-markets within the area. If different rates were introduced, the proposed £60 psm would be the *minimum* end of the range, with rates for some areas increasing.	
Lichfields on behalf of CEG Land Promotions Ltd	Consider setting specific rates for identified strategic sites.	Not necessary as the proposed CIL is set at a nominal rate and is therefore analogous to other strategic CILs (such as the London Mayoral CIL which operates alongside borough CIL and S106).	
	Consider different rates for residential reflecting different sales values across GC.	Not necessary for the reason above.	None
	Consider separating offices from R&D.	Considered in more detail in separate note on R&D and offices.	
	The Viability Report does not consider BREEAM standard.	Incorrect – the appraisals incorporate full net zero carbon standard which meets the requirement of BREEAM.	
	The Viability Report does not consider the impact of CIL in different residential market areas.	Incorrect – the appraisals consider the maximum CIL rates that could be viably absorbed in 9 different value points across the GC area.	
	The Viability report does not include a contingency.	This is incorrect – the appraisals incorporate a contingency equating to 5% of costs.	
	Observations as to percentage of viable outcomes at paras 1.41 to 1.44 of representation.	Lichfields do not understand the outputs of the appraisals. Areas where sales values are at the lower end of the range are in the rural areas, whereas brownfield sites are in the City, where values are significantly higher. Lichfields have therefore compared the values that are predominantly applicable to greenfield development to brownfield land.	
	Office rents lower than those in the viability report.	Lichfields have included secondary offices in their analysis. Rents of new offices would not attract secondary rents.	

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
Lichfields on behalf of Hill Residential	CIL should not apply to large strategic developments. Contributions on major developments should be negotiated on individual basis. Other authorities offer nil rates for major strategic sites. They cite South Oxfordshire as an example (among others). Admit that the finance rate in the viability study is higher than most other local plan viability report. Claims that the appraisals do not include a contingency. Claim at para 1.58 that 84.6% of scenarios tested at a sales value of £4,000 per square metre are unviable.	The proposed CIL has been set at a deliberately low rate to enable major sites to continue to fund the bulk of infrastructure requirements through S106. As noted previously, the proposed CIL is analogous to the London Mayoral CIL, which has been set at a rate that enables boroughs to charge their own CIL and seek contributions via S106. Unlike other areas where CIL is used as the primary vehicle for collecting contributions to infrastructure, GC intends to continue to use S106 for the bulk of contributions. These will continue to be negotiated, offering a higher degree of flexibility than offered by other authorities. The representation fails to acknowledge that the CIL rate in South Oxfordshire is significantly higher at £366.20 per square metre, compared to the £60 per square metre proposed in GC. Reducing the finance cost would have a significant (positive) bearing on larger strategic sites. Incorrect – the appraisals incorporate a 5% contingency. Sales values at this level are quite rate in the GC area. If schemes were to come forward with these sales values on greenfield sites, there would need to be an adjustment to affordable housing, even before the CIL is applied. The addition of CIL at £60 per square metre would have little bearing on the percentage of affordable housing that could be viably delivered. Lichfields have also cited examples which will not, in reality, come forward. For example, in their table 4 they have compared "low density rural extensions" of various scales to BLV1 and BLV 2, which are City based benchmark land values. In reality, a rural based site would not be brought forward on a city-based benchmark land value.	None
Lichfields on behalf of Lolworth Developments	The industrial typologies are not reflective of the types of schemes being brought forward in GC. There are 50 sub-categories in BCIS data covering B2/B8 floorspace. Cites livestock buildings as an example. Claims that fees should be 15%. No allowance for abnormal costs (i.e. contamination) No contingency allowed. Claims yields of 6.9% to 7%. Rental range of £82.14 to £153 per square metre claimed. Lichfields Table 4 notes that industrial developments are unviable when considered against BLVs 1 and 2.	The typologies are based on single hectare plots which can be extrapolated upwards as necessary. The BCIS categories selected reflect the main types of B2/B8 space being developed. We have recently agreed 7% on a strategic industrial development in a live FVA. The bulk of schemes are expected to come forward on greenfield land so instances of contamination will be rare. Incorrect – the appraisals incorporate a 5% contingency. These yields will relate to secondary stock. It is also unclear how Lichfields have arrived at these yields. They are not consistent with the yield guides for prime industrial produced by the main agents. Lichfields have not made any distinction between secondary stock and new stock in their analysis which therefore understates income. While there will be a degree of variation in rents, the proposed CIL of £35 per square metre is significantly lower than the maximum rates identified by the appraisals of £261 to £510 per square metre, which leaves significant headroom for variations in rent levels. Again, Lichfields are relying upon unrealistic scenarios. Developers would not replace existing office space with industrial units, nor would they replace existing industrial space with more industrial. They would, however, bring forward new industrial floorspace on previously undeveloped land (BLVs 3 and 4).	None
Savills on behalf of Anglia Ruskin	See Savills on behalf of St Johns College – no additional points raised in this representation	N/A	None

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
Savills on behalf of Endurance Estates and Pigeon	Risk to affordable housing mentioned	The risk of a £60 per square metre CIL is very low when considering the cost of delivering affordable housing is at least £3,000 per square metre (when considering the difference between market housing and the amounts that RPs will pay for affordable housing).	None
Savills on behalf of Hallam Land	No new comments – identical to Savills representation for Endurance Estates and Pigeon	N/A	None
Savills on behalf of Martin Grant Land	No new comments – identical to Savills representation for Endurance Estates and Pigeon	N/A	None
Savills on behalf of Martin Grand Land and Endurance Estates	No new comments not raised by Savills in other representations	N/A	None
Savills on behalf of Newlands (Cambridge) Ltd and Tritax Big Box Developments Ltd	Criticise the level of rents assumed for industrial development. Larger big box developments will attract lower rents.	The rents are based on actual lettings of industrial space in GC. They have suggested a CIL liability of £8.48m for Tritax Park and Newlands Park combined. The GDV of this scheme (based on their suggested rent of £12.50 per square foot) would be £652 million. The CIL liability equates to just 1.22%.	None
Savills on behalf of St Johns College	Charitable relief – activities beyond core charitable objective may not benefit from charitable relief. Suggests that CIL is being brought forward in advance of local plan and therefore CIL rates being set prematurely. They suggest that rents set by the college are lower than market rents. Not clear whether viability study reflects circulation space for flatted schemes. Comments regarding typologies. Sales values are predominantly from second hand units. Quotes a range of schemes with values ranging from £356 - £538 per square foot. External works allowance – they say that strategic sites will require a wide range of physical infrastructure secured through S106 obligations.	Charitable relief is a matter for the college to deal with. If it develops schemes as speculative developments then they will be CIL liable. However, the proposed CIL is a very small proportion of overall development costs and far lower than other comparable authorities. Viability testing reflects the emerging Local Plan. If rents for college PBSA are discounted and qualify as affordable, GC could consider classifying them as affordable for CIL purposes. The appraisals incorporate circulation space. The typologies are consistent with those adopted by the Local Plan Viability Study. This will tend to understate, not overstate values as new build units will typically generate premium values. These are all schemes outside the City Centre. The upper level of our range is for schemes in the City Centre so their values are not out of sync with ours. They are confusing different ‘pots’. There is an explicit allowance in the appraisal for Section 106 obligations which is distinct from on-site (non planning obligation) infrastructure. External works cover on-site plot costs, not items secured through S106.	Consider applying nil rate to PBSA if the rents are discounted and secured by a planning obligation
Stantec on behalf of Royal London Asset Management	Questions whether funding gap will persist after CIL receipts have been applied funding from other sources. Refers to challenging economic conditions. Developments in GC already subject to a wide range of obligations and policy requirements. Appendix A – please see response above to “Bidwells on behalf of consortium”.	There will still be a significant funding gap after CIL given the modest rate applied. The bulk of contributions sought by the authority (though S106) will continue to be applied on a negotiated basis and could, if necessary, flex accordingly. Policy requirements in GC are no more onerous than in other LPA areas in the south east, where CIL rates have been in place at significantly higher levels than proposed by GC.	

Submitting organisation/client	Substantive viability points	Comments	Action
Twenty five on behalf of Henry Boot	Lists a range of charging authorities with nil rates for employment uses. It includes Oxford with £175 psm for offices and £35 psm for B2 / B8. Rents for Mid-Tech are lower than R&D Questions why there are not multiple rates for different areas within GC. Suggestion to extend instalments policy to 480 day.	Other than Oxford (which adopted its revised CS in 2025), all the other charging schedules that Twenty five identify are very historic and where brought forward at a time when capital values for employment floorspace and logistics/B2/B8 space were significantly lower. If these authorities were setting CIL rates today, it is very unlikely that they would adopt the same position. Mid-Tech would fall into B2/B8 CIL rate, not R&D. The proposed rates are set at a modest level that can be viably absorbed across all sub-markets within the area. This makes subdivision unnecessary. This extension does not appear to be unreasonable for larger developments.	None If mid-tech does not fall within B2/B8 uses then CS should be clarified to incorporate Mid-tech into £35 psm rate Consider proposed extension to fourth payment in instalments policy
Urban & Civic	Contends that strategic sites should be nil rated due to extensive on-site infrastructure costs. No recognition that the Development Corp may bring new funding sources and this would reduce the funding gap. The evidence base does not test the economics of large scale strategic residential development. Suggests nil-rating major strategic sites. Specific points on viability: • No contingency allowed • Developer return 17.5% • Professional fees 7% too low • Abnormal costs – no infrastructure costs Suggest that sales values do not reflect GC area	These costs are reflected in the assessments. Furthermore, the proposed CIL is set at a rate that is arguably relatively nominal compared to many other authorities. This is speculative and it is very unlikely that the Dev Corp would be able to access sufficient funding to fill the gap even after CIL has been introduced. Not agreed – the Local Plan and the CIL VS both include major development typologies. This would normally be an approach where LPAs intend to secure all (or the bulk of) contributions via CIL and not through S106. GC has proposed the opposite – that S106 will continue to be used for most contributions and CIL will be used for strategic transport only. • Incorrect – a 5% contingency is included • This is consistent with the rate applied in live FVAs in GC and across the south east • Consistent with rate applied in live FVAs. • Incorrect – there is an allowance for normal on-site infrastructure costs in the appraisals. This is incorrect – values are based on recorded transactions in the area. This return is line with the profit assumed in live FVAs in the GC area and elsewhere in the south east Not agreed – this is a reasonable allowance for major sites. Incorrect – while the appraisals exclude allowances for true abnormal costs (e.g. contamination), they do include allowances for onsite infrastructure (which developers often refer to as “abnormal” costs). Not agreed – the sales values are based on transacted values across the two local authority areas.	None
Vistry Group	There is suggestion that the impact on CIL on cashflow has not been modelled. Requests that instalments policy for larger sites be extended over development period. Comments regarding alleged double dipping.	This suggestion is incorrect – the CIL has been modelled so that is incurs development finance. Nevertheless, extending payments over longer developments is supported. The Council has set out clearly the elements of infrastructure that it will seek through S106 and those that will be funded by CIL and there is no double dipping. The vast majority of obligations will be secured through CIL which is negotiable and can take account of viability. Only a very small element of the total package will be fixed via CIL.	Reconsider instalments policy to extend payment periods

Greater Cambridge Community Infrastructure Levy – Offices / R&D rate

1. Introduction

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning ('GCSP') ran a consultation on a Draft Charging Schedule between 16 February and 29 March 2026, in response to which a number of stakeholders submitted representations. We have commented separately on these representations and we indicated that the evidence base underpinning the proposed rate of £175 per square metre for offices and R&D should be explored further.

2. Rationale for Offices and R&D rate

As noted at Section 6.23 of the CIL Viability Study, the Cambridge office and R&D sectors share many similar characteristics to Oxford, which has recently updated its CIL Charging Schedule to increase the rate for Offices and R&D from £33.74 to £168.74 per square metre (which has subsequently increased to £175 per square metre as a result of indexation).

The purpose of this note is to consider in more detail the suggestions in the representations that values for R&D developments are lower in Greater Cambridge than in Oxford and therefore arguing that GCSP should consider a lower CIL rate than the proposed £175 per square metre.

3. Evidence

The Carter Jonas 'Life Sciences Research Report' (Spring 2026) provides the following analysis of the Oxford and Cambridge life sciences markets:

Oxford:

"Prime Science Park and City Centre Rents

Prime city office rents are holding at elevated levels, with Recent evidence around £62.50 per sq ft and expectations that new, best-in-class buildings will achieve in excess of £70 per sq ft. Limited availability of high-quality Grade A space in core science locations continues to support rental resilience.

Prime lab-enabled space is currently achieving around £75 per sq ft. However, rental levels vary materially depending on specification and fit-out. Fully fitted laboratory space has achieved above £80 per sq ft in certain schemes, with premiums reflecting technical readiness and the increasing preference for operationally capable space.

Overall, rental tone across both prime offices and laboratories remains firm, underpinned by sustained life sciences demand and constrained supply of high-quality accommodation".

Cambridge:

"Prime Lab Rents

Prime rents across Cambridge's office and life sciences markets remain robust, underpinned by sustained demand for high-quality, well-located accommodation and a shortage of best-in-class supply. In the city centre, a new headline office rent of £65 per sq ft was achieved at 21 Station Road in December. Further evidence of the depth of demand. is reflected in a single floor at 10 Station Road being under offer at a similar level on a long, unbroken term.

Out of town, a new headline office rent has been set with the letting of the Optic building at Peterhouse Technology Park, where Arm secured the entire building at £48 per sq ft, reinforcing the strength of demand for prime technology park accommodation.

In the laboratory market, the prime headline rent in Cambridge remains at £71 per sq ft, achieved at Babraham Research Campus, while quoting rents on new lab accommodation at Cambridge Science Park and Camlife are currently pitched higher, reflecting rising development costs. However, headline comparisons should be treated with caution given variations in specification, fitted condition and whether space is measured on a GIA or NIA basis".

The Bidwells 'Cambridge Offices and Labs Market Databook' (February 2026) and 'Oxford Offices and Labs Market Databook' (February 2026) provide the following analysis on the two markets:

Oxford:

- Office rents reported to be at £68 per square foot. Yields at 6.5%. Capital value before incentives of £1,046 per square foot.

- Lab rents reported to be at £79.25 per square foot. Yields at 5.25%. Capital value before incentives of £1,510 per square foot.

Cambridge:

- Office rents reported to be at £66 per square foot. Yields at 6.5%. Capital value before incentives of £1,015 per square foot.

- Lab rents reported to be at £75 per square foot. Yields at 5.25%. Capital value before incentives of £1,428 per square foot.

In comparison, the Viability Study applies rents of £57 per square foot for life sciences and a yield of 6%, which generates a capital value (before incentives) of £950 per square foot.

3. Implications for offices and R&D CIL in Greater Cambridge

In response to similar critiques when Oxford City Council consulted on its rate change, they considered the impact of applying the rents and yields above on the maximum potential CIL rates.

In Cambridge, capital values in the Viability Assessment (£950 per square foot before incentives) are circa £478 per square foot lower than the rents reported by Bidwells and Carter Jonas. This difference covers the additional construction costs that some representations alluded to for enabled lab space.

4. Conclusions

On the basis of the review above, we recommend that GCSP proceed with the CIL rates as set out in the Draft Charging Schedule.

Quintic Advisory
5 June 2026