

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules

Examination

Examiner's note

Examiner: Kevin Ward BA (Hons) MRTPI of Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE)

Programme Officer: Ian Kemp

Email: ian@localplanservices.co.uk

Mobile: 07723 009 166

Introduction

1. I have been appointed to examine the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedules submitted by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (the Councils) on 13 July 2026.
2. The Programme Officer for the Examination is Ian Kemp. He is responsible for the administration of the Examination and liaison between myself, the Councils and other parties. Any queries regarding the Examination should be directed to the Programme Officer.

The Hearing

3. An Examination Hearing has been arranged. This will provide those who made representations on the Draft Charging Schedules and requested to be heard, an opportunity to speak in relation to their representations. The Hearing will commence at 10.00 on Monday 12 October 2026 and will be held in the Council Chamber at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne CB23 6EA. A full day has been set aside. A second hearing day may be required and this has been scheduled for Tuesday 13 October 2026, again commencing at 10.00. At this stage, those intending to participate at the hearing should be available for both days.
4. An agenda for the Hearing will be circulated during the week commencing 5 October 2026. More specific timings may be set out at that point.
5. Only those who made representations on the Draft Charging Schedules during the relevant time i.e. between 16 February and 29 March 2026 **and** made a request to be heard at the time will be able to speak at the Hearing. The Programme Officer has been liaising with those concerned and will continue to do so. The Hearing is open to others to observe however.
6. The Hearing will take the form of a relatively informal discussion which I shall lead by asking a series of questions, primarily directed to the Councils in the first instance. I will give other participants full opportunity to make relevant points, related to their representations. New material should not be introduced at the Hearing.

Written Statements

7. The Examination will be focussed on a number of key issues and questions. These are set out below. The Councils are requested to address all of the questions by submitting a separate written statement for each issue. Others who will be participating at the Hearing may also submit written statements on questions relevant to their representations if they wish, although they may choose to rely on the representations themselves. I have all of the representations made on the Draft Charging Schedules and will take them fully into account.
8. Written statements should be sent to the Programme Officer. They must be received by 12.00 noon on Friday 2 October 2026 at the latest. Statements received after this deadline will not be accepted. Statements should be as succinct as possible and there is no need to repeat sections of original representations or national policy/guidance, cross referencing will suffice.

Following the Hearing

9. Following the Hearing, I will produce a report to the Councils. This will recommend that the Draft Charging Schedules are:
 - a) Approved; or
 - b) Approved with specified modifications; or
 - c) Rejected
10. In all cases the reasons for my recommendations will be set out in the report. I will give an indication of the timescale for my report at the end of the Hearing.

Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council

Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules

Examination

Issues and questions

Issue 1

Legislative requirements and consultation

- 1) Have the Councils complied with relevant requirements for the format and content of the Draft Charging Schedules and the publication, submission and availability of documents?
- 2) Have the Councils undertaken adequate and appropriate consultation on the Draft Charging Schedules? How has the development sector been involved in the preparation of the Draft Charging Schedules?

Issue 2

Infrastructure requirements and funding

- 1) Is the evidence on strategic transport infrastructure requirements adequate and sufficiently up to date?
- 2) What is the timescale for implementation of projects and how is this intended to be achieved?
- 3) What is the basis for the estimated costs of this infrastructure and are the costs realistic and up to date?
- 4) What is the package of funding for this infrastructure and to what extent is it secured?
- 5) How will the use of S106 contributions change following the introduction of the CILs? Will there be overlap between funding from S106 contributions and CIL for particular infrastructure projects or from particular development proposals?
- 6) Will there be a funding gap which justifies the introduction of the CILs in principle?
- 7) What is the basis for the estimated CIL income? Is this realistic?
- 8) How much CIL income is estimated to be passed on to Parish Councils/Neighbourhoods? How does this affect the amount to be used on strategic transport infrastructure?
- 9) What is the intended approach to the use of CIL income to support administrative/operational costs?

N.B. the following questions in Issues 3-8 largely relate to evidence in the Viability Assessment of January 2026 (Exam Doc 3.2)

Issue 3

Residential charging rates (including retirement housing and residential institutions)

- 1) Do the 26 residential typologies provide for a sufficiently comprehensive assessment in terms of the types of developments likely to come forward?
- 2) Is the evidence on residential sales values (Fig 2.16.1 and Appendix 3) sufficiently comprehensive? Does it provide an appropriate basis for the viability appraisal and how has it been used to inform the appraisal?
- 3) How has it been used to appraise different residential typologies, including retirement housing and residential institutions?
- 4) What is the basis for the assumptions on affordable housing tenure and values and are these appropriate?
- 5) Are the assumptions on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date? Do they adequately reflect the build costs associated with different residential typologies including retirement housing and residential institutions?
- 6) Are the increases for external works appropriate?
- 7) Is the additional cost assumption for larger residential developments on the edge of settlements (£29,070 per unit) justified and appropriate?
- 8) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 9) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate?
- 10) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 11) Is the charging rate of £60 per sqm for residential houses and flats justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rates? Is it appropriate to apply the same rate to all residential houses and flats regardless of the scale of development or location?
- 12) Is there sufficient, specific evidence to justify the charging rates for retirement housing and residential institutions?

Issue 4

Charging rate for Student accommodation

- 1) Do the student accommodation typologies provide for a sufficiently comprehensive assessment in terms of the types of developments likely to come forward?
- 2) Is the assumption on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date?
- 3) Is the increase for external works appropriate?
- 4) What is the basis for the assumptions set out in Paragraph 4.10 of the Viability Assessment and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 5) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 6) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate?

- 7) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 8) Is the charging rate of £60 per sqm for student accommodation justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rate?

Issue 5

Charging rate for hotels

- 1) Is the assumption on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date?
- 2) Is the increase for external works appropriate?
- 3) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 4) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate?
- 5) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 6) Is the charging rate of £50 per sqm for hotels justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rate?

Issue 6

Charging rate for shops, restaurants, financial and professional services

- 1) Which typologies have been assessed and how do they relate to the specific development types listed in the Draft Charging Schedule?
- 2) Is the assumption on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date?
- 3) Is the increase for external works appropriate?
- 4) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 5) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate?
- 6) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 7) Is the charging rate of £50 per sqm for shops, restaurants, financial and professional services justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rate?

Issue 7

Charging rate for offices and R&D

- 1) Do the two office typologies provide appropriate evidence for the types of schemes being brought forward in Greater Cambridgeshire? Do they provide appropriate evidence in relation to R&D uses?
- 2) Is the assumption on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date?
- 3) Is the increase for external works appropriate?
- 4) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?

- 5) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate?
- 6) Are the assumptions on rental income appropriate?
- 7) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 8) Is the charging rate of £175 per sqm for offices and R&D justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rate?

Issue 8

Charging rate for industrial use including data centres

- 1) Do the typologies for industrial and warehousing/logistics provide appropriate evidence for the types of schemes being brought forward in Greater Cambridgeshire? Do they provide appropriate evidence in relation to data centres?
- 2) Is the assumption on build costs appropriate and sufficiently up to date?
- 3) Is the increase for external works appropriate?
- 4) What is the basis for the assumptions on S106 costs and are they realistic and appropriate?
- 5) What is the basis for the approach to benchmark land values and is this appropriate? Is the reference in Paragraph 6.25 of the Viability Assessment to development typically being on previously developed land appropriate?
- 6) Are the assumptions on rental income appropriate?
- 7) Are the other assumptions including on profit, other costs and policy requirements appropriate? To what extent have emerging Local Plan policy requirements been taken into account?
- 8) Is the charging rate of £35 per sqm for industrial use including data centres justified by the evidence? Does it provide for a sufficient buffer below the potential maximum charging rate?