

4.1 Representations received through consultation platform

Id	Respondent	Agent name	Topic	View	Representation
209339	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	This response is submitted on behalf of Bar Hill Parish Council, representing the interests of residents of Bar Hill in South Cambridgeshire.
209515	BioMed Realty [131008]	Bidwells (Miss Aoife Hand, Senior Planner) [131007]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Response of behalf of Biomed Realty as a Developer/Landowner. Please see representations submitted via email. - 20260334 - Biomed CIL Reps
209528	Brockton Everlast c/o Bidwells [132069]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Response of behalf of Brockton Everlast as a Developer/Landowner. Please see representations submitted via email comprised of the following documents: - 27.03.26 - Cambridge CIL VA Technical Note - Brockton – Final - 20260327 - Brockton - CIL Representations - Appendix 1 - Retail and Industrial Comparables - Appendix 2 - Commercial Build Cost Evidence - CIL technical appendix - Brockton 1
209417	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Other - Cambridge Ahead is a business, research and academic membership organisation that is a long-term voice for the Cambridge economy, dedicated to good growth that improves quality of life.
209548	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	(CBCL), the non-profit partnership representing the major health, research, education and life sciences organisations located on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus: Abcam, AstraZeneca, the MRD Laboratory of Molecular Biology, University of Cambridge, and the 3 NHS Foundation Trusts of

	Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]				Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Cambridge University Hospitals and Royal Papworth Hospital..
209552	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd (CBCL), the non-profit partnership representing the major health, research, education and life sciences organisations located on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus: Abcam, AstraZeneca, the MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, University of Cambridge, and the 3 NHS Foundation Trusts of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Cambridge University Hospital and Royal Papworth Hospital.
209392	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	I'm responding on behalf of Camcycle, Cambridgeshire's local membership charity working for better cycling.
208716	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	I am a resident of Cambridge City, occasional leisure cyclist and keen walker with local rambling groups.
208823	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Other - Civic Society
208786	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE

208488	Catherine Wood [130071]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident, supportive of the CIL to improve local facilities for businesses and residents.
207317	Claire Carroll [131906]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	I am a resident.
209493	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Croudace Homes is a medium sized housebuilder that operates out of three regions with the aim to expand further in the coming years. Our current patch includes the East, South East and parts of the South West, West Midlands and East Midlands. We aim to deliver 1,200 high quality, sustainable homes per year and currently have 19,400 plots under an option or promotion agreement, ranging from 50-unit sites to 2,500-unit sites. We have developed sites in Cambridgeshire, including in Linton and Orwell. We also are currently promoting three sites through the Greater Cambridgeshire Local Plan.
208796	Dr David Andrew [132010]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident
207265	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	as member of the public
207209	Dr Simon Ravenscroft [131889]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
209435	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Fowlmere Parish Council

207380	Frances Marsh [131911]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	N/a
208675	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Parish council
209461	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Great Shelford Parish Council
209484	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Object	Henry Boot Developments Ltd
209398	Homes England [132047]	Homes England (Mr James Hawkins) [131578]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Homes England
209457	Jesus College [132059]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Response of behalf of Jesus College as a Developer/Landowner. Please see representations submitted via email comprised of the following documents: - 20262703 - Jesus College - CIL Representation - 27.03.26 - Cambridge CIL VA Technical Note - Final - Jesus College - Appendix 1 - Retail and Industrial Comparables - Appendix 2 - Build Cost & Professional Fees Evidence

209333	Jonathan Jones [5905]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
209469	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	We write on behalf of our client, Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited ('Juniper'), the owners of Bourn Airfield.
209445	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Linton Parish Council
209309	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Parish Council
209310	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Parish Council
209532	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Lolworth Developments Limited ('LDL'), a subsidiary of Salhia Real Estate.
209382	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Riverside Area Residents Association - neighbourhood group rar.org.uk

209330	marshall [131436]	Quod (Rebecca Sanders) [8708]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	The Cambridge Airport site, owned by Marshall Group Properties, is currently safeguarded and not allocated for development in the local plans, with policies preventing its development until a review occurs. The site is recognised in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan as a strategic area for at least 8,000 homes and mixed-use development, but pre-application discussions have not yet begun. Draft Policy S/CE requires a tailored transport mitigation plan for the site, which has not yet been developed or costed, indicating a need for site-specific funding mechanisms. Marshall argues that applying a generalised CIL to Cambridge East could complicate infrastructure delivery and requests that the site be nil rated for CIL due to its unique requirements. The importance of bespoke infrastructure provision for Cambridge East is highlighted, suggesting that planning obligations are more effective than a generalised CIL for securing necessary infrastructure. Marshall requests confirmation from authorities that the proposed Charging Schedule will not apply to the development of Cambridge East, seeking clarity on this position.
207268	Mr Alan Fersht [131901]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Personal
207231	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident

207103	Mr Bruce Marshall [3554]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
208843	Mr Bruno Poltronieri [132028]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident
207311	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Object	I am a Cambridge resident
207208	Mr Derek Blackburn [131886]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	as a resident
207197	Mr Derek Blackburn [131886]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
205629	Mr Felix Sanchez Garcia [5806]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
209307	Mr Isaac Rawlings [132044]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident
207187	Mr James Nadin [131885]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	.
207251	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident of Cambridge
207104	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
207099	Mr Maurice Barnes [131881]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident

207085	Mr Michael Blackburn [130839]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Cambridge resident.
207528	Mr Paul Hourigan [131948]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Object	We are a small and medium sized property developer that operates in and around the Greater Cambridge Region. We strongly object to the implementation of the CIL levy bill.
207527	Mr Paul Hourigan [131948]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Object	We are a small and medium sized property developer that operates in and around the Greater Cambridge Region. We strongly object to the introduction of the CIL levy.
207322	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	I am commenting as a resident of Cambridge
207262	Mr Tarek Saad [131899]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
209400	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Developer/landowner
207424	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident in Cambridge
209375	NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board [131754]	NHS Property Services Ltd (Mr Mark Adams) [129763]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICB
209531	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	We are a Developer/Landowner

209520	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	We are responding on behalf of Places for People. Places for People are promoting the land to the north and west of Wilbraham Road, Fulbourn as part of the emerging Local Plan as a sustainable site for a residential led development for over 2,500 dwellings.
209512	Railpen [132064]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Response of behalf of Railpen as a Developer/Landowner. Please see representations submitted via email comprised of the following documents: - 27.03.26 - Cambridge CIL VA Technical Note - Final – Railpen - 20262703 - Railpen- CIL Representations - Appendix 1 - Retail and Industrial Comparables
207228	Roland Curtis [131892]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident
207409	Rosy Greenlees [131913]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	I am responding as a resident
209298	Sarah Hughes [131437]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Resident
209506	Stanhope [132060]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Stanhope as a Developer/landowner. Please see representations submitted via email comprised of the following documents: - 27.03.26 - Cambridge CIL VA Technical Note - Stanhope - 20260327 - Stanhope - CIL Representations - Appendix 1 - Retail and Industrial Comparables - CIL technical appendix - Stanhope

209366	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Swavesey Parish Council
209317	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Response on behalf of Bursars' Planning Sub-committee for Cambridge University Colleges. Note that individual Colleges may make their own responses.
207353	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	Other
209426	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Comment	The University of Cambridge
207263	Mr Tarek Saad [131899]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
207217	Matt Whiting [9162]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
205630	Mr Felix Sanchez Garcia [5806]		Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?	Support	Resident
209470	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand,		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	I may or may not wish to participate in the CIL examination.

	Planning Director) [7930]				
209340	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes Bar Hill Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to participate in the examination process in order to represent the views of the local community regarding the potential implications of the Community Infrastructure Levy for infrastructure delivery and development within the area.
209408	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
209517	BioMed Realty [131008]	Bidwells (Miss Aoife Hand, Senior Planner) [131007]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Biomed Realty wish to reserve a right to appear at CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
209529	Brockton Everlast c/o Bidwells [132069]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Brockton Everlast wish to reserve a right to appear at CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
209418	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No

209553	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes subject to the comments in the later in this submission.
209549	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes, if matters set out this response are not agreed or are challenged.
208718	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Happy to be involved if called.
208824	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
208787	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Object	n/a

209509	Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis [132051]	Quod (Mrs Georgina Thomson, Associate) [7297]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes, we would like to reserve the opportunity to appear at examination.
208489	Catherine Wood [130071]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Do not wish to participate.
209494	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Object	No
207275	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	this would depend on the time commitment. so most likely no, I don't want to participate.
207193	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	I support
209436	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes
208676	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Do not wish to participate in CIL examination
209460	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in	Comment	No we do not wish to participate in the CIL examination

	Webster, Clerk) [6190]		the CIL examination?		
209485	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Object	Yes. Henry Boot Developments Ltd is a development company proposing a unique development at IWM Duxford and we would like our interests expressed as part of the CIL Examination.
209458	Jesus College [132059]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Jesus College wish to reserve a right to appear at CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
209483	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes
209446	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Yes Linton Parish Council wish to participate
209299	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	We wish to participate in the CIL examination
209533	Lolworth Developments	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in	Comment	Yes

	Limited [129685]	Planner) [129682]	the CIL examination?		
208804	Maria Carvalho [132017]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
209383	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes
207232	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Yes
207312	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Not sure what I should write here?
209308	Mr Isaac Rawlings [132044]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Yes
207186	Mr James Nadin [131885]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	.
207188	Mr James Nadin [131885]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	.
207252	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	support principle, don't need to be involved

205637	Mr Martin Shrosbree [131231]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Fully Support
207105	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	I wish to participate in the CIL examination
207100	Mr Maurice Barnes [131881]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
207370	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Object	Any additional charges should be stopped.
208560	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	No Opinion
207529	Mr Paul Hourigan [131948]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
207323	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	I wish to comment on the proposal to introduce CIL
207154	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Yes
209401	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in	Comment	No.

			the CIL examination?		
207425	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	x
207271	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Support
209376	NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board [131754]	NHS Property Services Ltd (Mr Mark Adams) [129763]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	If required
209537	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Yes. Pioneer Group wish to reserve a right to appear at the CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
209519	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Object	Yes we would like to participate in the CIL examination.
209514	Railpen [132064]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Railpen wish to reserve a right to appear at CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right

					to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
207410	Rosy Greenlees [131913]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	No
209507	Stanhope [132060]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	Stanhope wish to reserve a right to appear at CIL Examination. The absence of reference to other parts of the CIL evidence base within the submitted representations should not be taken as agreement to their content, and we reserve the right to make further comments on the evidence at examination stage.
209367	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes
209565	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes. Trinity College wishes to participate in the CIL examination and requests the right to appear at the hearing sessions to present and develop the concerns set out in this representation.
209318	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	Yes
207354	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Support	yes

209427	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?	Comment	No
209334	Jonathan Jones [5905]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I support CIL in principle because Cambridge's growth needs infrastructure, and the Greater Cambridge Partnership has now reached the final tranche of its City Deal funding, so ongoing delivery cannot rely on that source. Sustainable development in a larger, more distributed city depends on more than transport alone. It also requires timely investment in health, education, local services, civic amenities and social spaces. The councils should therefore justify CIL more broadly, and explain clearly how it will support the wider infrastructure needed to keep Cambridge liveable as it expands.
207247	Lord Lord Richard Balfe [131895]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	It seems a good and worthwhile idea to me
209471	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	This depends solely upon the Council's approach to my answer to Question 1.
205644	B Nicolson [5745]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	It looks like a very practical solution to me.
209341	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes, in principle. Bar Hill Parish Council recognises that the Community Infrastructure Levy can provide an important mechanism for ensuring that new development contributes towards the

					infrastructure required to support growth. Given the scale of planned development across the Greater Cambridge area, the introduction of a levy to secure infrastructure funding is appropriate. However, the effectiveness of CIL will depend on how revenues are allocated, the transparency of decision-making processes, and whether communities experiencing development pressures receive meaningful infrastructure improvements.
209409	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	The implication of introducing CIL is that the level of affordable housing would almost certainly need to be reduced.
207304	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	The best way I can imagine of killing off the centre of the city for business.
209419	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Cambridge Ahead recognises and supports the need to secure funding for strategic infrastructure to enable sustainable growth and close the infrastructure gap in Greater Cambridge. A clear and proportionate local funding approach would also show Government that Greater Cambridge is committed to supporting infrastructure delivery alongside national investment. Cambridge Ahead also recognises the rationale for introducing a mechanism such as CIL to support infrastructure delivery. However, there are significant concerns that the current evidence base does not yet fully reflect the realities of delivering development in Greater Cambridge, and greater clarity is needed around the assumptions underpinning the viability evidence. A mechanism like the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

				has the potential to contribute to this by providing a clearer and more consistent framework for infrastructure funding, enabling increased predictability and certainty. However, the introduction of CIL must be considered in the context of current market conditions. The residential and commercial development sectors are currently working in a more difficult market environment, shaped by higher construction costs, less demand, increased financing costs and growing policy expectations relating to design, sustainability and biodiversity. In this difficult environment, cumulative cost burdens are already significant. While the Council's viability assessment indicates that the proposed CIL rates are deliverable, feedback from those actively delivering schemes in Greater Cambridge suggests the current market is more challenging than the assessment implies. There is a clear willingness within the development community to contribute to infrastructure provision. However, viability is currently more challenging than previously, and schemes are operating within tighter constraints. In this context, the Planning Authority should be extremely cautious about introducing additional fixed costs that could further increase cumulative pressures on development. For this reason, the introduction of CIL must be clearly justified and underpinned by robust, up-to-date evidence. The levy must demonstrably support rather than constrain delivery, including the economic growth that the infrastructure it funds is intended to enable. Ultimately, getting that balance right depends on a proportionate, evidence-based approach that reflects current market conditions and supports continued delivery.
--	--	--	--	--

209550	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Subject to subsequent comments about viability and exemptions for the existing campus CBCL supports the proposed Strategic Transport CIL.
209554	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes,
209551	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes.
209393	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes, we support the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy. More investment is urgently needed in the sustainable transport network in Greater Cambridge for walking/wheeling, cycling and public transport to be a genuine option for everyone. In addition, building new transport infrastructure requires long-term thinking. Local authorities are best placed to plan and deliver new transport infrastructure when funding mechanisms are long-term and under their own control.

208719	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	It is essential that new development contributes to the public good as it is putting additional pressure on existing facilities. Section 106 contributions are inadequate on their own.
208825	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes, in principle. The CPPF supports the introduction of a CIL to ensure that small-scale developments, which currently escape significant contributions under Section 106, contribute to the area's infrastructure. However, our support is contingent on the levy being used as a holistic funding tool rather than a narrow mechanism for specific transport projects
208788	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE supports the introduction of CIL as a mechanism to help fund the infrastructure needed to support planned growth. It is reasonable that development contributes towards the infrastructure required to make growth sustainable. However, it will be important that funding is not focused solely on large strategic infrastructure. In villages and rural communities, even modest development can increase demand on local infrastructure such as community buildings, village halls, green spaces and local walking and cycling links. These facilities play an important role in supporting community life and helping communities absorb growth well.
209324	Cambridgeshire Chambers of Commerce (Mr Connor Butler, Engagement Manager) [132045]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	The respondent emphasises the need for infrastructure funding to support sustainable growth in Greater Cambridge, highlighting the importance of a levy structure that reflects the current cost environment for businesses and developers. The development sector is under financial pressure due to build cost inflation, financing constraints, and regulatory requirements, which are impacting scheme viability.

					Upcoming business rate increases of 8 to 12 percent from April 2026 are expected to further tighten margins for commercial and mixed-use developments. The proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) introduces additional costs that could exacerbate existing financial pressures, with a typical unit incurring a charge of £3,255, representing an effective additional cost of around 1.9 percent. Even modest additional costs can significantly affect investment decisions, potentially leading to delays or reductions in development schemes, which would impact housing delivery and economic growth. The final CIL rates should be informed by up-to-date viability evidence to balance infrastructure funding needs with the maintenance of development conditions. A proportionate and evidence-based approach is necessary to ensure infrastructure funding supports sustainable communities while maintaining development viability and attractiveness to investors. The respondent encourages stakeholders in the construction and development sectors to review the draft proposals and provide detailed feedback to ensure the final framework supports both infrastructure and economic growth. The respondent expresses commitment to collaborating with partners to ensure policy decisions facilitate growth while reflecting the realities faced by businesses.
209508	Cambridgeshire County Council	Quod (Mrs Georgina Thomson,	Question 3: Do you agree that the	Comment	The Parties welcome in principle the introduction of CIL but seek clarity on its application to CBC and its expansion. In principle, the Parties support the concept that all development

	and Prologis [132051]	Associate) [7297]	Council should introduce CIL?		within and as an expansion of the Campus should contribute equitably to Campus enhancements and infrastructure. The consultation documents do not provide clarity on what the CIL proceeds will be spent on. There is concern that the proposed CIL may not adequately address the infrastructure requirements for CBC as it relates to the adopted Local Plans and not the transport mitigation package developed by the Landowner Collaboration Group. It would be inappropriate for development at the Campus to be asked to pay a generalised CIL charge if the proceeds were not ring fenced for expenditure required by the Campus. It is essential to differentiate between infrastructure projects funded through CIL and those funded by localised s106 agreements to avoid double payment by developers. The consultation lacks clarity on how CIL proceeds will be coordinated with wider government investment in Cambridge. The proposed instalment policy for CIL payments is deemed too low; a longer-term approach similar to that used in Oxford is recommended for large contributions.
207310	carl turner [130634]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	This levy is simply another tax. It will suppress the creation of new housing stock and hinder the redevelopment of brownfield sites. Section 106 should reformed , ie developers must provide the promised services before the properties are signed off by building control. Not after.
207365	Catarina Campos [130646]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	I only support if with the right amounts datacentres should be charged a lot of money. They require too much water, electricity, and barely provide employment. Shops etc should be charged a lot less we barely have a community.

208490	Catherine Wood [130071]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes, current developments (Darwin Green, Eddington) do not have enough community infrastructure built alongside. A CIL would help address the shortfall partly.
207318	Claire Carroll [131906]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	It makes sense to do, but this proposal goes about it the wrong way.
209495	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Croudace understand CIL is necessary to meet the ambitious aims of the Council and can see there is a funding gap between the total transport project costs and the secured funding. Therefore, we would support a CIL being introduced, provided it benefits large, medium and small developments, and the overall ambitions of the County. It is also important that the charging schedule does not result in CIL being payable too early, which may cause developments to be unviable due to negative cashflow implications. There is a risk that this would apply a disproportionate burden to small and medium size developers.
209325	Dino Zuvela [132046]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Public transportation links and utilities have continually worsened, and there is little guarantee that additional levees and charges will directly lead to an improvement for the area's infrastructure. Potentially useful spaces are left unoccupied throughout Cambridge and surrounding areas, and additional levies will further disincentivise future development.
208797	Dr David Andrew [132010]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
207192	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Cambridge infrastructure needs urgent overhaul and quite honestly I am surprised the council has not applied a levy that was an option to them for such a long time.

207194	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Why on earth has this not already been done - the impact is clear in the state of Cambridgeshire as a place to live and travel. The massive expansion needs infrastructure support
207419	Dr Roger Sewell [5506]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Development puts additional strain on all the local infrastructure - of course the developers should pay for this.
207212	Dr Simon Ravenscroft [131889]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	A lot of new development is proposed for Cambridge. This is a sensible way of funding the infrastructure that will be needed to support that.
209437	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes. We should add that whilst CIL appears to be a straightforward money-raising system in practice it is complex. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 which implement it are complex and cumbersome. Nor is its relationship with s.106 agreements simple. We also note that CIL for Greater Cambridge is only expected to meet £50 million of a £272.5 million funding gap. However we are also aware that between 15 and 25% of CIL receipts are passed to Parish Councils in a way which is simpler than under s.106 agreements. That is a significant reason for our support.
208677	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes CL should be introduce to fund infrastructure projects in the local area.
209462	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes CIL is more beneficial that stand alone S106

209486	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Whilst there is no in principle objection to CIL, in our representations we have raised concerns about the potential for double counting of contributions through the use of CIL and S106 in tandem. In addition, we have raised serious concerns with the proposed CIL charging schedule as drafted.
209399	Homes England [132047]	Homes England (Mr James Hawkins) [131578]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes
209335	Jonathan Jones [5905]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
209447	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes we agree the Council should introduce CIL
209311	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	yes CIL should be introduced
209300	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	We agree that the council should introduce CIL

209534	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Please see Letter submission.
207248	Lord Lord Richard Balfe [131895]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	yes
208808	Maria Carvalho [132017]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I think it's important to charge the developers for transportation and road infrastructure costs that the rapid growth in population brought by new developments brings.
209384	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
207215	Matt Whiting [9162]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Absolutely this is needed (and should have happened a long time ago).
207216	Matt Whiting [9162]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
207223	Miss Caroline Blackmun [131891]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I agree
207222	Miss Caroline Blackmun [131891]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	It is important the development funds infrastructure.

207261	Miss Noemi Jelinek [131898]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Seems like a money grab to me. Rather than looking for funding and saving within the council first thing that is plan is take more money from everyone else.
207233	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Yes
208844	Mr Bruno Poltronieri [132028]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Seems reasonable, as long as it's clear and transparent how it will be spent.
207313	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	We don't need new houses and we don't need to pay for them
207198	Mr Derek Blackburn [131886]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Repeat - support
207211	Mr Derek Blackburn [131886]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Repeat: Support
207204	Mr Derek Blackburn [131886]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
207362	Mr Harry Clifford [131909]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Overall support a levy to be used for infrastructure. Large office buildings add huge stress to transport, and large residential add huge stress to things like water, electric, and local amenities. I do not agree with a levy on those local amenities though, including shops, restaurants, cafes. These are slowly disappearing from Cambridge and being replaced with office and lab space.

207253	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Strongly support this, as helps fund crucial infrastructure and developers need to sacrifice short term gain in return for long term trust on developing full communities
207411	Mr Jon Garnsworthy [131914]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	We need the infrastructure. The money has to come from somewhere and developers seems a reasonable place to get it from
207294	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	We do not need a further tax on new builds especially at this rate - we need to encourage growth, not hamper it.
207296	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	we do not need or want an additional tax like this - please fire most of of the staff instead and replace them with AI
207414	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes it should most council's have
207106	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I approve of the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy
207101	Mr Maurice Barnes [131881]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	None
207350	Mr Michael Brown [131890]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	I am not satisfied that any additional funding will be allocated wisely
207349	Mr Michael Brown [131890]		Question 3: Do you agree that the	Object	Object

			Council should introduce CIL?		
207363	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Charging the levy will only pass on costs to the public of Cambridge. Also the Council Tax is going up by the maximum amount. When will the local Authorities stop using the public as cash cows due to their incompetence with the public finances.
207364	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	No absolutely not, more costs will drive businesses abd people to go elsewhere.
208561	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I think that developers are more likely to comply with CIL than S106
207530	Mr Paul Hourigan [131948]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Small and medium-sized property developers (SMEs) play a crucial role in delivering housing throughout the Greater Cambridge Region. The environment for SME home builders has become steadily more challenging. The complexity and cost of the planning process being a burden for the past decade. In addition to this, issues with viability, infrastructure constraints and increasing demand-side challenges limit their capacity to plan and deliver new projects.It's no surprise that confidence among small developers is slipping and also deter new entrants from joining the sector altogether. The introduction of the CIL will decimate the already challenging SME platform.
207240	Mr Philip Cornett [131894]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	I support if data centres have higher rate than £35.
207246	Mr Philip Cornett [131894]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Only if Data centre rates are higher than £35. They use up loads of energy, increase electricity costs, and create noise pollution. No one wants an AI data centre near them.

207324	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	I object to the introduction of CIL as it will add a significant further overhead to businesses seeking to operate in Cambridge, to the detriment of the City's attractiveness to enterprise and the profitability of business activity here. This is an anti-business proposal which runs wholly contrary to the Government's growth agenda. It will help to stifle development and initiative to the City's long-term detriment. Residents will suffer as at least some of the resulting costs will inevitably be passed on to customers/consumers.
205622	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Generates more funds for much needed infrastructure spending. Developers are at present adept at wriggling out of S106 'obligations'
205623	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
207264	Mr Tarek Saad [131899]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Totally, the developments should pay for the infrastructure
207153	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	Levy will increase costs and will be passed on costumers.
207155	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	This is another financial burden for businesses. Council should support businesses, not implying more "taxing" on them.
207277	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Ues

207290	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	I agree with the levies. It will make developers more aware of local needs and raise money for the council to use for the benefit of the residents in the area
207259	Ms Elizabeth Buie [131896]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	I object to an emphasis on growth, full stop. First, we haven't got the water infrastructure. Second, the traffic will get worse. Third, all of the new construction is boring and ugly, uniform with no soul and no heart. If we don't promote growth, there will be no need for a levy. But if you're going to insist on promoting growth, you HAVE to take care of the water problem before you start doing anything at all about it. btw, I am a resident. The so-called "Question 1" in this form doesn't offer a way to answer it.
207260	Ms Elizabeth Buie [131896]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	See my answer to question 2.
207426	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	I agree that additional committment to finance infrastructure required by additional populations is required A levy for a 'whole of place' development (rather than individual buildings) could also attractive if the levy is slightly lower for a holistic approach (making biodiversity, access/affordability, etc. more feasible) Might the levy be adjusted for re-furb and/or for Small biz It is not a 'silver bullet' solution, however, and should be considered alongside other forms of infrastructure revenue (e.g., what are the key infrastructure being considered? roads (given the terrible state of them in Cambridge), water/electricity cables, etc. and/or education and schools?

207269	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Agreed
207273	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Support
207203	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Developers are not keeping their promises to provide GP Surgeries, Pharmacies, Schools etc, so a CIL ring fenced to do this is a good idea
207206	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Money from CILs must be used for the development it was levied on
209377	NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board [131754]	NHS Property Services Ltd (Mr Mark Adams) [129763]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough ICB want to understand the impact of the introduction of this CIL charge on new development, particularly on the impact on the viability of new developments coming forward subject to the CIL charge, and how the delivery of other health infrastructure and developer contributions towards health will be impacted. If the CIL funding for transport infrastructure is secured through CIL, we would expect to see a clear commitment and support from the Council and Local Plan Policy to ensure that funding and mitigation to support new/improved health infrastructure to support growth is supported and prioritised.
209535	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	No. We do not oppose the principle of a charging schedule, but the timing, evidence base and rates proposed in this Consultation risk harming deliverability, given current market conditions, the emerging policy context, and the complex, phased nature of strategic development projects such as the Grafton Centre.

					In addition, for the site-specific reasons set out in our representations, we are requesting the explicit exclusion of the Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton (FBG) Area of Major Change (AMC) from any CIL Charging Area, to have a £0 psm rate applied.
209521	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	The respondent supports the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for funding major transport and infrastructure projects in the Greater Cambridge area. CIL should primarily focus on strategic infrastructure delivery, while Section 106 agreements should continue to address localised community infrastructure needs such as schools and open spaces. It is crucial to ensure that the viability burden on developers is appropriate to prevent developments from becoming unviable. The respondent acknowledges the importance of infrastructure projects proposed by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Combined Authority for accelerating growth in the area.
207229	Roland Curtis [131892]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	Funds raised by a CIL should not be used to fill the broken finances of the GCP. The GCP is a time limited organisation with projects often late and seriously over budget.
209573	S Page [130882]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Greater investment still required in sustainable transport. Infrastructure development requires long term input and funding.

207378	Solon Karapanagiotis [131910]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Object	In theory, a more investment-friendly policy is not to introduce CIL
209368	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Support	Yes
209564	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	TCC strongly supports the principle of good growth in Greater Cambridge. Managed, well-planned growth is essential to sustaining Cambridge's global standing as a centre of scientific and technological excellence. For Cambridge this means the delivery of world-class research, development and innovation facilities alongside high-quality housing and supporting infrastructure. TCC submits these representations in a constructive spirit, and with the aim of ensuring that the CIL charging schedule is fit for purpose and does not inadvertently constrain the very development on which the area's future prosperity depends.
209566	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment	We would therefore recommend at this stage that: • Pause the progression of the current CIL Charging Schedule to allow alignment with the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and the evolving governance and infrastructure funding framework for the area. • Undertake a comprehensive review of infrastructure funding mechanisms alongside the emerging Local Plan, ensuring that CIL, Section 106, and other funding sources are considered holistically and in a coordinated manner. • Commission and publish a supplementary viability appraisal specifically addressing R&D and laboratory development, using appropriate and up-to-date construction cost data and

				reflecting the full range of typologies within the sector. • Incorporate the cost implications of emerging sustainability policies, including net zero carbon requirements, within the viability evidence base. • Reassess the treatment of strategic sites, with a view to: - o applying nil CIL rates or, at the very least, reduced rates to ensure they do not compromise the viability of strategic sites; and - o relying more heavily on bespoke Section 106 mechanisms to secure infrastructure delivery, supported by a clear framework for how CIL and Section 106 will interact. • Review and reduce the proposed CIL rates to ensure they do not compromise the viability and delivery of R&D development. • Ensure that the final proposals strike an appropriate balance, in line with Regulation 14, between the need to fund infrastructure and the potential impact on development viability.
209428	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	Comment The University supports stronger mechanisms for ensuring development contributes to transport infrastructure, highlighting a funding gap and the need for a local funding approach to support sustainable growth. Concerns were raised about the current evidence base not reflecting the realities of development in Greater Cambridge, necessitating clearer assumptions in viability evidence and comprehensive inclusion of policy requirements from the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan.

					Viability assessments should be based on real-life test schemes that are fully policy compliant, incorporating urban design, landscape, drainage, ecology, and abnormal land costs, rather than generic cost assumptions. The University expressed willingness to contribute to infrastructure provision but cautioned against introducing additional fixed costs that could hinder development viability and reduce affordable housing provision. Concerns were raised about the timing of CIL adoption, suggesting it should align with the Draft Local Plan process to ensure the evidence base is robust and relevant.
209342	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes, although further clarification would be beneficial. The supporting statement identifies a significant gap between the estimated cost of infrastructure required to support development and the level of funding expected to be generated through CIL. While the Parish Council accepts that a funding gap has been demonstrated, the scale of the gap raises questions regarding how the remaining infrastructure costs will be addressed. The Parish Council would therefore welcome greater clarity regarding how infrastructure investment will be prioritised and how the remaining funding requirements will be met.
209410	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Barratt does consider that the published Infrastructure Statement demonstrates a funding gap.
209420	Cambridge Ahead (Emma		Question 4: Do you agree that the	Comment	Cambridge Ahead understands that there is a significant strategic transport infrastructure funding gap associated with

	Pritchard) [130653]		Council has demonstrated a funding gap?		the GCP programme and that substantial investment will be required to deliver the transport interventions needed to support growth in Greater Cambridge. However, while the existence of the gap is not in question, the explanation of how the current shortfall has been derived remains unclear, particularly in relation to earlier City Deal assumptions about anticipated developer contributions. Greater clarity on how the shortfall has been calculated, would help provide confidence in the proposed approach. It would also be useful to set out more clearly how CIL income is expected to interact with other funding sources, whether a gap is still likely to remain once CIL is introduced, and how decisions will be made and infrastructure sequencing decided if funding falls short of expectations. This is particularly important in understanding the scale of funding that the proposed CIL is expected to generate in relation to the overall infrastructure funding gap. From the information available, it appears that the CIL may only make a relatively limited contribution towards addressing the identified shortfall. If this is the case, it raises questions about the extent to which the proposed approach will materially address the funding challenge, particularly when considered alongside the existing approach. Clear and transparent reporting on how CIL funds are collected, allocated and spent, including any unspent balances, will be important to maintain confidence that the money is being used effectively and in a timely way.
209555	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes

	Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]				
209394	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	The respondent believes the Greater Cambridge Infrastructure Statement significantly underestimates the funding gap, stating it should account for more than the £275 million indicated. They argue that the Infrastructure Statement only includes costs for current projects by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and does not consider additional projects deemed necessary by Cambridgeshire County Council. The respondent highlights the omission of essential projects identified by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority, such as those outlined in the Bus Strategy, which are crucial for achieving its local transport vision.
208720	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
208826	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes. There is a clear and documented funding gap for essential infrastructure. However, we are concerned that the current proposal focuses almost exclusively on transport infrastructure to fund Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) projects. A true assessment of the 'gap' must equally prioritise health, education, and green infrastructure, which are currently side-lined in this proposal.
208789	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE agrees that the consultation documents demonstrate a clear gap between the infrastructure required to support planned growth and the funding currently available. It is therefore reasonable for the

	Executive) [131460]		demonstrated a funding gap?		Council to seek mechanisms that allow development to contribute towards meeting these infrastructure needs. However, it will be important that investment addresses infrastructure needs across the whole Greater Cambridge area, including rural communities where growth can also place pressure on local facilities, transport connections and community infrastructure.
207319	Claire Carroll [131906]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	There is a funding gap.
209498	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes, the infrastructure statement identifies a significant funding gap between the transport related infrastructure costs, and the committed funding. The funding remains uncertain, as even with the projected CIL money, there is still a large gap, and with inflation and delayed large infrastructure across the region there is still uncertainty as to how the gap will be closed.
208798	Dr David Andrew [132010]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
207195	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	I support this
207214	Dr Simon Ravenscroft [131889]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Agree

209438	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes. However, whilst the amount estimated to be raised by CIL is £50 million this does not appear to take into account the obligation to distribute 15-25% to parish councils. Nor is it clear how the remaining part of the funding gap, £222.5 million, is to be met.
208678	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes there is a clear funding gap
209463	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes[, although the Parish Council does not necessarily agree with all the projects listed in the Infrastructure statement, for example it is opposed to CSET2. It also wishes to note that the scaled-back Sawston Greenway proposals are very disappointing, particularly through the village and Stapleford.]
209487	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	The supporting documentation identifies that there is a funding gap but clarity is sought about all the funding streams Greater Cambridge is receiving, including as part of the 'City Deal' and part of the 'Greater Cambridge Oxford to Cambridge corridor' in which the Government recently announced £800 million ¹ . Further, a funding gap should not act as wider brake on development, that would potentially become unviable.
209336	Jonathan Jones [5905]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	I agree that the councils have demonstrated a funding gap. However, the evidence base is framed almost entirely around transport. It does not adequately identify the wider infrastructure needs of a growing and intensifying city, including health, education, community facilities, civic amenities and social spaces, all of which are necessary for sustainable development.
209475	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has	Comment	See comments above

			demonstrated a funding gap?		
209448	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
209301	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	We agree that the council has demonstrated a funding gap
209538	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	See letter submission.
208805	Maria Carvalho [132017]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes. And we can see it in the state of the roads and fragmented transportation network
209385	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
207234	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes

207314	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	I do not agree that this is necessarily a funding gap.
207254	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes.The alternative congestion charge which did not get voted through means crucial bus and other services cannot be funded. The council clearly demonstrates this funding gap.
207297	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	no - just another tax - even calling it a levy is disingenuous
207415	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	More funding for roads repair is required too - the roads are in a terrible state of disrepair
207107	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	I agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap.
207102	Mr Maurice Barnes [131881]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
207351	Mr Michael Brown [131890]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	The funding gap would be better closed by not wasting money on absurd schemes such as the "Birthday Cake" roundabout on Milton Road

207371	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	No
207366	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Yes the funding gap they created due to their incompetence.
208562	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes, there is insufficient money for a transport network that would encourage commuting from beyond the green belt. Some of the money should be used to give the green belt lands to charities that will protect it for eternity.
207325	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	If there is a funding gap, the Council should focus on driving down infrastructure costs and cutting expenditure, rather than impose a levy on enterprise and business activity.
207156	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	If there is a funding gap, mismanagement of funds is to blame. We, Cambridge community, pay more and more council tax every year, but we get less and less for it. Something is very wrong. I am affraid that the more money CCC will get, the more of it will be wasted. Like £4.8 million spent by GCP on Congestion Charge consultations.
207500	Mrs Daphne Lott [9215]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Council has shown a funding gap but MUST manage its funds better. GCP is appallingly run.
209402	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has	Support	Redrow does consider that the published Infrastructure Statement demonstrates a funding gap.

			demonstrated a funding gap?		
207291	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes they have demonstrated a funding gap
207427	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Water drought, pot holes in the road -> directed lived experience of pressure on infrastructure!
207274	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Support
207207	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	I don't have this information
209536	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	No. A funding gap has been asserted, but not robustly demonstrated for the purposes of setting the Draft Charging Schedule. Please see our letter of representation, sent via email.
209522	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	We have not undertaken a detailed review of the funding gap. However, from review of the consultation material it appears that a funding gap exists in respect to the major transport infrastructure projects being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership and the Combined Authority.

209574	S Page [130882]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	Sort of, but I believe the funding gap is significantly underestimated.
209369	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Support	Yes
209567	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	TCC accept that provision of strategic infrastructure is vital to enable major housing and employment developments to take place in the Greater Cambridge area. They also accept that a range of mechanisms, including CIL, need to be considered to fund this infrastructure. However, given the weak link between the evidence base, funding requirements and the proposed charge, and with the new joint Local Plan on the horizon, this is considered to be the wrong time to implement a CIL charge. A more appropriate course and efficient use of resources would be to pause the current CIL plans. This would allow GCPS to consider all funding mechanisms for the infrastructure to support the new Local Plan in the light of the emerging new governance and funding regime including the expected creation of the Development Corporation. It would also allow a clear evidence base to be developed and a range of funding mechanisms which could include a CIL charge, to endure for the life of the Local Plan.
207355	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Object	They have money for unnecessary things, maybe that should be redirected

209429	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	Comment	The consultation identifies a funding gap but lacks clarity on the calculation of the current shortfall, particularly regarding earlier City Deal assumptions about developer contributions. Greater transparency on the derivation of the funding gap and the operation of CIL alongside other funding sources is needed to enhance confidence in the proposed approach. Clarification is required on how CIL income will interact with alternative Government funding through the proposed Development Corporation and whether a residual gap is anticipated after CIL implementation. The process for determining infrastructure priorities and sequencing in the event of inadequate funding should be clearly outlined.
207413	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	Residential CIL rate is too low
209472	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	As mentioned in the response to Question 1 consideration must be given to the relationship with S106 contributions. It is not clear that this has been adequately considered.
205646	B Nicolson [5745]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	I certainly support it but I do question the low rate for data centres. Given the huge amount of resources they use, I think a significantly higher charge should be levied.

209343	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Partially. Bar Hill Parish Council recognises that the proposed rates are informed by viability evidence and supporting analysis. However, given the scale of infrastructure requirements identified in the supporting statement, it is not entirely clear whether the proposed rates will generate sufficient revenue to meaningfully contribute towards addressing the identified funding gap. The Parish Council therefore encourages the councils to provide additional justification explaining how the proposed rates have been determined and how they are expected to contribute towards infrastructure delivery.
209411	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Concerns regarding the Benchmark Land Values (BLV) suggest testing a range of £100,000-£150,000 per gross acre for strategic sites, as the current assumption of circa £100,000 may not align with landowner expectations. The capital values for affordable housing tenures are unclear, particularly the blended capital value for affordable rent of £293psf, which appears high compared to private values. Professional fees should be increased to a minimum of 10% for strategic sites due to significant infrastructure costs, rather than the applied 7%. Clarification is needed on whether the 1.4% allowance for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) costs is based on base build cost or includes externals, as current assumptions significantly underestimate the financial burden of achieving a 20% net gain. The viability assessment should clarify whether the 6 sales per month refers to all tenures, with a suggestion to limit

					private sales to no more than 3 per month per outlet. The omission of a return for a master developer in the viability assessment is significant; an additional 15% on cost is recommended for strategic sites, along with increasing the profit margin for private residential to a minimum of 20% on GDV. The cashflowing of appraisals for strategic sites needs to be more detailed, ensuring that investment in primary infrastructure is accurately represented to avoid overly optimistic viability results.
209518	BioMed Realty [131008]	Bidwells (Miss Aoife Hand, Senior Planner) [131007]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The viability evidence prepared by BNPP is deemed inaccurate, lacking robustness and market realism to support the proposed CIL rates, raising concerns about its credibility. The assumptions regarding costs, values, and developer margins do not reflect real market conditions, leading to unrealistic conclusions about the feasibility of CIL payments. The introduction of CIL at the proposed levels may undermine policy objectives, negatively impacting sustainability, design quality, and affordable housing provision. There are concerns that the necessary developer engagement as per national guidance has not occurred, questioning the evidence's compliance and soundness. The Infrastructure Statement lacks a clear justification for the identified transport projects and relies on outdated evidence from previous plans and strategies. The current Infrastructure Delivery Strategy indicates that CIL will generate only £50 million, which is insufficient to address the identified funding gap of £222.371 million.

					The Draft Charging Schedule cannot be justified based on an infrastructure strategy that is inadequately evidenced and not demonstrably deliverable.
207305	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Not the way to solve the problem
209530	Brockton Everlast c/o Bidwells [132069]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The review of the viability evidence indicates that BNPP has been overly optimistic in their cost and value assumptions, leading to a disconnect between development costs and realisable values in Greater Cambridge. Concerns are raised about the accuracy of the viability assessment, suggesting that the proposed CIL rates may not be sustainable and could undermine development viability and public benefits such as affordable housing. The assumptions regarding costs, values, and developer margins do not reflect the realities of the Greater Cambridge market, risking the deliverability of essential projects. The introduction of CIL alongside existing policy requirements may impose significant pressure on viability, potentially leading to project funding withdrawal and undeliverable schemes. The Infrastructure Statement lacks a clear justification for the identified transport projects and relies on outdated evidence from previous plans, failing to reflect current needs and conditions. The projected CIL revenue of £50 million is insufficient to

					address the identified funding gap of £222.371 million, raising concerns about the deliverability of the proposed infrastructure projects.
209421	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Cambridge Ahead has significant concerns about the viability assessment presented in the evidence base for the CIL proposal and whether it adequately reflects current delivery conditions on the ground. Many of our members who are active in this sector have suggested that real-world build costs are higher than those assumed in the evidence base, and that yield assumptions may also differ from current market expectations, raising concerns that the modelling does not reflect current market reality. If this is the case, it risks overstating what development schemes can realistically support. We would encourage the Authority to give careful consideration to the evidence that organisations submit as part of this consultation process, to ensure that the CIL rates strike the right balance between contributing to the cost of strategic transport infrastructure and maintaining a viable pipeline of development. In addition, feedback from members who are actively bringing schemes forward in Greater Cambridge highlights the importance of ensuring that the modelling properly reflects the local development context. In Greater Cambridge, high design quality and ambitious environmental standards are already expected from developers, which is welcome and appropriate for an economy so critical for broader UK growth ambitions. While these expectations are supported in principle, they can add materially to construction costs. If these factors are not fully reflected in the viability evidence, there is a risk that the introduction of CIL could inadvertently discourage the delivery of high-quality development or reduce ambition around environmental standards, and we would be concerned if this resulted in an unintended reduction in the quality or sustainability of development coming forward.

					The commercial and innovation real estate market has faced a particularly challenging period since 2023, with less demand, higher financing costs and increased investor return requirements. These factors are shaping development decisions and should be carefully reflected in the viability assessment. The pace at which new schemes are coming forward in the current market also suggests that viability is already tight in practice. There is also concern that laboratory and innovation space appears to have been grouped with general office uses within the viability assessment, and that the evidence base does not adequately reflect the costs and market conditions associated with delivering complex R&D space such as laboratories. Laboratories, for example, are significantly more expensive to deliver than standard office space, with higher build costs, servicing requirements and different rental expectations. Given the importance of the innovation sector to Greater Cambridge, more explicit consideration of these uses would provide greater confidence that the assessment reflects local delivery realities. We would therefore welcome a review of the assumptions used within the viability assessment to ensure they reflect current build costs and commercial conditions in Greater Cambridge. Aligning the evidence more closely with recent delivery experience will help to ensure that the proposed rates are realistic and sustainable. The grouping of research and development space with general office uses in the draft charging schedule also raises concern that higher rates on these uses could discourage investment in commercial space for sectors that underpin the Greater Cambridge knowledge-intensive economy.
209557	Cambridge Biomedical		Question 5: Do you agree that the	Comment	The robustness and currency of the viability evidence used to reach the balance is questioned.

	Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?		Concerns are raised about the proposed CIL charge of £175 psqm for lab space, as it is considered too high due to the unique and costly requirements of lab development compared to general office space. An exemption for health-related development is recommended, particularly regarding the potential application of CIL to new Acute Hospital developments. A general exemption from CIL for the existing Cambridge Biomedical Campus is suggested, as developments will support funding for a new acute hospital and may require alternative funding mechanisms. It is proposed that key worker affordable housing developments on the existing campus should be exempt from CIL charges if a general exemption is not granted.
209556	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	We are not convinced that the evidence is comprehensive and robust. And while we support the principle of the CIL, we remain unconvinced as to whether the CIL charge is set at the right level to not choke off development which otherwise would come forward.
208721	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	The evidence produced is very biased towards 'utility' transport schemes. Important as these are, it is a fact that residents of South Cambs take part in more leisure walks than utility walks and even in Cambridge leisure walking is popular. What about the 33% of households with dogs? They need green spaces for circular walks away from traffic. There is no reference too the Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan which should also be guiding where funds

					are spent. Please include Jenny's path from Great Shelford to the A10 and an off-road route by Lime Kiln Hill
208827	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	No. While we acknowledge the intent to capture revenue from commercial developments that currently pay nothing, the evidence used to set the residential rate appears flawed: • Insufficient Residential Levy: The proposed £60/sqm for housing is significantly too low. It generates approximately £4.2k per dwelling, which pales in comparison to the £35k average currently secured via Section 106. • Infrastructure Shortfall: This rate fails to meet the actual costs of major infrastructure. For example, the Grange Farm A11 bridge requires roughly £10k per dwelling, a figure the proposed CIL cannot meet.
208790	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE recognises that the Council has used viability assessments and infrastructure planning evidence to inform the proposed CIL rates and to balance infrastructure funding with development viability. However, we would encourage the Council to ensure that future monitoring of the levy includes consideration of impacts in rural areas. Smaller developments in villages can still create additional pressure on local infrastructure, including community buildings, transport connections and shared spaces. Understanding these local impacts will help ensure that CIL supports sustainable growth across both urban and rural communities.
207320	Claire Carroll [131906]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The Council has not provided adequate justification for the high CIL on residential properties. Personal housing is a need, not a business decision, and residential properties should be on the lowest CIL (£35). Industrial and data centres are resources and infrastructure hungry, and therefore should not be given the lowest rate.

					They need to support the infrastructure they demand and should have the highest rate shared with businesses (£175).
209499	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The viability report relies on optimistic data, including an assumed 7% interest rate, which may not accurately reflect future trends, as rates could increase rather than decrease. Smaller developers may face borrowing challenges at the assumed interest rate, leading to potential viability issues that larger developers may not encounter. The viability report treats CIL as a flat cost, neglecting the additional borrowing costs that developers will incur prior to sales. Concerns are raised regarding the assumed return on affordable housing, particularly the 6% GDV for 75% social rent, which may not be realistic in all Greater Cambridge locations. The assumption of six sales per month in the viability report is deemed unreliable given current market conditions in the South East.
207278	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	yes
207196	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	I think the rates are fair and proportionate

209439	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	We have no view on this and reserve our position.
208679	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Yes robust evidence has been outlined in the reports.
209464	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	evidence
209488	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The evidence supporting the proposed CIL charging rates is the "Greater Cambridge: Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment" prepared by BNP Paribas (January 2026). For the detailed reasons set out within these representations and appended information provided by Newsteer, it is considered that the Council has not appropriately evidenced the proposed CIL rates.
209459	Jesus College [132059]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The review by the viability experts indicates that the viability evidence prepared by BNPP is overly optimistic, with costs set unrealistically low and values at the upper end of the range, leading to an overstatement of the viability of development in Greater Cambridge. There are significant concerns regarding the assumptions used in the draft CIL rates, which do not reflect real market conditions, particularly in terms of costs, values, and developer margins. The viability evidence fails to provide a credible assessment of the impact of proposed CIL rates, risking the economic viability of

					developments and undermining policy objectives such as sustainability and affordable housing provision. Introducing CIL at the proposed levels could lead to undeliverable schemes and increased pressure on viability, particularly in a high-cost market like Greater Cambridge, echoing experiences from other locations such as London. The Infrastructure Statement lacks a clear justification for the identified transport projects and is based on outdated evidence that does not reflect current transport needs or costs. The projected CIL revenue of £50 million is insufficient to address the identified funding gap of £222.371 million, raising concerns about the deliverability of the proposed infrastructure projects.
209337	Jonathan Jones [5905]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	The councils have produced a viability assessment to support the proposed rates. However, this is a high-level area-wide exercise, and the evidence for the precise calibration of the rates — particularly the very high office/R&D rate and the decision not to differentiate geographically — appears more judgment-based than fully granular.
209477	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	See comments above
209449	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Yes
209302	Little Wilbraham and		Question 5: Do you agree that the	Support	We agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates

	Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?		
209544	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	In summary, the CIL viability assessment: 1 Is tested on a very limited range of scenarios which are not reflective of Cambridgeshire's stock of industrial premises; 2 Adopts a single build cost assumption that is lower than the BCIS build costs across many types of industrial development; 3 Fails to have regard to other costs including abnormal costs or provide an allowance for contingency; 4 Applies a single rental value of £195/sqm which fails to reflect the range of values associated with different types of industrial premises and is higher than actual rental values commanded across Cambridgeshire as a whole as well as each of the individual constituent postcode districts; 5 Adopts a single market yield assumption of 5% which is lower than the actual yield achieved across Cambridgeshire's industrial stock; and, 6 Identifies that CIL charging is only viable on greenfield sites under its own testing parameters. This analysis demonstrates that the identified CIL rate cannot be justified. As a minimum, further testing is required in order to consider the impact of the changes to the various inputs that we have identified above. We believe that this will render

					the application of any CIL in respect of industrial development in Greater Cambridge to be unviable.
207249	Lord Lord Richard Balfe [131895]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	It seems to have done
209386	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Yes
207239	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Yes
207298	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	n/a
207416	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	CIL rate on residential is too low
207108	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used	Support	I agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates.

			appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?		
207367	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	No
207373	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	No they only tell us only what we need to know and not the whole story
208563	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Yes
207326	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	I am not in a position to comment on this question. I object to the introduction of CIL in principle.
207157	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The idea is very wrong. There is no need for present evidence. It looks like just a money scam.

209403	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	Concerns regarding development typologies in the viability report, specifically the classification of densities which do not align with typical definitions. A full review of typologies is recommended. The affordable housing values in the report are considered high compared to market unit sales values, suggesting a need for reassessment of the blended figure used for Affordable Rented units. The report lacks clarity on which quartile of BCIS build costs is used, and the allowance for external works is deemed too low, not reflecting true development costs. Professional fees are underestimated; a figure of 10% is suggested to better reflect current market conditions. Assumptions regarding developer finance costs should reflect a 10% rate due to ongoing geopolitical uncertainties and potential interest rate rises. Clarification is needed on whether the 1.4% allowance for Biodiversity Net Gain costs includes external works. The costs for achieving a 20% net gain are significantly underestimated. The viability report overestimates sales rates, which do not align with current market conditions, indicating a need for adjustment. Developer profit should be a minimum of 20% of GDV to reflect risks, especially in the Affordable Housing sector, with a blended figure of 25% suggested for overheads.
--------	------------------------------	--	---	--------	--

207292	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Yes the council has provided the required evidence
207428	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	I have a concern about levys impacting small businesses. I did not see analysis to indicate if there was a differentiation of business size that was considered as part of the levy (which may not be relevant) - in short we do not want to undermine small business start-ups so any liability must not be passed onto them otherwise small shops/cafes which are needed to create local community may be impacted
207276	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Support
207210	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	Northstowe development is a case in point
209539	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	No. The BNPP viability analysis is not robust or market-realistic: key assumptions on costs, values, margins and infrastructure do not reflect the conditions in Greater Cambridge, and there is uncertainty over the developer engagement undertaken (required by guidance). The strategic infrastructure evidence relies on out-of-date transport programmes, while expected CIL yield (circa £50m) would not contribute significantly towards the stated £272.5m funding gap.

209516	Railpen [132064]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The viability review indicates that BNPP's CIL viability assessment is overly optimistic, with inflated values and underestimated costs, leading to a disconnect between development costs and realisable values in Greater Cambridge. The respondent urges a reassessment of viability inputs and CIL charging rates to avoid negatively impacting development viability and public benefits like affordable housing. Concerns were raised about the lack of robust evidence supporting the draft CIL charges, questioning the accuracy of assumptions regarding costs, values, and developer margins. The respondent highlights that the proposed CIL levels may undermine sustainability, design quality, and affordable housing provision, risking project deliverability. The Infrastructure Statement lacks a clear justification for identified transport projects and relies on outdated evidence from previous plans, failing to reflect current transport needs. The projected CIL revenue of £50 million is insufficient to address the identified funding gap of £222.371 million, raising concerns about the feasibility of the proposed infrastructure strategy.
207230	Roland Curtis [131892]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	The levy on hotels should be higher. They have much higher infrastructure requirements compared to other areas, given the high turnover of people who visit them.
209575	S Page [130882]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used	Object	see answer to qu 6.

			appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?		
207379	Solon Karapanagiotis [131910]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	were can I find this information?
209505	Stanhope [132060]	Bidwells (Miss Charlotte Tate, Principal Planner) [131107]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The review by the viability experts indicates that the CIL viability assessment by BNPP is overly optimistic, with costs underestimated and values set too high, leading to an inflated perception of development viability in Greater Cambridge. There are significant concerns regarding the assumptions used in the BNPP evidence, which do not accurately reflect market conditions, potentially undermining the viability of development and public benefits such as affordable housing. The proposed CIL rates may impose undue pressure on development viability, risking the withdrawal of essential project funding and the potential for schemes to become undeliverable, contrary to government growth ambitions. The Infrastructure Statement lacks a clear justification for the identified projects and fails to demonstrate the necessary link between the proposed CIL and the development strategy, with evidence being outdated and insufficient. The projected CIL revenue of £50 million is inadequate to address the identified funding gap of £222.371 million, raising concerns about the deliverability of the proposed infrastructure projects.
209370	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Support	Yes

209568	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	The viability evidence base is incomplete regarding R&D and laboratory development, which are crucial to Greater Cambridge's economy. Construction costs for R&D buildings are significantly higher than standard commercial offices, with a premium of at least 40-50% due to specialised requirements. The Viability Report inadequately models R&D development economics, failing to distinguish between office and laboratory uses, leading to potential underestimation of costs. The report does not include a discrete analysis for laboratory or containment-grade R&D facilities, which is a significant omission given their economic importance. The proposed CIL rates risk undermining the viability of R&D developments, which are essential for the region's growth strategy. The Viability Report fails to account for the costs associated with achieving net zero carbon and water efficiency standards, particularly for energy-intensive R&D buildings.
209319	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	The respondent highlights the mandatory charitable exemption from CIL under regulations 41 and 43 of the 2010 CIR Regulations, noting its importance for Colleges applying for PBSA. The respondent questions whether BNP/GCSPS has considered this exemption in their assumptions for PBSA undertaken by Colleges. The respondent advocates for the application of discretionary relief provisions under section 44 of the CIR for charities' commercial developments, emphasising the impact of the

					Collegiate University's educational activities. The respondent expresses concern that real world build costs are significantly higher than those assumed in the study, suggesting a risk of overestimating the developments' support for CIL. The respondent recommends that real world evidence from construction professionals be closely considered to ensure accurate assessments.
209320	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Comment	The respondent recommends the adoption of an Exceptional Circumstances Relief (ECR) policy to prevent educational and charitable developments from becoming undeliverable due to the absence of relief options. The respondent emphasises that implementing the ECR policy at the introduction of the Charging Schedule is crucial for maintaining viability and preventing negative impacts on development. The inclusion of the ECR policy is seen as a necessary safeguard that should be established from the outset to ensure timely and viable charitable educational developments, including student accommodation, in accordance with the Cambridge Local Plan.
207356	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	Object	Money is available to build things people object to, why not use it to provide what is needed instead
209430	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate	Comment	The respondent expresses concerns that the viability assessment does not accurately reflect current market conditions, with higher actual construction costs and misaligned yield assumptions potentially overstating

			evidence to inform the proposed rates?	development support. Feedback indicates that the modelling fails to consider local context and requirements in Greater Cambridge, where high design quality and environmental standards increase construction costs. The respondent warns that if policy requirements are not reflected in viability evidence, the introduction of CIL may hinder high-quality development and environmental ambition. Concerns are raised about the grouping of laboratory and innovation space with general office uses in the viability assessment, as laboratories have significantly higher costs and different market conditions. The respondent highlights that aligning evidence with recent delivery experiences is crucial for ensuring proposed rates are realistic and sustainable. There are concerns that higher CIL rates on research and development space could deter investment in sectors vital to the Greater Cambridge economy. The respondent supports the allocation of 'F1' uses within the 'All other uses' category at a £0 CIL rate, noting that educational developments are not profit-generating and can mitigate impacts individually. Further discussion is requested regarding the charity exemption for the University when developing for charitable purposes, and confirmation is sought on charitable relief for Colleges and Universities for student accommodation.
--	--	--	---	--

207270	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	The levy rates are too low - they do not reflect the true cost of infrastructure improvements required as a result of new developments. Examples include data centres (energy and water), residential (schools, shops, transport, regeneration of green spaces).
207412	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	The CIL rates are too low for residential - most areas have higher residential CIL rates. Cambridge has very high house prices and it should have a commensurately high residential CIL rate
207098	Mr Maurice Barnes [131881]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect	Comment	Data centres should have a CIL which considers the high water use in an area which has a low water availability and thus the infrastructure required to provide cooling for such projects.

			on the viability of developments?		
209473	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	This depends largely upon the Council's position on S106 and the relationship with CIL.
209344	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	Uncertain. Bar Hill Parish Council acknowledges the requirement within the CIL Regulations for local authorities to balance infrastructure funding with development viability. However, it is not entirely clear whether the proposed rates will generate sufficient revenue to address infrastructure pressures while maintaining development viability. The Parish Council would therefore welcome further explanation of how this balance has been assessed and how the impacts of the charging schedule will be monitored over time.
209412	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support	Comment	No comment

			development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
207306	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	No - killing the goose that lays the golden egg
209422	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	Achieving the right balance between securing infrastructure funding and maintaining development viability is clearly challenging. Cambridge Ahead supports the principle of funding the infrastructure needed to enable growth, but the Planning Authority should be extremely cautious about adding further cumulative pressures on development to the extent that schemes become unviable and do not come forward. Development in Greater Cambridge is already subject to a wide range of policy requirements, including affordable housing and workspace provision, sustainability standards, biodiversity obligations and Section 106 contributions. While each of these requirements is supported in principle, their combined impact is significant, particularly in the current market where viability is already under pressure. The introduction of CIL alongside continued Section 106 requirements will add to these cumulative pressures, and it

				will be important to ensure that the combined impact does not undermine scheme viability or prevent development from coming forward. Section 106 should continue to focus on addressing the direct impacts of individual developments, while CIL is intended to contribute towards wider strategic infrastructure. Greater clarity is needed on how the two mechanisms will operate alongside one another in practice, to ensure that there is no overlap or unintended cumulative pressure. We recognise that the proposed levy is largely intended to support transport infrastructure, which is critical to unlocking sustainable and inclusive growth that Cambridge Ahead has long called for. However, further consideration is needed to ensure that the cost of funding that infrastructure does not inadvertently make it harder for development to come forward. Given current market conditions, it will be important to keep the impact of the levy under review once introduced, to ensure it continues to support delivery as intended. It will also be important that the approach recognises the different characteristics of development sites across Greater Cambridge. Larger, strategic or more complex schemes can involve significant on-site infrastructure provision and longer delivery timescales, and the operation of CIL will need to take account of these realities to ensure that development remains deliverable.
209558	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support	Comment • Yes. This is a well-trodden path. And in the context of the campus, securing additional funds towards essential long planned but unfunded transport schemes such CSET outside of the campus and therefore unable to be addressed via S106, is essential to realise the campus's potential.

			development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		• However in the same way that the level of a S106 package needs to be seen in the context of the viability of a scheme. The level of the CIL on any scheme, particularly on the existing campus needs to be
209563	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	The robustness and currency of the evidence of viability used to reach the balance in the consultation is unclear. Concerns are raised regarding the proposed CIL charge of £175 psqm for lab space, as it is considered too high due to the higher development costs associated with lab facilities compared to general office space. An exemption for health-related developments is recommended, as it is unclear if the proposed CIL would apply to new health facilities, particularly the new Acute Hospital. A general exemption from CIL for the existing campus is suggested, as developments will support funding for the new acute hospital and may require additional funding mechanisms like TIFF. Key worker affordable housing developments on the existing campus should be exempt from the CIL charge if a general exemption is not granted.
209395	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect	Object	Significant additional investment in transport infrastructure and services is necessary for sustainable travel to be a viable alternative to car travel in Greater Cambridge. The proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule is insufficient, and councils should aim for a more ambitious CIL rate from developers. The proposed residential CIL rate of £60 per square metre is low compared to neighbouring authorities and previously

			on the viability of developments?		proposed rates for Cambridge City. Comparative CIL rates include Huntingdonshire District Council at £152, East Cambridgeshire District Council ranging from £70 to £159, and Cambridge City at £125 in 2014.
208791	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE considers that the proposed rates appear to strike a reasonable balance between securing contributions towards infrastructure and maintaining development viability. It will be important that this balance also works in practice for communities. Development should not only be viable for developers but also sustainable for the places where it occurs. This includes ensuring that local infrastructure keeps pace with growth, particularly in villages where even small developments can increase demand for community buildings, local services and transport connections.
207372	Catarina Campos [130646]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	Until you get rid of the "greenbelt", no. Let the city expand
208492	Catherine Wood [130071]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between	Support	Yes, much more needs to be done to make new neighbourhoods sustainable, good places to live. Currently there are NO medical facilities in Eddington or Darwin Green developments, and no pharmacy services either. The north/west of Cambridge is extremely poorly serviced for

			additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		medical facilities, doctors, and pharmacies. There are also no swimming facilities which were promised from the university. This is a huge disappointment and massively lets down residents who have had to accept massive developments with no quality sport, schools, or medical infrastructure. This is a scandal and must be rectified.
209500	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	No. The viability does not provide evidence which clearly demonstrates the CIL rates can be absorbed without affecting delivery. Key assumptions in the viability testing, including early loading of CIL, S106 and policy costs, optimistic finance rates and sales rates overstate viability headroom.
208799	Dr David Andrew [132010]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	On the face of it, no. Even with the projected income from the CIL there is still a significant funding gap, and congestion in Cambridge is already critical. Further development is simply not sustainable without significant extra investment to tackle this problem, and it is far from clear that even bridging the funding gap to allow completion of the current pipeline of schemes would be sufficiently transformational. This would indicate that a higher levy is required.
207199	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate	Support	It is essential that residents no longer bear the burden of developments and their negative impact on the environment we live in. Cambridge is a growth environment and

			balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		developers should have more input to the cost impact of their profitable builds
209440	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	We have no view on this and reserve our position.
208681	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes
209489	Henry Boot Developments	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck	Object	No, for the detailed reasons set out within these representations, the Council has not appropriately evidenced the proposed CIL rates.

	Limited [131707]	Voyias) [131260]	an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
209479	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	See comments above
209450	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes
209312	Little Shelford Parish Council		Question 6: Do you agree that the	Support	yes

	(Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
209303	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	We agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments
209545	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	No. Please see our response to Question 5.

209387	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes
207224	Miss Caroline Blackmun [131891]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Looks reasonable to me.
207241	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect	Comment	the CIL levels chosen need to be increased to cover the funding gap.

			on the viability of developments?		
207315	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	Lately it's all about development; we need to preserve character in Cambridge. We don't need ugly brutalist houses.
207185	Mr James Nadin [131885]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	.
207255	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and	Support	Yes. developers always complain they cannot get high enough rates of return, but it is important to bring them to longer term thinking for the entire ecosystem of infrastructure.

			the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
207300	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	n/a
207417	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	Residential CIL rate is too low
207111	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support	Support	I agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments

			development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
207109	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	I agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.
207369	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	Absolutely not.its their incompetence why they are in this mess.
207374	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to	Object	No this is not a consultation only stick box exercise and they'll do what ever they want, not what tge public want

			support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
208564	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes
207327	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	See my previous comments.
207431	Mr Robert MacDonald [9405]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional	Object	The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Assessment indicates that viable CIL rates for residential properties could range from £161 to £843 per square metre, significantly higher than the proposed £60 per square metre in the draft charging schedule.

			investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		With an assumption of 50,000 residential units built over 20 years, the proposed £60 rate would generate £300 million for transport infrastructure, but the assessment suggests that rates ten times higher could be viable. The potential loss of over £2 billion in revenue due to the lower proposed rate could have disastrous effects on sustainable transport initiatives in the city.
205624	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	yes
207158	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	What balance?? Only council benefits. Everyone else is losing.
209404	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck	Object	It is clear from the modelling calculations of maximum CIL rates that new settlements are unable to afford the proposed CIL charge, even with 0% affordable housing, unless sales

			an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?		values are £6,500 per square metre. However, evidence of sales values obtained from Landstack clearly demonstrate that new settlements are simply not able to achieve such high values. Cambourne are only achieving £4,166 per sqm and Northstowe only £3,800. At this sales value, no affordable housing would be possible which demonstrates that CIL is simply not viable for these sites.
207293	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes I think the balance is appropriate
207429	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	I am not placed to comment on developer economics

207279	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Support
207213	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	This is not my field of expertise
209540	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect	Object	No. In combination with substantial Section 106 obligations and emerging policy requirements (e.g. BREEAM, affordable workspace, 20% BNG, minimum tree canopy), the proposed CIL charge would erode headroom, risking reductions in design quality, sustainability performance and affordable housing provision, and threatening delivery – particularly for brownfield, high-cost, phased schemes like the Grafton Centre.

			on the viability of developments?		
209523	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	No objection is raised to the proposed CIL rate of £60 per square metre for residential developments, informed by the Greater Cambridge Community Infrastructure Viability Assessment. The consultation lacks a defined site threshold for distinguishing between strategic site allocations and other developments, despite the welcomed distinction in Section 106 contributions. Strategic sites incur significant non-Section 106 infrastructure costs, such as highway improvements and utilities, which should be included in the viability model. The same CIL rate for both strategic and non-strategic sites is questioned; non-strategic sites should pay a higher rate to ensure the viability and timely delivery of strategic sites. Concerns are raised regarding the CIL rate of £175 per square metre for offices and R&D, suggesting a zonal system with varying rates based on location due to differing property values.
209576	S Page [130882]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect	Object	Related to underestimating amount of investment required in infrastructure. Rates should be closer to those of neighbouring authorities.

			on the viability of developments?		
209371	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Support	Yes
209569	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	The balance has not been demonstrated for R&D and strategic site development. For the reasons set out under Question 5, Trinity College does not consider that the Councils have demonstrated, on the basis of the current evidence, that the proposed rates strike the balance required by Regulation 14 of the CIL Regulations for R&D and laboratory development.
209321	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and	Comment	Funding to unlock strategic transport initiatives which have been stalled for too long is clearly important in allowing the region to realise its potential. Striking the right balance between securing infrastructure funding and maintaining development viability is challenging. The system should be kept under regular review to ensure that development viability is not being undermined.

			the potential effect on the viability of developments?		
207357	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Object	See above responses. The population is growing yet people can't get a doctor's appointment or get to a pharmacy when they need to. This is way more important
209431	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 6: Do you agree that the Council has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments?	Comment	The respondent supports funding for infrastructure but warns against introducing additional fixed costs that could make development unviable. Current policy obligations create cumulative pressures on development, which may hinder financial feasibility in a constrained market. Greater clarity is needed on the operation of Section 106 agreements and CIL to avoid duplication and double charging; strategic sites should be excluded from CIL. The proposed levy for transport infrastructure is acknowledged, but its cost must not hinder necessary development for growth. The approach should consider the varying characteristics of sites, particularly larger or complex developments that require substantial on-site infrastructure.

					CIL can provide more certainty in development appraisals compared to Section 106, but its introduction may create uncertainty for ongoing proposals. There is a concern that the introduction of CIL could lead to a turbulent period for development in an already challenging market.
209474	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	It is not clear and clarification through the examination would be essential. It would be appropriate to adopt a SPD alongside the CIL schedule (if adopted).
209468	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	The relationship between CIL and Section 106 contributions needs to be clearly defined, as CIL should not serve as an additional levy to S106 contributions. Clarity is required through a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) regarding the roles of CIL in funding strategic infrastructure and S106 in mitigating development impacts. There may be overlaps in contributions, particularly concerning highways and education, which necessitates clear guidance to avoid complexity in assessing new developments. The potential for viability challenges exists if contributions from CIL and S106 are not clearly established, highlighting the need for clarification during any CIL examination.
209345	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section	Comment	Not entirely. While the consultation explains that CIL will fund strategic infrastructure and Section 106 obligations will continue to

			106 Planning Obligations?		secure site-specific mitigation and affordable housing contributions, the relationship between the two mechanisms remains complex. Bar Hill Parish Council is concerned that reliance on CIL may limit the ability of planning authorities to secure development-specific infrastructure improvements through Section 106 agreements. Greater clarity regarding the interaction between these mechanisms would therefore be beneficial.
209413	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	No Comment
207307	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Irrelevant
207308	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Irrelevant
209423	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Greater clarity would be helpful on how CIL is intended to operate alongside Section 106 in practice. Section 106 should continue to address the direct impacts of individual developments, while CIL is intended to contribute towards wider strategic infrastructure. Clear guidance on how the two mechanisms will work together would provide confidence that there will be no overlap or unintended cumulative impact. Developers need certainty that infrastructure will not

				effectively be charged for twice through different routes. It will also be important to ensure that the combined impact of CIL and Section 106 requirements is fully understood, and that this does not create additional viability pressures that could affect the delivery of development. Given that planning obligations often involve more than one local authority, consistency in how CIL and Section 106 are applied will also be important. Clear coordination across authorities will help to avoid unnecessary complexity in bringing schemes forward. It will also be important to ensure that the interaction between the two mechanisms does not unintentionally affect the timing of applications or introduce uncertainty in the process. It would also be helpful to understand how CIL will operate in practice across different types of sites. Schemes vary in complexity and in the infrastructure they provide on site, and it will be important that the levy works in a way that is fair and proportionate. It will be important that the instalment policy reflects the realities of phased and more complex developments, which might involve longer build-out periods and multiple stages of delivery. Clarity around commencement will also be important, particularly where pre-commencement conditions or ongoing Section 106 discussions affect when development can actually begin on site. The point at which the levy becomes payable should align with these practical stages of delivery. As with any new charging regime, clear communication about
--	--	--	--	---

					implementation and transition will help provide certainty for those progressing schemes.
209559	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	• Yes. This is a well-trodden path. And in the context of the campus, securing additional funds towards essential long planned but unfunded transport schemes such CSET outside of the campus and therefore unable to be addressed via S106, is essential to realise the campus's potential. • However in the same way that the level of a S106 package needs to be seen in the context of the viability of a scheme. The level of the CIL on any scheme, particularly on the existing campus needs to be
209572	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	• Yes. This is a well-trodden path. And in the context of the campus, securing additional funds towards essential long planned but unfunded transport schemes such CSET outside of the campus and therefore unable to be addressed via S106, is essential to realise the campus's potential.
209396	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	No. S106 funds are currently used to support various bus services in Greater Cambridge. It is not currently clear whether the local transport infrastructure required for new developments (e.g. new bus shelters, cycle parking) will be supported by CIL or S106 contributions going forward. In addition, for bus travel, the frequency and operating hours of bus services are as, if not more important than bus infrastructure (e.g. a busway). It is not clear whether bus services from new developments would be funded by CIL or S106. Clarity on these points is required.
208828	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal)		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section	Object	No. The current proposal creates a "bun fight" where transport infrastructure is positioned to receive its funding slice first. This creates an inequitable system where: • Transport is prioritised at the expense of other essential

	Planning Officer) [1801]		106 Planning Obligations?		services. • Health, education, and green infrastructure remain reliant on Section 106, which will continue to fail to capture contributions from smaller sites. We argue that for a 'balance' to be struck, all infrastructure types must be funded equitably to address existing service shortfalls.
208792	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Partly / broadly yes Cambridgeshire ACRE recognises that the consultation documents explain the broad distinction between CIL and Section 106 obligations. However, further clarity would be helpful for communities and parish councils about how the two mechanisms will work in practice and what types of infrastructure will be funded through each route. Clear guidance would help local communities understand how development in their area will translate into infrastructure improvements. This is particularly important in rural areas where smaller developments can still create pressure on local facilities and community infrastructure.
209510	Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis [132051]	Quod (Mrs Georgina Thomson, Associate) [7297]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	No, there is insufficient clarity. They recommend a clear distinction between infrastructure projects funded by CIL and those funded by localised s106 agreements to ensure comprehensive funding for Campus infrastructure improvements.
209501	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Yes, it is clear the CIL will fund strategic transport infrastructure, while S106 obligations will capture other items. Operational clarity is still lacking as the Planning Obligation SPD has not been adopted yet, which will provide more detail on the separation in cases of overlap.
207281	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate	Support	it is clear

			alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?		
207200	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	I agree
209441	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	No. Whilst the Viability Report does refer to the continued use of s.106 agreements there is no clear statement setting out the approach for the future if CIL is approved. Such a statement is needed so that developers, Parish Councils and the general public understand what potential remains in the s.106 system.
208683	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Yes. However further detail is needed about how this will operate in the rural areas of Greater Cambridge, securing infrastructure for villages (pages 6&7 of the Greater Cambridge Infrastructure Statement)
209490	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	No, clarity needs to be provided about the purpose for the CIL funding beyond just strategic projects to ensure there is no double counting of infrastructure costs with S106 and CIL operating in tandem.
209480	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	See comments above
209451	Linton Parish Council (Mrs		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear	Support	Yes

	Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?		
209313	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	yes
209304	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	We agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations
209546	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	See Letter submission.
208806	Maria Carvalho [132017]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Yes
209388	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Yes

207242	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Yes - Both with run in tandem as they have different focuses.
207256	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Yes. It is clear that this is a modest CIL, given that Section 106 is still the main resource.
207110	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	I Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations.
207112	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	I agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations
207375	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	I understand
208565	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section	Support	Yes

			106 Planning Obligations?		
207328	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Please see my previous comments.
205625	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	No comments
205626	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	no comments
207266	Mr Tarek Saad [131899]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Clear as day
207159	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	That s ok.
207289	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate	Support	yea

			alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?		
209405	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	While we recognise there is no longer a requirement to publish a Regulation 123 list, in the interests of clarity we would strongly encourage the Council to publish a list of infrastructure items that are intended to be funded through CIL and those items that will remain as S106 obligations.
207295	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Yes it is clear
207280	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	Support
207218	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	I disagree with some recent planning decisions. How the new Waterbeach Station was approved without toilets for example
209378	NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Integrated Care Board [131754]	NHS Property Services Ltd (Mr Mark Adams) [129763]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Further clarity is required on the impact of the introduction of CIL, and how contributions towards health and other infrastructure will be affected. If the CIL funding for transport infrastructure is secured through CIL, we would expect to see a clear commitment and support from the Council and Local Plan Policy to ensure that funding and mitigation to support new/improved health infrastructure to support growth is

					supported and prioritised. This should be made clear within emerging policy.
209541	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	No, it is not entirely clear. Further clarity is required. Whilst we understand that the proposed CIL will relate to strategic infrastructure, with all other matters covered by S106 Obligations. However, there is a risk of overlap and potential double-charging. Furthermore, there is already an expectation of some Highway works via S278; there is a new Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD to be adopted; plus there are additional layers of future governance which could potentially include additional CIL mechanisms, including the SDS and a possible Development Corporation.
209524	Places for People [131604]	Ceres Property (Mr David Fletcher) [130250]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Yes, it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 obligations and this has been clearly defined in the consultation.
209577	S Page [130882]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	Not clear to me what will be provided by either when it comes to both new infrastructure, maintaining existing infrastructure and, as critical, routes and frequencies of buses.
209372	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	The respondent agrees with the clarity of how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 planning obligations and supports the continuation of S106 for community infrastructure and improvements. The respondent suggests widening the beneficial area for CIL payments from large development sites beyond the parish boundary where the development is located, particularly for sites along the A14 that impact surrounding villages.

					The respondent raises concerns about how CIL benefits will be allocated, questioning if they will be restricted to transport improvements in the parishes of the development, despite impacts on multiple surrounding parishes. The respondent requests consideration for regulations that allow CIL benefits to be used more widely to address the broader impact of large developments.
209570	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	The relationship between CIL and S106 for strategic sites requires clarification and is not adequately addressed. At present: • There is insufficient explanation of the circumstances in which S106 obligations will be used to address infrastructure requirements at strategic sites rather than, or in substitution for, CIL. • The Infrastructure Statement does not clearly identify which elements of the infrastructure programme are intended to be delivered through S106 at strategic sites, and which through CIL receipts. • There is no clear explanation of how the Councils will avoid the double-counting of infrastructure contributions where a strategic site is already making substantial S106 commitments (for example, in relation to transport, utilities, public realm and employment floorspace delivery). • There is no flexibility for employment led sites (the Councils merely identify a reduction in affordable housing on residential sites as a 'safety value' to overcome viability issues). • There is no clarity on when infrastructure funds will be spent

					to support the delivery of strategic sites. Whereas 100% of s.106 contributions which are identified as mitigation for strategic transport will be spent on strategic transport, that is not the case for CIL whereby a significant proportion will be earmarked for other uses, significantly reducing the monies available for investment in strategic transport.
209322	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Comment	Greater clarity on how CIL will interact with Section 106 and across council areas (where planning obligations involve more than one local authority) will be important.
207358	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Support	It is clear
209432	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	Object	Authorities typically exclude strategic sites from CIL due to complexity and viability issues, with Section 106 agreements being preferred. Larger strategic sites relying on strategic infrastructure delivery at or near to the site rather than contributing to a generic CIL fund. for example Grange Farm's development depends on the CSET scheme, highlighting the need for Section 106 funding to ensure public transport and active travel options. Strategic sites in the draft plan, such as Eddington and CBC, should be nil rated for CIL unless a clear definition of strategic versus development-specific infrastructure is provided.

					The proposed CIL approach may not expedite development as it only addresses strategic transport, leaving other impacts requiring Section 106 agreements. Lack of clarity on what constitutes 'strategic' transport impacts could lead to delays in application determinations.
209476	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	No observations.
209346	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	No objection in principle. The Parish Council recognises that instalment policies are intended to support development viability and developer cashflow. However, it is also important that infrastructure funding is received in a timely manner to ensure that infrastructure can be delivered alongside development. The Parish Council therefore supports the principle of an instalment policy but encourages the councils to monitor its operation to ensure that infrastructure delivery is not delayed.
209414	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	Barratt welcomes the draft instalment policy however further clarification is required. The instalment policy refers to the total CIL liability but does this allow for the liability of phased developments? Barratt wish to see this clarified, and allowance made for the ability to phase development as this will significantly improve the balance between income and cashflow.
209560	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson,		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right	Comment	An instalment policy is essential for development of the scale envisaged on the campus. However CBCL is not a landowner or developer and will therefore not be liable to pay the CIL.

	Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		balance between income and developer cashflow?		• Notwithstanding, the split proposed for the larger schemes with CIL charges over £500,000 is reasonable. Noting any event the transport schemes for the campus that the CIL will support will need to be forward funded by some other mechanism if they are to be delivered in a timely manner. In this context CIL will be a retrospective payment.
208793	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE considers that the proposed instalment policy appears proportionate and provides a reasonable balance between ensuring timely collection of CIL receipts and recognising the cashflow constraints faced by developers. Staged payments for larger liabilities should help maintain development viability while still ensuring that infrastructure funding is secured. It will be important that the approach allows infrastructure investment to be delivered in a timely way so that communities see the benefits of development alongside growth.
209511	Cambridgeshire County Council and Prologis [132051]	Quod (Mrs Georgina Thomson, Associate) [7297]	Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	No, the thresholds are considered to be too low given the scale of payments that may be generated by the proposed CIL rates. We request that these are extended to improve the viability of development proposals. For very large contributions, the instalment policy should take a longer term approach. In Oxford the instalment policy for sums over £2m is: 1st instalment, 25% within 60 days; 2nd instalment, 25% by end of year 1; 3rd instalment, 25% by end of year 2; 4th instalment ,25% by end of year 3.

					This approach should be replicated given the similar CIL rates proposed.
209502	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	The current payment dates for CIL liability do not consider the occupancy of units, leading to financial strain on developers before generating income. The negative cashflow implications for small and medium-sized sites should be acknowledged, as they may face significant interest costs. A more proportionate approach with tailored payment plans for larger sites is recommended to alleviate financial pressure. Developments may stall for reasons beyond the developers' control, and requiring payment before sales can disproportionately impact smaller businesses.
207272	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	while developer's cashflow is important to consider, the interest of the long term needs of the community they build for will not be their priority and it is high time this view is built into all development projects.
207201	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Strongly agree with this
209442	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela)		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy	Comment	We have no view on this and reserve our position.

	Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?		
208685	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Yes . However there is a need for explanation of infrastructure CIL delaying payments to parish councils. Parish Councils can not commission work without total funds being made available-so larger infrastructure projects are likely to experience a delay of at least 2 years from commencement of approved development before infrastructure projects are able start on site. The occupiers of approved developments will have moved in and not be able to access completed infrastructure projects on new developments. Payments should be as up front as possible to enable delivery of community infrastructure projects at the front end of the development scheme.
209491	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Support is given to South Cambridge District Council's proposed instalment policy, particularly in respect of projects with a CIL Liability of over £500,000 as this will assist with developer cash flow. However the final payment could be extended to 16 months.
209452	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Yes
209314	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse,		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between	Support	yes

	Clerk/RFO) [131311]		income and developer cashflow?		
209306	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council (Hayley Livermore) [131216]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	We agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow
209389	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	Yes
207225	Miss Caroline Blackmun [131891]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Seems a good balance.
207243	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	Yes. there should be a cutoff though that the liability is paid in full before occupation of any of the buildings in a development.
207184	Mr James Nadin [131885]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between	Support	.

			income and developer cashflow?		
207257	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	This seems well evidenced.
207113	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	I agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements
207376	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	No not enough information
208566	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	Developers are making excessive profits and could pay more if they raise capital to pay up front there is less risk of developers putting companies into administration before all obligations are fulfilled.
207329	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between	Object	Please see my previous comments.

			income and developer cashflow?		
205627	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	no comments
207160	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	The idea is simply communist. Creates more obstacles than sollutions.
207287	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	No, the policy is overly generous to developers.
209406	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	Redrow welcomes the draft instalment policy however further clarification is required. The instalment policy refers to the total CIL liability, but does this allow for the liability of phased developments? Redrow would wish to see this clarified, and allowance made for the ability to phase development as this will significantly improve the balance between income and cashflow.
207299	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between	Support	Yes the balance is fair to developers and the council (on behalf of the local residents)

			income and developer cashflow?		
207282	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Support
207219	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	The Developers will object
209542	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Object	No. For multi-phase strategic developments, we support longer instalments and occupation-linked triggers, plus a deferral provision for situations where there is market stress. This would allow CIL payments to better align with sales/income while safeguarding delivery. Small sites should retain simple 2–3 stage options.
209373	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Support	Yes
207359	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary		Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right	Object	See previous comments. How many people can the community support before resources run out

	Radiographer) [131908]		balance between income and developer cashflow?		
209433	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	Comment	It is important that the instalment policy reflects the realities of phased and complex developments, which may involve longer build out periods and multiple delivery stages. Clarity around commencement will also be important, particularly where pre commencement conditions or ongoing Section 106 discussions affect when development can actually begin. The point at which the levy becomes payable should align with these practical stages. As with any new charging regime, clear communication about implementation and transition will help provide certainty for those progressing schemes.
209347	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	The Parish Council has no evidence to suggest that regulatory requirements have not been met. Based on the information provided in the consultation documents, Bar Hill Parish Council has no reason to believe that the councils have failed to meet the relevant regulatory requirements associated with preparing the CIL charging schedule. However, the Parish Council emphasises the importance of transparency and continued engagement with local communities throughout the implementation of the levy.
209415	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	As above, until such time as the viability information which underpins the draft CIL charging schedule is resolved, Barratt reserves the right to consider that not all regulatory requirements have been met.
207309	Bob Ward [130114]		Question 9: Do you agree that the	Support	Irrelevant

			Council has met all regulatory requirements?		
209424	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	Cambridge Ahead has no specific comments on regulatory compliance but would emphasise the importance of transparency, clarity and consistency in implementation.
209561	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes
208794	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Cambridgeshire ACRE considers that the consultation appears to follow the appropriate regulatory process, with supporting evidence and consultation documents published to allow stakeholders to review the proposed charging schedule and provide feedback. Clear and transparent processes are important to ensure confidence in the system and to help communities understand how infrastructure funding will support planned growth across the Greater Cambridge area.
209503	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes, the Council has met its regulatory requirements through consultation.
207284	Dr hedda Joyce [131900]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all	Comment	this is outside my expertise

			regulatory requirements?		
207202	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	I agree
209443	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	We have no view on this and reserve our position.
208699	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	Regulation 59A mandates a portion of CIL payments to be allocated to town and parish councils for large infrastructure projects, specifically 15% or 25% for those with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The Greater Cambridge Infrastructure statement minimally addresses the role of Parish/Town Councils and Neighbourhood Plans, referencing them only once. It is suggested to include a detailed paragraph on the communication protocol between the authority and town/parish councils, outlining the amount, timescale of resources, and legal requirements. Some Neighbourhood Plans contain identified infrastructure requirements that should be referred to.
209466	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	met

209465	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Obligations met
209492	Henry Boot Developments Limited [131707]	Twenty5 Planning Ltd (Ms Lydia Voyias) [131260]	Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	No, for the detailed reasons set out within these representations, the Council has not met all regulatory requirements. •It is considered the Council should offer discretionary charitable relief available under Reg 44. •It is considered the Council should offer exceptional circumstances relief available under Reg 55.
209481	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	See comments above.
209453	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward, Parish Clerk) [104763]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	To the best of our knowledge
209315	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	yes
209305	Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all	Support	We agree that the council has met all its regulatory requirements

	(Hayley Livermore) [131216]		regulatory requirements?		
209547	Lolworth Developments Limited [129685]	Lichfields (Mr Josh Hymer, Senior Planner) [129682]	Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	See Letter Submission
209390	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	Yes
207244	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Comment	No comment.
207114	mr Matthew Tennant [3315]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	I do not have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed.
207377	Mr Michael Maries [120571]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	That all they do
208567	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes
207330	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 9: Do you agree that the	Object	Please see my previous comments.

			Council has met all regulatory requirements?		
205628	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	no comments
207161	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	IT is waste of council time. If it will be introduced, more bureacrats need to be employed to deal with Levy scheme.
207283	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes
209407	Mrs Louise Simmonds [132043]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	As above, until such time as the viability information which underpins the draft CIL charging schedule is resolved, Redrow reserves the right to consider that not all regulatory requirements have been met.
207301	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes regulatory requirements are met
207285	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Support
207220	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 9: Do you agree that the	Comment	Again, this is not my area of expertise

			Council has met all regulatory requirements?		
209543	Pioneer Group [132070]	Bidwells LLP (Mrs Jennie Hainsworth, Partner, Planning) [131374]	Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	No. We have concerns regarding: • the evidence that has been used to support the proposed CIL charges; • the adequacies of the infrastructure list that has been used; and • whether developer engagement has been proportionate and representative. These matters should be reviewed carefully, and further consultation undertaken if required to ensure compliance and robustness ahead of any Examination.
209374	Swavesey Parish Council (Ms Linda Miller, Clerk) [131173]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	Yes
209571	Trinity College, Cambridge (Emma Woods) [132073]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Object	The evidence base does not meet Regulation 14 requirements for R&D typologies, particularly regarding construction costs and economic viability. The Viability Report fails to model construction costs for specialist R&D and laboratory buildings as a separate development typology. The Viability Report does not apply appropriate net-to-gross ratios for laboratory buildings.

					The report does not account for the full costs of compliance with Local Plan sustainability policies for energy-intensive R&D uses. The evidence base does not prove that proposed commercial rates will not jeopardise the viability of specialist R&D development in Greater Cambridge. A supplementary R&D-specific viability appraisal should be conducted, published, and consulted on before the Draft Charging Schedule is submitted for examination.
207360	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	Support	I'm sure they were very careful to make sure they did
209478	Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited (Mr Andy Brand, Planning Director) [7930]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	No comment.
205648	B Nicolson [5745]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	I believe there was plan to draw up a list of scheme to pick from, rather than scrabble around for something to spend money like this on. Asking councillors, stakeholders and maybe residents too could be useful.
209348	Bar Hill Parish Council (Kate Flack, Parish Clerk) [132049]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood	Comment	Bar Hill Parish Council emphasises the importance of ensuring that communities experiencing development pressures receive meaningful benefits from the neighbourhood portion of CIL funding.

			portion should be distributed?		The Parish Council considers that the neighbourhood portion should be distributed in a manner that is: • Transparent, with clear criteria for the allocation of funding; • Locally responsive, enabling parish councils to identify local infrastructure priorities; and • Proportionate to development impacts, ensuring that areas experiencing greater levels of development receive appropriate support. Ensuring that local communities can see tangible benefits from development is important for maintaining public confidence in the planning system.
209416	Barratt Homes (Northampton) [132058]	Carter Jonas (Mr Duncan Mason, Associate Planner) [131672]	Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	No comment
209425	Cambridge Ahead (Emma Pritchard) [130653]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Cambridge Ahead supports the principle that communities where development takes place should benefit directly from investment through the neighbourhood portion of CIL. Where significant sums are generated, it will be important that there is clear governance, transparency and accountability around how funding decisions are made and how money is spent. Regular reporting on allocation and expenditure would help maintain confidence that funds are being used effectively and in a timely way. Cambridge Ahead would welcome further consideration of how this would operate in practice. There may also be opportunities for neighbouring areas to work together where appropriate to deliver projects that benefit a wider community.

209562	Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Mr Ed Watson, Strategic Planning and Place Advisor) [130389]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	We support the idea that a proportion of the CIL is spent locally on improvements related to the strategic transport schemes it is supporting. We encourage early engagement with the active communities in the area around the Campus. We are happy to provide the contact details of those groups with whom we work closely.
209397	Cambridge Cycling Campaign (Ms Anna Williams, CEO) [925]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Cambridge must not miss out on its neighbourhood portion due to the absence of Parish Councils. Community consultation on how neighbourhood portions in Cambridge should be spent will be vital.
207456	Cambridge Group of Ramblers (Jane Crawford-White, Group Chair) [130382]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	As Ramblers we would like to see the 15% neighbourhood portion invested in connecting PROWs. Specifically a PROW to connect Cherry Hinton with Wandlebury and the Beechwoods that avoids the highly dangerous Lime Kiln Hill that is accessible and appealing for all non motorised users.
208717	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	Supporting the CIL proposals; requesting that the Neighbourhood projects 10% is available for leisure walking, not just 'active' travel. Residents of the Greater Cambridge area take part in more leisure walking activities than 'utility' walking and there is no reference anywhere to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan as a key guide to new walking/cycling routes.
208724	Cambridge Group of the Ramblers (Jill Tuffnell, Secretary) [8914]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	This share should be available to support leisure walking which is woefully neglected in the policies, plans and schemes listed. Residents of South Cambridgeshire are more likely to walk for leisure purposes than for utility reasons and even in Cambridge leisure walking is very important. One-third of households own dogs and they need exercising, preferably away from traffic, cycles and on a soft surface. It is also vital that gaps in the rights of way network are filled,

					enabling residents to walk to Wandlebury, the Beechwoods and Roman Road. A safe route next to Lime Kiln Hill please.
208829	Cambridge Past, Present and Future (Ms Sarah Nicholas, Principal Planning Officer) [1801]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	The neighbourhood portion must be distributed transparently to ensure that the communities directly impacted by development see tangible benefits. Given the proposed low CIL rate for housing, there is a significant risk that the neighbourhood portion will be too small to fund meaningful local improvements, further highlighting the need to revise the £60/sqm rate upward.
208795	Cambridgeshire ACRE (Mrs Hayley Neal, Chief Executive) [131460]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Cambridgeshire ACRE believes the neighbourhood portion should be distributed in a way that is transparent, place based and clearly linked to the impacts of development on local communities. Funding should prioritise the areas most directly affected by growth and support infrastructure that helps communities absorb development well. This includes local facilities such as community buildings, village halls, green spaces and active travel connections. Clear guidance should also ensure that rural communities and smaller settlements benefit fairly, particularly where even modest development can place additional pressure on local infrastructure.
207368	Catarina Campos [130646]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Should be 100%. To counterbalance the effects on affected communities.
209504	Croudace Homes (Hem Johal) [132008]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	The neighbourhood portion should be distributed fairly, and primarily towards smaller communities who have taken development and will therefore need, and benefit from it most. The large majority of transport related infrastructure is currently focused on large strategic sites.

207205	Dr Nazima Pathan [131887]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	It is clear that areas like Trumpington have been massively developed yet it remains a village with little more than a supermarket that is a traffic hotspot for the City and little else in terms of infrastructure. And the roads (even Addenbrookes road let alone trumpington and Shelford Roads) have been massively impacted.
209444	Fowlmere Parish Council (Angela Mulholland, Parish Clerk) [130417]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Fowlmere is in South Cambridgeshire, not Cambridge City; accordingly we are not responding on this question.
208701	Gamlingay Parish Council (Mrs Kirstin Rayner, Parish Clerk) [7618]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	There needs also to be an additional section of how the neighbourhood portion will work outside Cambridge- see answer to question 9, and in areas where there is an adopted Neighbourhood Plan
209467	Great Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Nicola Webster, Clerk) [6190]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	City question only
209482	Juniper Propco (Bourn) Limited [132062]	Lichfields (Jennifer Woods) [132061]	Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	See comments above
209454	Linton Parish Council (Mrs Jenny Seaward,		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood	Comment	N/A

	Parish Clerk) [104763]		portion should be distributed?		
209316	Little Shelford Parish Council (Mrs Beckie Whitehouse, Clerk/RFO) [131311]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	no
207250	Lord Lord Richard Balfe [131895]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	This is a terribly badly designed questionnaire
208807	Maria Carvalho [132017]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	It should be used to fund neighbourhood teams and projects. Remove barriers. Asset based community development. A pot of funding to encourage a new way of working to best support residents needs
209391	Maria Cleminson [131415]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	We agree that CiL is preferable to S106 and believe that local councillors should decide about the 15%. It is vital that it is in the hands of our democratically elected representatives to whom we can appeal directly.
207245	Mr Anthony Lock [131893]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	The Section 106 charges should already cover all the local increases in infrastructure (and should be raised until they do). The CIL is for more strategic increases in transport and other infrastructure. Locally this 15% could be used to integrate the two - e.g. bus routes increased via the new development, integration of cycle routes into the cycle routes already provided in the new development.

208845	Mr Bruno Poltronieri [132028]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Seems like it should be more than 15%.
207316	Mr Cristiano Belloni [131905]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Object	I object that the development should be funded in the first place. Use everything on the neighbourhood and nothing on new developments.
207258	Mr Jeremy Baumberg [9264]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	This is ideal for consultation at local level through existing councillors. I would suggest non-car transport infrastructure is the right focus, given the ire about potholes, bike and bus infrastructure etc.
207302	Mr jonathan williams [131904]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Object	please NO MORE TAX
207418	Mr Kevin Ramsden [131915]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Object	How much will go to the development corporation when it is given planning powers for Cambridge?
208568	Mr Mike Evans [131774]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood	Comment	The question is inappropriate for consultation. If we do not know how the details will be decided then we do not know how to respond. My suggestion is that local ward councillors should be able to

			portion should be distributed?		decide how the 15% is spent after consulting with their residents. The money should be spent in the ward the development happens in.
207331	Mr Rob Ward [131907]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Object	Please see my previous comments.
205631	Mr Roger Crabtree [130954]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	no comments
207267	Mr Tarek Saad [131899]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	Local transport infrastructure is sorely lacking
207162	Mr Tomasz Dyl [131884]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Only 15%?? is it a joke??
207288	Mr Zbigniew Ulanowski [131897]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Object	No

207303	Mrs Marilyn Ballisat [131903]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	I believe it should be spent on repairing potholes and improving drainage in roads liable to flooding in heavy rain
208893	Mrs Sally Walmesley [130580]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	Steeple Morden Councillors are concerned over the difference in contribution for a Parish with and without a Neighbourhood Plan, and would like all councils to get 25%
207430	Ms Flynn Lebus [131931]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	The neighbour hood portion is likely the most straightforward aspect of the CIL - local nursery/primary school, pharmacy, bus stop/public transport, secure water supply, cycle routes, maintenance of biodiversity/nature strategies and investments (climate adaptation investments), local energy battery from renewable sources. The wider implications are on the broader infrastucture of Cambridge -> the roads are a priority given risk to cyclists, drivers. Might this funding be a way to fund a tram system, to better finance state schools, strengthen resilience of water supply and maintain protection of green spaces, etc.
207286	Ms Lesley Nicholls [131902]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	Support
209525	Ms Shelley Gregory-Jones [132067]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the	Support	Small, local wildlife charities like Cambridge Hedgehogs are in need of support to enable them to provide education services to residents and hospital services for injured and

			neighbourhood portion should be distributed?		sick hedgehogs. Across the UK hedgehogs are an endangered species, but Cambridge has a significant urban population and, as a community, we have a responsibility to protect and care for it.
207221	Ms Tanya Baker [131888]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	No information provided, so can't comment
209323	Trinity Hall (Tim Harvey-Samuel, Bursar and Steward) [9736]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	BPSC contends that proceeds should benefit those areas where development is taking place. Clear governance and regular transparent reporting on the sourcing and deployment of funding generated from CIL will be absolutely essential.
207361	University of Cambridge (Miss Melanie Rist, Veterinary Radiographer) [131908]		Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Support	On what is needed to support the community, not a way to bring in trade
209434	University of Cambridge [130704]	University of Cambridge (Mr Mark Parsons) [7290]	Question 10: Do you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed?	Comment	We assume that the neighbourhood portion would need to be spent on strategic transport items only, rather than on general community uses. This point would benefit from clarification. The University would want to ensure measures will be in place to ensure these payments are truly spent for the reason they are collected for.