

HIPC - CIL CONSULTATION

Question 1: Who are you responding on behalf of?

Histon & Impington Parish Council

Question 2: Do you wish to participate in the CIL examination?

No

Question 3: Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?

Yes

CIL provides a clearer and fairer way to secure funding for essential infrastructure. Histon & Impington requires investment in pavements, crossings, drainage, green spaces, recreation facilities and community buildings, but receives few direct Section 106 contributions because major developments are located outside the parish boundary.

Despite this, the parish acts as the **functional centre** for the area, absorbing a significant share of the travel, school-route and recreation pressures created by the surrounding settlements and city-edge developments.

CIL provides one of the only mechanisms through which established communities can secure a fair share of strategic infrastructure investment.

Question 4: Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?

Yes

The pausing of several major transport projects demonstrates the seriousness of the current infrastructure funding gap. This also highlights that significant infrastructure requirements for established parishes are not fully addressed in current strategic plans.

The gap is evident in deteriorating pavements, verges and drainage systems; pressure on crossings and active-travel routes; ageing recreation and community facilities; and facility demand created by residents of Darwin Green, North West Cambridge and surrounding parishes.

CIL is one of the few mechanisms available to help address this gap for established communities.

Question 5: Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?

Yes

Yes, broadly — but with important caveats that must be recognised.

Histon & Impington Parish Council accepts that the viability evidence appears to follow national guidance, including use of residual land value methodology, typology testing and analysis of local market conditions. The approach taken is broadly appropriate for strategic plan-making and for setting indicative CIL rates.

However, we also recognise the **limitations raised in the DWP response**, which remain important:

- The viability assessment is deliberately high-level and does not reflect site-specific costs or constraints, particularly in complex village or edge-of-city locations.
- The assessment is sensitive to assumptions about sales values, build costs and developer profit margins, all of which remain uncertain in the current economic climate.
- In some scenarios, higher CIL could place downward pressure on affordable housing levels, creating a tension between competing policy goals.

On balance, the evidence is **sufficient for consultation**, but must be applied with caution going forward. Implementation should allow for appropriate flexibility, monitoring and responsiveness to changing viability conditions.

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?

Yes

Yes, in principle — but with recognised risks.

Histon & Impington Parish Council accepts the logic of striking a balance between viability and infrastructure funding. The proposed rates appear proportionate and recognisably aligned with national guidance.

However, limitations identified in the DWP response remain important:

- The assumption that CIL costs will be absorbed entirely through land value adjustments may not reflect real market behaviour, particularly where landowner expectations remain high.
- There is a practical risk that increased CIL burdens could affect the delivery of affordable housing on marginal sites.
- Effective implementation will require active monitoring and adjustment as real-world viability conditions change.

Alongside these caveats, the Parish Council emphasises the importance of maintaining the distinction between:

- **CIL for strategic infrastructure investment**, and
- **Section 106 for localised, site-specific impacts.**

This distinction is essential for parishes like ours that face substantial strategic pressures without corresponding levels of local development.

Question 7: Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?

Yes

Yes, with reservations.

While the principles are clear in the documentation, Parish Councils do not yet experience systematic early involvement in Section 106 discussions. A workable solution requires a structured **golden thread** of information that ensures parish-level evidence flows directly into District and County infrastructure planning. This must include parish budgets, pavements, crossings, drainage, verge and gully data, open-space needs, recreation strategies, neighbourhood-plan evidence and cross-parish mobility patterns.

Question 8: Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?

Yes

The instalment schedule appears fair and proportionate.

Question 9: Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?

Yes

Yes, as far as we can tell.

However, the Parish Council requests confirmation that parish-level evidence has been included in the infrastructure assessment, including mobility and active-travel needs, drainage and gully-mapping, pavements and accessibility, public realm pressures and neighbourhood-plan evidence.

Question 10 (Cambridge City only): Do you have any comments on the neighbourhood portion?

Not applicable to Histon & Impington Parish Council. Relevant principles have been addressed within the main submission.