

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY EXAMINATION RESPONSE ON BEHALF OF HENRY BOOT DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Introduction

Henry Boot Developments Limited (HBD), welcomes the opportunity to respond to the South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (CS) Examination Issues and Questions identified by the Inspector ahead of the Examination Hearing scheduled for Monday 10th October 2026.

Representations were submitted on behalf of HBD in response to the SCDC CIL Consultation in March 2026, in respect of their proposal for employment led development at 'Duxford Aviation Technology Campus' and new museum building for Imperial War Museum (IWM) Duxford at Land West of IWM Duxford (the 'Site').

HBD maintains its objection to the proposed SCDC CIL CS rates for the reasons raised in our representations., and this subsequent statement. This hearing statement acknowledges that the planning policy context has evolved further since March 2026 and updates the Inspector accordingly.

CIL Examination Evidence

It is noted that the proposed SCDC CIL CS is being jointly examined with Cambridge City Council (CCC) CIL CS.

The Councils submitted the following supporting documentation which forms part of the CIL Examination:

- [1.1 Cambridge City Council Draft Charging Schedule](#)
- [1.2 South Cambridgeshire District Council Draft Charging Schedule](#)
- [2.1 Cambridge City Council Instalment Policy \(tracked changes\)](#)
- [2.2 Cambridge City Council Instalment Policy \(amended\)](#)
- [2.3 South Cambridgeshire District Council Instalment Policy \(tracked changes\)](#)
- [2.4 South Cambridgeshire District Council Instalment Policy \(amended\)](#)
- [3.1 CIL Supporting Statement](#) (January 2026)
- [3.2 Greater Cambridge Viability Report](#) (July 2026)
- [3.3 Greater Cambridge Infrastructure Statement](#)(January 2026)
- [5.1 Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation Statement](#) (June 2026)
- [5.2 Quintic Advisory response to viability representations](#) (June 2026)
- [6.1 Cambridge Local Plan](#)(2018)
- [6.2 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan \(2018\)](#)
- [6.3 Infrastructure Delivery Study](#) (2015)
- [6.4 Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document](#) (as adopted in April 2026)

- [6.5 Cambridgeshire County Council Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire](#) (2014)
- [6.6 Cambridgeshire County Council Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan](#) (2022)
- [6.7 Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan](#) (2015)
- [6.8 Cambridgeshire County Council Cambridgeshire Active Travel Strategy](#) (March 2023)
- [6.9 Greater Cambridge City Deal](#) (2014)
- [6.10 Greater Cambridge Partnership Future Investment Strategy 3](#) (28th September 2023)
- [6.11 Greater Cambridge Partnership Budget 2026-27](#)
- [6.12 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Local Transport and Connectivity Plan](#) (2023)
- [6.13 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority Bus Service Improvement Plan for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough](#) (2021)
- 6.14 Cambridge Growth Company A Place of National And Global Significance (October 2025)

Planning Context – Update since March 2026

Since the submission of duly made representations to the CIL Consultation in March 2026, there have been various notable updates to the local planning context including the adoption of the Planning Obligations SPD (April 2026). The Greater Cambridge Authorities have also updated the Local Plan, issuing a Regulation 19 ‘Publication’ version of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan (GCLP) for consultation, which ran to 25th September 2026.

Additionally, the ‘*Greater Cambridge Development Corporation (Establishment) Order 2026*’ came into effect on 23rd July 2026; and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in August 2026.

Planning Obligations SPD

It is also drawn to the Inspector’s attention that, following the close of the CIL Consultation in March 2026, the Councils have since adopted the [Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document](#) in April 2026.

The Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD states at paragraph 1.21 that:

“The Councils are continuing to review whether a CIL should be introduced to support sustainable development in Greater Cambridge. Any proposed CIL would complement rather than duplicate the obligations to be secured in a S106 agreement.” (our emphasis)

The recently adopted SPD, whilst focused on the provisions of adopted Local Plans, does also provide guidance in respect of topics, such as ‘affordable workspace’ (Chapter 20), which do not

form part of adopted development plan requirements but are proposed as part of the Publication Local Plan. Although Guidance, the SPD is now adopted by both Councils and forms an important consideration for the negotiation of Heads of Terms for S106 Agreements.

The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 replaces supplementary planning documents (SPDs) with 'supplementary plans' but limits their scope to:

- Site Specific Policies, and
- Area wide design codes

Specifically Schedule 7, Section 15CC of the Act states:

“(a) policies (however expressed) in relation to the amount, type and location of, or timetable for, development at **a specific site** in their area or at two or more specific sites in their area which the authority consider to be nearby to each other;

(b) other policies (however expressed) in relation to the use or development of land in the local planning authority's area which are designed to achieve objectives that relate to the particular characteristics or circumstances of **a specific site** in their area or two or more specific sites in their area which the authority consider to be nearby to each other;

(c) details of any infrastructure requirements, or requirements for affordable housing, to which development in accordance with any policies, included in the plan under paragraph a) or b) would give rise;

(d) requirements with respect to design that relate to development, or development of a particular description, throughout the local planning authority's area, in any part of their area or at one or more specific sites in their area, which the local planning authority consider should be met for planning permission for the development to be granted.”

This is reflected in the NPPF (August 2026) at Policy PM4 'Supplementary Plans'.

As such, should the emerging CIL CS be approved by the Inspector and subsequently implemented, it is considered that the Planning Obligations SPD will no longer be up to date. As there is no longer provision for SPDs to be updated, the current guidance would consequentially need to be withdrawn.

In order to provide specific clarity and directly responding **to Question 5 of Issue 2** set out in the Examiners' 'List of Issues and Questions' document regarding approach to funding infrastructure via CIL and S106 Planning Obligations, our client believes that amendment should be made to the CIL CS itself to identify the infrastructure intended to be funded by CIL to avoid any double counting with section 106 obligations.

Publication of Local Plan (Regulation 19) & CIL

On 25th September 2026, South Cambridgeshire District Council together with Cambridge City Council closed their consultation on the Greater Cambridge Regulation 19 (Publication) Local Plan. It is important to highlight that the emerging Local Plan is being prepared under the provisions of the 2024 NPPF.

Draft **Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum, Duxford (inc. AvTech 1)** proposes to designate the Site as part of a wider 'Area of Major Change'. Duly made representations have been submitted in response to the Publication Local Plan. Whilst broad support has been given to Policy S/AMC/IWM, the representations highlight concern with the number of policies that, if adopted, would place additional burden upon the viability of proposals coming forward.

Based upon the current timescales, it is recognised that the emerging CIL regime is likely to be implemented before the Local Plan Examination has been concluded but it is important that any emerging policies within the forthcoming Local Plan consider the full impact of the emerging CIL, and vice versa the emerging CIL does not undermine the emerging Local Plan.

Notwithstanding the emerging context, the Councils have made it clear that the proposed CIL CS has been prepared in the context of the adopted Local Plans (2018) (Examination Documents 6.1 and 6.2) despite their basis on dated information. Given the advanced nature of the emerging Local Plan and concerns raised, it is considered that the CIL Examination should be held in abeyance until the emerging Local Plan Examination has been materially concluded. Should the Inspector agree with this approach, we reserve the opportunity to provide further comment accordingly.

CIL & Blanket Approach

We also maintain that a blanket approach across Greater Cambridge (mirroring the shared planning service) that is being adopted is inappropriate for CIL and raises the need for many of the questions set out in Issue 8 of the Examiners List of Questions and Issues.

Before addressing some of those questions we comment that Greater Cambridge covers a vast geographical area, from the Centre of the City to peripheral rural locations. Whilst its population may be far lower, the geographical scale would not be wholly different to London, where each Authority sets its own local rate based on market conditions, viability and infrastructure requirements in that area. Even Mayoral CIL comprises three different rates applied across the 33 Authorities. We are of the view that from a pure spatial perspective that a similar approach must be adopted in Greater Cambridge to reflect the differences between the City Centre, established campuses such as the Science Park, and more rural peripheral locations.

Additional to the spatial perspective there are strong real estate fundamentals for tapering CIL charges related to the distance from the City Centre.

Question 6 of Issue 8 asks whether the assumptions on rental income are appropriate, and **Question 7** asks whether assumptions on Profit, Other Costs and Policy Requirements are appropriate.

Our response to both of these questions is to suggest that more consideration should be given to the complexity of the Greater Cambridge market place. The ability to pay a CIL charge, is primarily a function of the Gross Development Value (GDV) of the real estate. Much of the assumptions to derive that GDV when considering CIL charges are set in Table 4.9.1 of the BNP Paribas viability report which we reproduce below.

Commercial Floorspace	Rent Per sq m	Investment Yield	Rent Free (months)
Retail	Cambridge City:£675 Elsewhere £325	7% 7%	12 12
Office /R&D	£615	6%	24
Industrial and warehousing	£195	5%	12
Hotel	£530	5%	12

It does not seem appropriate to base the proposed ability to pay a CIL charge from a blanket rent across such a wide area. It is widely accepted that industrial and warehousing rents are higher in the City Centre than in the rural regions of the South Cambridgeshire region.

Similarly, there is in our client's a view something of a spread of investment yields and the one size fits all rate of 5% as stated is not an accurate reflection. One reason for the spread is that many of the regions most significant schemes are developed on land where the landowner, often one of the academic institutions, wishes to retain the freehold and benefit from ground round income streams. A clear case of this is the well-established Science Park stretching across some 152 acres all owned by Trinity College, Cambridge.

In such cases it is clearly adopted in the market place that a discount on full market value needs to be provided to reflect what a future purchaser is buying.

The Proposal (Duxford Aviation Technology Campus)

A hybrid planning application is being prepared jointly alongside landowners Imperial War Museum (IWM) and Gonville & Caius College, both with Charitable status for the proposal following extensive pre-application discussions with local communities, key stakeholders and

South Cambridgeshire Officers as part of a planning performance agreement (PPA). The Illustrative Masterplan for the proposed development has been the subject of Design Review Panel.

The hybrid application is expected to be submitted imminently. It seeks full planning permission for a multifunctional museum building known as 'IWM Lab'. A key purpose of this building will be to facilitate the storage of large objects in modern climate controlled conditions to better retain important aspects of the extensive collection. The IWM Lab will also incorporate flexible space and specialist machinery so that critical artefact conservation can be undertaken on site. The proposal will incorporate dedicated classrooms to facilitate training as part of apprenticeship programmes and sharing best practice within the specialism. This element of the proposal will have an F1, c, Use Class, which as such will have a proposed CIL rate £0 per square meter. IWM submitted their own representations in response to the CIL Consultation in March 2026.

The hybrid application also seeks phased permission for the construction of 'Duxford Aviation Technology Campus' (AvTech) with full planning permission sought for the first phase and outline permission sought for the remaining phases. It is important to note the location for the proposal specifically responds to the proximity of the site to the airfield and the potential opportunity for occupiers to use the existing airfield to test prototypes and refine concepts. The proposed development is specifically aimed at low carbon occupiers, with specific focus upon the important 'aviation technology' sector.

Proposed CIL & AvTech

The key point to note is that the Aviation Technology floorspace created will provide a dedicated funding stream to Imperial War Museum and Gonville & Caius, both registered charities. At present IWM's only income is from tourism-related ticket sales which are subject to fluctuation and no certainty.

Income from the letting of space within the Aviation Technology Campus, which at its heart is a Mid Technology ('Mid-Tech') scheme will provide a more reliable form of income that enables planned investment to be made within the wider estate.

Given the detailed, site specific nature (fully researched via sequential tests) of the proposed AvTech and its inter-relationship with the Imperial War Museum and the charitable status of Gonville & Caius, the floorspace proposed at land west of IWM Duxford, should be subject to a site specific CIL Rate of £0 per square metre to reflect (a) the F1 Use Class of the LAB Building, (b) the funding that Aviation Technology floorspace will provide to the wider Museum; and (c) the site specific rationale for floorspace being located here, and the restrictions under which it will likely be permitted – i.e. for aviation related uses, which are identified as part of a Frontier Industry within the UK's Modern Industrial Strategy and specifically the Government's Future of Flight

Action Plan. This would also reflect the emerging allocation as part of the Area of Major Change under **Policy S/AMC/IWM: Imperial War Museum, Duxford (inc. Mid Technology (Mid Tech))**.

Proposed CIL & MidTech

Within the March 2026 CIL Representations, it was highlighted that the Greater Cambridge employment market is nuanced in so far as it has a highly successful 'Mid-Tech' presence.

Mid-tech is a flexible floorspace that generally comprises large open span warehouse buildings that are built to a high specification, and with a larger office content. It transcends Use classes B2 and E(g)(ii) (Research & Development (R&D)) and elements of ancillary storage (Class B8). 'Mid Tech' is not a formal Use Class, but it has increasing presence within the Greater Cambridge market and enables speculative development to be built that can appeal to and be operated by a wide range of potential occupiers.

Good examples are found at the Bourn Quarter to the west of Cambridge, with further developments under construction. What is key to Mid-Tech is that occupiers can develop, manufacture and store/distribute products within one building. The proposals for Aviation Technology align with that flexibility afforded to Mid-Tech. The space is proposed to be occupied by parties that wish to develop, manufacture, test prototypes and store products that have been developed on site – the concept transcends use classes as identified in the Government's own Future of Flight Action Plan, comprising R&D, manufacturing, testing and developing prototypes. Some businesses within this sphere are more orientated towards R&D, some towards manufacturing, others with a need to store large products. The primary function of businesses can evolve over time, which is why flexibility is needed between the use classes.

It is envisaged that the primary use within Aviation Technology will be B2. However, we would not wish to rule out any future occupiers having an R&D (E(g)(ii)) presence particularly as reserved matters permissions would be market driven by future occupiers to reflect their bespoke needs and the opportunity the Site brings for innovation within the aviation industry.

The AvTech proposal does not therefore reflect the 'traditional' life sciences R&D uses which are typical across Greater Cambridge. This is reflected in the lower rents anticipated for the development. However, if an R&D CIL rate would apply to any speculatively developed space at Duxford AvTech, it will prohibit development from occurring and will simply serve to constrain the range of tenants that can be accommodated within the development, completely contrary to the Government's ambition to grow this sector.

We are strongly of the view and in response to **Question 2 of Issue 8** that 'Mid-Tech' should be a defined use within the Charging Schedule, and even more so in the case of AvTech, should it not be exempt.

The Quintic Advisory (Examination Document Ref: 5.2) states in response to the representations made on behalf of HBD that:

“If mid-tech does not fall within B2/B8 uses then CS should be clarified to incorporate Mid-tech into £35 psm rate”.

Notwithstanding this recommendation, there was no amendment to the SCDC CS. We maintain that the amendment should be made.

Comparison of other Employment CIL Rates

Within the CIL Representations submitted in March 2026, we demonstrated that it is highly unusual to see CIL rates proposed for employment uses across the East of England.

In response to our representations, the Quintic Advisory (Examination Document Ref: 5.2) stated that:

“Other than Oxford (which adopted its revised CS in 2025), all the other charging schedules that Twenty Five identify are very historic and where brought forward at a time when capital values for employment floorspace and logistics/B2/B8 space were significantly lower. If these authorities were setting CIL rates today, it is very unlikely that they would adopt the same position.” (underlining for emphasis).

This statement is factually incorrect. East Suffolk (2023), Oxford City (2025), South Oxfordshire (2023) and Welham Hatfield (2025) have all adopted CIL charging schedules in the last 3 years.

Further there is opportunity for Local Charging Authorities to revise their rates should they wish to do so and evidence justifies the changes. At the time of writing Babergh Council and Mid Suffolk Councils are both progressing revised CIL Charging Schedules, which have been submitted for Examination on 7th September 2026. Both authorities propose to charge for residential and maintain £0 psm rate for Office, Industrial/Warehouse, and ‘all other uses’.

As such a comparison is up to date and relevant to the discussion regarding employment rates, particularly in respect of South Oxfordshire.

In this final section we have as requested set out a full written response to the questions set out within Issue 2.

ISSUE 2 – INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS AND FUNDING

1) Is the evidence on strategic transport infrastructure requirements adequate and sufficiently up to date?

The SCDC CS itself provides no clarity about how CIL receipts raised are intended to be spent.

It is however clear that the proposed SCDC CS and CCC CS have been prepared in response to the adopted Local Plans (Examination Documents 6.1 and 6.2). It is reiterated that both Local Plans were the subject of joint Examination and were adopted in 2018, as such 8 years have subsequently passed.

Adopted Local Plan

The administrative area of Cambridge City is encircled by South Cambridgeshire District. There is a tightly drawn Green Belt designation around the City which extends to the surrounding settlements that encircle the City.

In recent years, SCDC has adopted Development Plans which allocated land for the delivery of development including new settlements just beyond the extent of the Green Belt, including Cambourne, Northstowe, Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach. As well as continued support for development at the edge of Cambridge.

In respect of employment policies are supportive of new employment provision near Cambridge – Cambridge Science Park (Policy E/1), Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension (Policy E/2), Site Allocation for land adjacent to Peterhouse Technology Park, Fulbourn (occupied by Arm), specialist policies at key locations such as Imperial War Museum at Duxford (Policy E/7) and Papworth Hospital (Policy E/6) in addition to other allocations within villages. Policy E/9 Promotes clusters of employment drawing on the specialisms of the Cambridge area.

The supporting CIL Infrastructure Statement (Examination Document 3.3) explains the adopted Local Plans were reliant upon the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council on 4 March 2014 – over 12 years have passed since the adoption of this document.

Local Plan Review

It is important to highlight that adopted Policy S/13: Review of the Local Plan (2018) expected the submission of a new local plan for examination by summer 2022. On the current programme, the emerging Local Plan is approximately four and a half years behind that timetable.

The updated Greater Cambridge Local Development Scheme (July 2026) anticipates submission of the Greater Cambridge Publication Plan for examination by 31 December 2026. It is therefore anticipated that a new Local Plan could be adopted during 2027 or early 2028.

Up to date Evidence

The SCDC CS itself provides no clarity about how CIL receipts raised are intended to be spent.

The supporting CIL Infrastructure Statement (Examination Document 3.3) refers to Transport Infrastructure Projects. It identifies projects delivered to date. It identifies a number of other Active Travel Projects (2.2.1), Greenway Projects (2.2.2) and Public Transport Projects (2.3.1) and Table 7 identifies that TSCSC schemes to be delivered by Cambridgeshire County Council. Separately at Examination Document 6.11, the Greater Cambridge Partnership Budget is provided for 2026/27. This sets out the anticipated expenditure for the various transport projects – in addition to ‘Operational budgets’ relating to Central Programme Coordination, Skills, Evidence, economic assessment and modelling, Smart Cambridge and Energy.

It should be noted the ‘Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Infrastructure Delivery Plan’¹ formed part of the Regulation 19 evidence base, this covered a wide range of transport items. In respect of transport it provides additional information such as scheme status, costs, delivery partners, prioritisation and phasing (where available):

- Strategic Transport Measures – Table 5.1
- Greenway Projects – Table 5.2
- Local Transport Measures – Table 5.3
- Internal Site Transport Measures (costs specific to North-East Cambridge (NEC) or Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) – Table 5.4

The ‘Draft Interim Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy’ prepared by Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority formed part of the evidence base for the Regulation 19 Local Plan Consultation². This refers to aspirations for Mass Rapid Transport connectivity, with specific connections identified between the Wellcome Genome Campus, Duxford, Whittlesford Parkway, Land adjacent to A11 and A1307 at Grange Farm and Granta Park, and then towards Haverhill.

2) What is the timescale for implementation of projects and how is this intended to be achieved?

The planned and expected timescales for the implementation of the various projects associated with transport infrastructure is unclear from the information provided through Examination Documentation.

¹ [Greater Cambridge Local Plan - Infrastructure Delivery Plan - July 2026](#)

² [Draft Interim Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy](#)

More detailed information regarding the delivery of transport infrastructure is listed as part of the 'Greater Cambridge Local Plan – Infrastructure Delivery Plan' which formed part of the Regulation 19 evidence base however this does not provide a detailed breakdown of information.

3) What is the basis for the estimated costs of this infrastructure and are the costs realistic and up to date?

The basis of the estimated costs for the various projects forming the transport infrastructure is unclear from the information provided through Examination Documentation. Examination Document 6.11 is entitled 'Greater Cambridge Partnership Budget 2026/27' appears to be dated 2026/27 but with no clear identifiable basis to those costs. Without that basis, or clear scope of works it is not reasonable to suggest that they could be deemed as realistic and or up to date.

4) What is the package of funding for this infrastructure and to what extent is it secured?

The supporting CIL Infrastructure Statement (Examination Document 3.3) explains to some degree the funding for infrastructure. However, there is no clarity about where funding has been secured in respect of each project, and the remaining funding to be secured for each project.

5) How will the use of S106 contributions change following the introduction of the CILs? Will there be overlap between funding from S106 contributions and CIL for particular infrastructure projects or from particular development proposals?

The Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD (April 2026) states at paragraph 1.21 that "*The Councils are continuing to review whether a CIL should be introduced to support sustainable development in Greater Cambridge.. Any proposed CIL would complement rather than duplicate the obligations to be secured in a S106 agreement.*" However no clarity is provided on this point.

The SCDC CS itself provides no clarity about how CIL receipts raised are intended to be spent.

The CIL Infrastructure Statement (Examination Document 3.3) refers exclusively to concerns regarding the funding available for the delivery of transport infrastructure. As such, clarity should therefore be provided within the proposed SCDC CIL CS that receipts are intended to fund transport infrastructure and funding for all other infrastructure will still remain via S106.

Given the strategic nature of a number of the transport projects discussed within Examination Document 3.3, it is anticipated that CIL funds collected by SCDC would be transferred from the Authority to another party for delivery.

It is noted that Examination Document 6.11 is entitled 'Greater Cambridge Partnership Budget 2026/27'. Clarity is therefore sought as to whether the expected funds raised through CIL will be transferred to:

- Cambridgeshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority)
- Cambridge and Peterborough Combined Authority
- Greater Cambridge Partnership
- Cambridge Growth Company
- Greater Cambridge Development Corporation

In the interest of transparency, annual publication of how funding is spent is already required through 'Infrastructure Funding Statements'. Therefore, an appropriate audit should be provided by SCDC as charging authority, of any CIL funds transferred to any other public body, and in turn that receiving public body should specify when and CIL funds have been spent.

This will enable a list of transport projects to be monitored, and updated when such projects have been completed.

This will also provide clarity for Planning Officers, Local Highways Authority, and Developers to ensure that there is no double counting of funds secured through S106 and CIL.

The introduction of a CIL which focuses on the delivery of transport infrastructure, has knock on implications for the delivery of other infrastructure in scenarios where viability is challenging. This is because CIL is non-negotiable whereas other infrastructure matters covered by S106 planning obligation would form part the viability considerations.

6) Will there be a funding gap which justifies the introduction of the CILs in principle?

Examination Documentation 3.3. purports to a funding gap at Table 10 of Chapter 7 but clarity is sought about all the funding streams the delivery bodies are 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. Further, a funding gap should not act as wider brake on development, that would potentially become unviable.

7) What is the basis for the estimated CIL income? Is this realistic?

There is no clarity from the Examination Documents as to how the CIL income has been estimated.

8) How much CIL income is estimated to be passed on to Parish Councils/Neighbourhoods? How does this affect the amount to be used on strategic transport infrastructure?

Regulation 59A of the CIL Regulations (2010) requires that, where CIL is secured from development at a location where there is a made Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. within the

Neighbourhood Plan Area), SCDC will be required to pass to the relevant Neighbourhood 25% of the receipt.

Where no Neighbourhood Plan has been made, SCDC will be required to pass to the relevant Parish Council 15% of the CIL receipt.

9) What is the intended approach to the use of CIL income to support administrative/operational costs?

It is noted that Examination Document 6.11 is entitled 'Greater Cambridge Partnership Budget 2026/27'. This appears to identify in the period 2027/28 to 2030/31 that over £3.5 million will be spent on 'central programme co-ordination'.

There is no indication as to what this category covers and whether it is proportionate.