DP9 Ltd
100 Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5NQ

Registered No. 05092507

+44 (0) 20 7004 1700
info@dp9.co.uk

www.dp9.co.uk

DP9 7208 & TH/EM

By email only: ian@localplanservices.co.uk

27th October 2026

Further Post Hearing Note from Examiner – DP9 Response

Following the Greater Cambridge CIL Examination Hearing, held on 12th and 13th October 2026, it was agreed that additional viability sensitivity testing should be caried out by the Council/Quintec.

A letter was published by the Council expanding further on which additional typologies they do and do not consider appropriate to be undertaken. A further post hearing note was then published by the Examiner on 23rd October 2026. This letter represents a response to the Council's letter and the Examiners Note, in relation to Trinity College Cambridgeshire and their land ownership of Cambridge Science Park.

DP9 Response

Science Park Typologies

Currently, the Science Park and Out of Town typologies provided are smaller than those given within the City Centre. For example, the lab and out of town are prescribed as 5,000sqm, 10,000sqm and 15,000sqm whereas the City Centre is provided with 10,000sqm, 20,000sqm and 30,000sqm. It is considered that the Science Park typology

should be larger than that of a City Centre site. It is understood that the Consortium have proposed a consistent 5,000sqm, 10,000sqm and 15,000sqm approach.

Build Costs

The letter refers to "sensitivity analysis" of build costs but does not provide clarity on what the baseline build costs are considered to be. It is therefore assumed that BCIS is the basis for the baseline costs, but this is needed to be made clear and that specific BCIS rates, including the BCIS rate for labs, will be used for the lab typologies.

Furthermore, the Note suggests the use of the Bidwells construction costs but is subject to the condition that "full, elemental cost plans" can be shared. The Consortium has stated that this is not possible and take the view that third party verification of the build costs data should not be necessary in this instance. The Consortium has presented evidence from appropriately qualified and experienced cost consultants in addition to evidence where Quintic have accepted build costs higher than BCIS when signing off site-specific FVAs in Cambridge (Hearing Statement 3, paragraphs 250-251). The purpose of the further testing sought by the Examiner is to understand the impact of alternative cost assumptions. Quintic is not being asked to certify the Consortium's costs, merely to model them to inform the Examiner. Quintic can make comment on the sensitivity test outputs, and it is ultimately a matter for the Examiner to apply appropriate weight to all evidence in forming a view on the Draft Charging Schedule.

Net vs Gross Floorspace

The Note does not include the mention of net versus gross floorspace as part of the considerations. The point was raised several times during the Examination Hearing, and it is pertinent that there is clarification on how this is intended to be dealt with. It is suggested that the G&T data is updated to provide benchmark data for net to gross rations for labs, research and development and office space in order to overcome this issue.

Fit Out Costs

With respect to lab spaces, the Note does not include the mention of fit out costs, which can be significant and should be applied to the top of the base build costs in order to provide a more accurate representation.

Base Land Value

A request was made during the Examination Hearing to expand on the previously developed land base land value typologies to include an existing science park. It is important to note that Council's own response regarding the Biomedical Campus request for a campus typology, concludes that the delivery for the new life sciences space is part of the intensification and expansion of the existing science park, as opposed to a brand-new campus so aligns with the request. Therefore, we consider that the Council have taken this point on board.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we request that the above points are taken into consideration and included as part of the Examiner's ongoing correspondence with the Council/Quintec surrounding the matter relating to the requirement for additional viability sensitivity testing to be carried out.

It is understood that the additional testing is to be completed by 6th November 2026 and circulated to the hearing participants who will be given the opportunity to respond by Friday 20th November, extended from the original date of 13th November. DP9 will take the opportunity to comment further at this time.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Horne

Senior Director