

**REPORT TITLE: Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule
Consultation Outcome and Submission for Examination**

**To: Leader & Cabinet Member for Planning and Transport, Councillor Thornburrow
Cabinet, 7 July 2026**

Report by: James Fisher, Team Leader
Tel: 01954 713217
Email: james.fisher@greatercambridgeplanning.org

Wards affected:
All Wards

Director Approval: Director Stephen Kelly confirms that the report author has sought the advice of all appropriate colleagues and given due regard to that advice; that the equalities impacts and other implications of the recommended decisions have been assessed and accurately presented in the report; and that they are content for the report to be put to the Cabinet/Cabinet Member for decision.

1.	Recommendations
1.1	<p>It is recommended that Cabinet authorises:</p> <p>The submission of the draft charging schedule, an amended draft instalment policy, and associated evidence for independent examination.</p>
2.	Purpose and reason for the report
2.1	<p>On 10 February Cabinet authorised a public consultation on the draft CIL charging schedule and associated documentation.</p> <p>The Council undertook a 6-week consultation between Monday 16 February 2026 and Sunday 29 March 2026. A consultation was undertaken at the same time for the South Cambridgeshire District Council draft CIL charging schedule and representations were invited in relation to both.</p> <p>The purpose of the Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire CIL is to secure more money from developments to help address the funding deficit for strategic transport infrastructure. Section 106 planning obligations will still be used to fund localised infrastructure including (but not limited to) schools, surgeries, community centres, and sports facilities.</p>

The consultation sought views from developers and our communities on the following CIL rates:

- £35psm for industrial buildings and data centres
- £50psm for shops, restaurants, financial and professional services, and hotels
- £60psm for houses and flats, retirement homes, residential institutions, and student accommodation
- £175psm for offices and R&D buildings

The Councils received 630 comments from 139 respondents. Officers have produced a Consultation Statement to summarise the broad theme of all representations and the Councils response to these. This statement is appended to the Cabinet report along with appendices containing representations received through the consultation platform and representations received by letter which have been summarised.

Broadly speaking there was support for the adoption of CIL because there was recognition that all developments should contribute towards infrastructure and the sense that developers were “wriggling out” of negotiated s106 contributions. This support was predicated on the Councils being confident that the introduction of CIL would not create an adverse impact on growth or other planning policy objectives. Some who objected were opposed to any new taxation.

Details relating to the infrastructure funding gap the Councils were relying on attracted many comments. Objectors stated that the infrastructure evidence is out of date, that there is no gap, that the gap is smaller than that being reported, that the gap is larger than being reported, and that the mismanagement of funds is the reason for any gap.

A significant number of representations focussed on the rates and the evidence that had been prepared for the Councils by independent viability experts. Many respondents submitted information relating to (for example) sales value, costs, profit, and fees. Other respondents sought to have specific sites (including strategic sites) exempted from CIL. Some respondents considered the Councils should be charging developers more to develop in the area.

No one objecting to the proposed rates offered alternative rates.

Broadly speaking most respondents understood how the Councils will use CIL alongside s106 contributions although some required a little more clarity.

Whilst there was broad support for the draft instalment policy there were some suggestions relating to having further instalments for larger payments and where payment is made over a longer period.

In terms of other comments some respondents considered that the regulatory requirements had not been met because of the lack of reference to how CIL Reg 43 Mandatory Charitable exemption and CIL Reg 44 discretionary charitable exemptions applied.

Having considered representations and examined carefully the submissions made on viability, Officers and the Councils viability consultants remain satisfied that the Council

	<p>has struck an appropriate balance between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments and that regulatory requirements have been met. This report recommends that the Council submits the draft charging schedule and associated evidence for independent examination.</p> <p>Adopting a CIL ensures that the Councils follow through on their City Deal commitments to generate an adequate local contribution to fund the infrastructure necessary for the Local Plans. It also ensures that all eligible development contribute towards the infrastructure that they benefit from and that planning permissions can be issued quicker. The consultation has demonstrated broad support for the proposed rates. Viability evidence has been re-evaluated following representations received from developers. This has confirmed support for the rates whilst recognising that the position for offices and research and development space is more challenging than when the viability assessments were carried out and the evidence available at that time.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Alternative options considered</p>
<p>3.1</p>	<p>The options are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) To authorise the submission of the draft CIL charging schedule for independent examination which would lead to the introduction of a CIL to help address the identified funding deficit. b) To authorise the submission of the draft CIL charging schedule with alternate rates alongside the publication of a 'Statement of Modifications' preceding any examination c) To instruct Officers to continue to negotiate developer contributions through S106 agreements recognising the challenges associated with this approach as outlined in the 3 February Cabinet report.
<p>4.</p>	<p>Background and key issues</p>
<p>4.1</p>	<p>Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council (the Councils) undertook a 6-week consultation on their respective Community Infrastructure Levy draft charging schedules between Monday 16 February 2026 and Sunday 29 March 2026.</p> <p>The Councils notified all consultation bodies and around 2,000 persons who had (a) responded to previous CIL consultations, or (b) who had responded to the Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document consultation, or (c) who had opted in to be notified about planning policy matters in Greater Cambridge generally.</p> <p>On Wednesday 18 February a notice was published in the Cambridge Independent and the Councils publicised details of the consultation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 February: Greater Cambridge Shared Planning LinkedIn profile post • 18 February: Greater Cambridge Shared Planning X profile post • 9 March: A reminder of the consultation was published on the LinkedIn profile of Greater Cambridge Shared Planning

The following presentations were given to stakeholders:

- 27 February: Officers gave an online presentation to Cambridge Ahead
- 6 March: Officers gave an in-person presentation to the Cambridge Development Forum
- 11 March: The Councils viability consultants (Quintic Advisory LLP previously BNP Paribas Real Estate) gave an online presentation to developers and agents

The Councils published a series of questions to help focus representations:

- Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?
- Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?
- Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?
- 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?
- Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?
- Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?
- Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?
- The Council is allowed to use 15% of CIL receipts to improve the area close to where development took place. This is known as the 'neighbourhood portion'. Details of how this will work in Cambridge will be worked up over the next 12 months. If you have any comments on how you feel the neighbourhood portion should be distributed, please let us know.

The Councils received 630 comments from 139 respondents. Officers have produced a Consultation Statement to summarise the broad theme of all representations and the Councils response to these.

Full representations received through the Councils consultation platform are appended to the Consultation Statement. This includes representations received by letter where the respondent provided a clear answer to the each of the consultation questions.

Representations that were received by letter have been summarised by Officers and appended to the Consultation Statement. The full letters, along with the supporting information, will be published in full on the Councils website.

67 (49%) of respondents were from residents. 48 (35% were from developer/agent/landowners. 10 (7%) were from Parish Councils. The balance (14) was from public bodies, community groups, charities etc.

Up to 43 parties indicated that they may wish to participate in the CIL examination. Experience shows that many parties who express an interest to participate often decide not to. The Uttlesford District Council CIL public examination held on 20 May 2026 closed after 9 minutes as parties (who had stated a desire to attend the examination) did not appear.

	Comment	Object	Support
Do you agree that the Council should introduce CIL?	54	23	59
Do you agree that the Council has demonstrated a funding gap?	30	22	32
Do you agree that the Council has used appropriate evidence to inform the proposed rates?	32	47	18
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?	32	39	21
Do you agree that it is clear how CIL will operate alongside Section 106 Planning Obligations?	35	25	22
Do you agree that the draft instalment policy strikes the right balance between income and developer cashflow?	20	11	18
Do you agree that the Council has met all regulatory requirements?	20	17	18

Broadly speaking there was support for the adoption of CIL because there was recognition that all developments should contribute towards infrastructure and the sense that developers were “wriggling out” of negotiated s106 contributions. Support was predicated on the Councils being confident that the introduction of CIL would not create an adverse impact on growth or other planning policy objectives. Some who objected were opposed to any new taxation.

Details relating to the infrastructure funding gap attracted many comments. Objectors stated that the infrastructure evidence is out of date, that there is no gap, that the gap is smaller than that being reported, that the gap is larger than being reported, and that mismanagement of funds is the reason for any gap.

A significant number of representations focussed on the rates and the evidence that had been prepared for the Councils by independent viability experts. Many respondents submitted information relating to (for example) sales value, costs, profit levels, and fees. Other respondents sought to have specific sites (including strategic sites) exempted from CIL. Some respondents considered the Councils should be charging developers more to develop in the area.

No one objecting to the proposed rates offered alternative rates.

Broadly speaking most respondents understood how the Councils will use CIL alongside s106 contributions whereas some required a little more clarity.

Whilst there was broad support for the draft instalment policy there were some suggestions relating to having a fifth instalment for larger payments and where payment is made over a longer period.

In terms of other comments some respondents considered that the regulatory requirements had not been met because of the lack of reference to how CIL Reg 43 Mandatory Charitable exemption and CIL Reg 44 discretionary charitable exemptions applied.

The Consultation Statement appended to the report provides evidence of the Councils review of submissions and response to each of the representations received. Further work has been undertaken in response to specific concerns expressed about the proposed CIL rate for offices and research and development space. Comments received highlighted that the economics of such development is now more challenging than when the Councils earlier viability assessments were carried out. The Councils viability consultant was therefore asked to consider again the initial assumptions underpinning the draft CIL charging schedule rate based upon the submissions raised. The further assessment has nevertheless concluded that the rates proposed remain appropriate and Officers are accordingly recommending that no changes are made to the draft charging schedule.

Officers recommend a modification being made to the instalment policy. The instalment policy that was consulted on proposed payment terms based on four thresholds. CIL liabilities of £500,000 or more (the highest threshold) would be paid in four equal instalments of 25% at the following days following implementation: 120, 240, 360, 420. Officers recommend increasing the last payment date to 480 days so that there is 120 days between each instalment. A fifth threshold would be introduced for CIL liabilities over £1m where five equal instalments of 20% of the CIL liability is due at the following days from commencement: 120, 240, 360, 480, 600. The tracked change version of the draft instalment policy is appended to the report.

If the Council proposed making substantive modifications to the draft Charging Schedule it would need to be reconsulted on. Minor modifications could be made without consultation. These would need to be set out in a 'statement of modifications'. The Council would need to notify everyone who provided a comment on the original consultation and give them 4 weeks to state whether (considering the modifications) they now wished to be heard by the examiner, whether they support or oppose the modifications, and why.

A Charging Schedule must be examined in public by an independent person appointed by the charging authority. The Council has issued an invitation to tender for this work and will appoint an examiner if the authority to proceed to examination is given.

Any person asking to be heard before the examiner at the examination must be heard in public. An informal hearing format is usually the most appropriate form of examination for the Community Infrastructure Levy and these typically last a single day.

If no-one has requested the right to be heard, the examiner also has the option of conducting the examination by written representations.

The examiner must report their recommendations to the charging authority in writing. The examiner may recommend that the draft charging schedule should be approved, rejected, or approved with specified modifications. The examiner must give reasons for those recommendations. Further details are set out as follows:

- a. Approval: the examiner must recommend approval of the draft charging schedule if a charging authority has complied with the requirements in the Planning Act and the levy regulations. In doing so, the examiner should establish that:
 - the charging authority has complied with the legislative requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008 and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended);
 - the draft charging schedule is supported by background documents containing appropriate available evidence;
 - the charging authority has undertaken an appropriate level of consultation;
 - the proposed rate or rates are informed by, and consistent with, the evidence on viability across the charging authority's area; and
 - evidence has been provided that shows the proposed rate or rates would not undermine the deliverability of the plan (see National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 34).
- b. Approval subject to modifications: if the charging schedule can be modified so as to comply with the drafting requirements, the examiner must recommend appropriate modifications. This could be the case where the proposed rate or rates would be inconsistent with the evidence or would put the delivery of the relevant plan at risk. As long as the charging authority addresses the non-compliance, they do not have to make the specific modifications recommended by the examiner. The examiner can also make non-binding recommendations.
- c. Rejection: where the charging authority has not complied with the drafting requirements, and this cannot be remedied by modifying the draft charging schedule, the examiner must recommend that the schedule is rejected. For example, this may occur where the charging authority has not complied with a procedural requirement in preparing the schedule.

What this means in practice is that the Inspector may recommend the adoption of CIL but with slightly amended (i.e. reduced) rates for some uses.

Whilst many charging schedules are adopted with no modifications, many CIL examiners decide that modifications are required.

In Teignbridge the Council proposed five zones with a (lowest) CIL rate of £70psm in Zone 3 including Bradmore New Neighbourhood. The CIL examiner said the proposed rate of £70 could undermine the deliverability of this critical site and that there is a significant risk to the delivery of housing. The examiner reduced the CIL to £0psm in this zone.

	<p>In the London Borough of Ealing the CIL examiner reduced the proposed rate of data centres from £200psm to £150psm.</p> <p>In Reigate and Banstead the CIL examiner changed the rate for residential developments built in zone 1 from £20 to £0 psm.</p> <p>Some examiners go beyond adjusting CIL rates. In West Oxfordshire the Council proposed a residential rate of £225psm on all greenfield developments. The CIL examiner added a threshold where such developments over 250 dwellings paid £150psm instead.</p> <p>Assuming a successful examination the charging schedule must be formally approved by a resolution of the Full Council of the charging authority. The resolution should include an appropriate commencement date following, or on, approval.</p> <p>CIL is expected to be implemented in early 2027.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Corporate plan</p>
<p>5.1</p>	<p><i>Explain how the decision links to the Councils Corporate Plan</i></p> <p>Corporate plan 2022-27: our priorities for Cambridge - Cambridge City Council</p> <p>Priority 1: Leading Cambridge’s response to the climate change and biodiversity emergencies.</p> <p>The work we do with others through the Greater Cambridge Partnership aims to create wider prosperity and improve quality of life now and into the future through better, greener transport.</p> <p>Priority 2: Tackling poverty and inequality and helping people in the greatest need</p> <p>The Council will work with voluntary and community groups and local employers to help strengthen local communities, and we will work cooperatively with partners to address the underlying issues. And we will seek to listen to and work with our communities, making sure that we work in partnership with residents rather than simply doing things for them.</p> <p>Priority 4: Modernising the council to lead a greener city that is fair for all</p> <p>Develop co-operative, collaborative ways of working with our communities and partners, increasing our collective ability to achieve the council’s vision and improve the quality of life and wellbeing of everyone in the city</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>Consultation, engagement and communication</p>
<p>6.1</p>	<p>Cambridge City Council consulted on a preliminary draft charging schedule in 2013 and a draft charging schedule in 2014.</p>

	<p>The consultation on this draft charging schedule took place for 6 weeks between Monday 16 February and Sunday 29 March 2026.</p> <p>In addition to publications issued by the Councils, news and details of the consultation were circulated by third parties including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire News (11 February) • Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce (25 February) • The Cambridge Town Owl (3 February) • Cambridge Cycling Campaign (26 March)
7.	Anticipated outcomes, benefits or impact
7.1	Adopting a CIL ensures that the Councils follow through on their City Deal commitments to generate an adequate local contribution to fund the infrastructure necessary for the Local Plans. It also ensures that all eligible development contribute towards the infrastructure that they benefit from and that planning permissions can be issued quicker.
8.	Implications
8.1	Relevant risks
	<p>The report seeks authority to submit the draft CIL charging schedule and associated document to an independent examiner. Provided the Council has met all regulatory requirements the examiner can approve the draft CIL charging schedule as submitted or approve it subject to modifications. The Regulations require a charging schedule to be formally approved by a resolution of the Full Council of the charging authority. If the Council does not like to adopt a CIL that the inspector has sought to modify it could obtain further evidence to support the proposed rates and undertake further consultation.</p>
	Financial Implications
8.2	<p>Costs associated with the adoption of CIL include the viability report and the examination. Administrative expenses associated with charging the levy include the costs of acquisition of new software and the appointment of officers to administer the collection and spend of the levy.</p> <p>To help charging authorities with initial set up costs, the regulations allow for a 'rolling cap' on administrative expenses. This covers the period comprising the first part of the year that an authority sets a levy and the following 3 financial years taken as a whole. From year 4 onwards of an authority's levy operation, the restriction works as a fixed in-year cap, meaning that an authority may spend up to 5% of receipts received in-year by the end of that year on its administrative expenses.</p>

	Legal Implications
8.3	The CIL Regulations explain the necessary steps relating to CIL consultation and examination which the Councils have followed and will continue to follow.
	Equalities and socio-economic Implications
8.4	In January 2011 Communities and Local Government published a document titled 'Localism Bill: Community Infrastructure Levy Impact Assessment' which included a section Specific Impact tests on 'Equality'. It said "The Community Infrastructure Levy is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any social group. By making communities more sustainable, the Community Infrastructure Levy will facilitate economic growth and liveability and so create opportunity for all. The infrastructure and services that the Community Infrastructure Levy will provide will enhance accessibility and liveability for all sectors of society and could help to deliver new infrastructure that serves different needs within the community, for example, by increasing mobility and accessibility.
	Net Zero Carbon, Climate Change and Environmental implications
8.5	The primary purpose of introducing a CIL is to ensure that strategic transport infrastructure identified in the TSCSC are delivered which will result in improvements to sustainable travel choices including reducing car dependency and the resulting emissions.
9.	Background documents Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
9.1	Cabinet Report 'Community Infrastructure Levy draft Charging Schedule' 10 February 2026 and associated documents.
10.	Appendices
10.1	Appendix A Community Infrastructure Levy Consultation Statement Appendix B Representations received through online platform Appendix C Representations received by letter summarised Appendix D South Cambridgeshire District Council Instalment Policy - tracked changes
	To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact James Fisher – Team Leader

James.fisher@greatercambridgeplanning.org

Telephone: (01954) 713217 and 07927 681965