



South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council

# Community Infrastructure Levy

## Statement of representations on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

<b>Contents</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule	3
Amount of representation received	4
High level representations and commentary	5
Infrastructure projects highlighted through the PDCS	7
Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?	8
Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?	14
Q3. Do you have any views on the introduction of an instalment policy for CIL payments?	23
Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?	32
Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?	38
Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?	47
Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?	55
Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?	66
Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?	71
Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?	75
Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?	82
Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?	88

## 1. The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

South Cambridgeshire District Council undertook a public consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS) under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 2010 (amended) between 19 July and 30 September 2013.

The consultation was supported by necessary evidence on (i) development viability and (ii) infrastructure evidence that was made available for public viewing.

A public notice advertising the consultation was issued in the Cambridge Evening News on 19 July 2013. The Council contacted more than 400 statutory and non-statutory consultees informing them of the consultation and how to make representation. Officers from the District Council were present at 12 Local Plan exhibitions to publicise the PDCS and respond to queries regarding CIL.

The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule proposed the following CIL rates:

Use	Charge £/sqm
Residential	£100
Residential for strategic development sites*	£0
Residential for land at North of Teversham Drift**	£125
Retail (up to 280 sqm)	£50
Retail (greater than 280 sqm)	£125
All other uses	£0

\* As defined by planning policy map ref:

NS/3 and SS/7 Northstowe

SS/2 Darwin Green

SS/3 (2) (the parcel Land North of Newmarket Road) Cambridge East

SS/5 Waterbeach

SS/6 Bourn airfield

SS/8 Cambourne West

\*\* As defined by planning policy map ref

SS/3 (2) (the parcel Land North of Teversham Drift) Cambridge East

The Council received a total of 232 representations, from 45 parties which can be summarised in the following table

Respondent	Count
Developer / Agent	22
Individual	6
Local Government	2
Other	3
Parish Council	12

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the representations that were received by the Council and to provide commentary on the Council's response. Though not available during the PDCS consultation, the Council has taken account of the CIL Regs 2014 and the CIL Guidance dated February 2014 guidance when responding to these representations.

The document is also used to demonstrate the rationale for changes that have been made to the charging schedule between the consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule and the consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule.

## 2. Amount of representation received

The following table highlights the number of representations received against each question and the extent to which the approach was supported.

Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Representations	Support	Object	Comment	Reps
Community Infrastructure Levy - Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule	110	51	71	232
Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?	19	2	2	23
Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?	15	4	5	24
Q3. Do you have any views on the introduction of an instalment policy for CIL payments?	15	4	6	25
Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?	10	3	3	16
Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?	5	1	14	20
Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?	7	8	3	18
Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?	6	11	4	21
Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?	5	6	5	16
Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?	3	2	9	14
Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic	15	2	2	19
Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?	10	6	3	19
Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?	0	2	15	17

### 3. High level representations and commentary

The following table provides a very broad summary to the representations received and how the Council intends reflecting these comments in the DCS (it is not intended summarise all representations that have been received).

Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule Representations	Representation	Response
Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?	On balance there is agreement that CIL should be introduced as the ability to use section 106 agreements will be restricted in the future.	The Council agrees that it should continue working towards the introduction of CIL to secure development funding towards the infrastructure needs of residents and businesses.
Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?	There is a general lack of understanding as to what a discretionary relief policy is, how it can be applied and what it could achieve.	The Council has decided not to introduce a discretionary relief policy at this stage but to keep this matter under review once CIL is implemented.
Q3. Do you have any views on the introduction of an instalment policy for CIL payments?	There were contrasting views as to whether or not an instalment policy should be introduced.	The Council consider that a developer cashflow relies on the CIL liability not being paid up front, and as such supports the introduction of an instalment policy. The Council will consult on a draft instalment policy at the same time as the Draft Charging Schedule.
Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?	General acknowledgement that sufficient evidence exists in terms of infrastructure needs.	The Council considers that sufficient information has been supplied to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap, which is also recognised by Government resulting in a Cambridge City Deal proposal. The infrastructure evidence will be scrutinised during the Local Plan examination.
Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?	Comments on several projects were received.	The Council will consult on a draft Regulation 123 list and refine this ahead of the CIL examination.
Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?	Some representations viewed the CIL rates to be the right one, whereas others considered that a zonal approach should be followed with a higher rate charged on development on the edge of Cambridge.	Although some representations (and the viability evidence) highlighted that values closer to Cambridge could warrant a higher rate being levied, the Council considers that (i) it would be difficult to identify the boundary of any zonal CIL charge and (ii) Government direction is that of the simplest CIL charging schedule. As a result the Council will continue with the proposed CIL rates.

<p>Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?</p>	<p>In general representations stated that the retail rate is too high and that a retail charge should be excluded from strategic sites.</p>	<p>The Council consider that there is no viability evidence to amend the retail rate. The Council does, however, agree that it is sensible to provide a CIL exemption for retail developments on strategic sites.</p>
<p>Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?</p>	<p>There were contrasting views as to whether businesses should be charged CIL.</p>	<p>There is no viability evidence to support a CIL business rate and none of the Council's neighbouring authorities are proposing a business rate. The Council will therefore maintain the proposed business rate but will review CIL in the future and apply a charge if the viability evidence demonstrates one can be supported.</p>
<p>Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?</p>	<p>Some representations highlighted student accommodation and some other possible forms of development as being liable for CIL.</p>	<p>The Council undertook a robust viability assessment which highlighted those forms of development that could support a CIL rate being applied. Although this process highlighted that student accommodation could afford a CIL rate there are no proposals in the Local Plan for this form of development and it is considered that Cambridge University may in any event benefit from a charitable exemption from CIL.</p>
<p>Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?</p>	<p>The use of s106 agreements on strategic sites is widely considered the right approach.</p>	<p>The Council continues to consider that this approach is the most suitable solution to provide infrastructure on strategic sites.</p>
<p>Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?</p>	<p>Representations recognised that a section 106 led approach to strategic sites meant that no CIL could be afforded.</p>	<p>The Council confirms that viability evidence prevents a CIL rate being levied on strategic sites as levels of affordable housing are not expected being met.</p>
<p>Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?</p>	<p>Concern that Parish Councils will receive less through CIL than the amount currently secured by way of s106</p> <p>More information is needed on how CIL money will be spent and how s106 agreements will be used.</p>	<p>The Council will commit to reviewing the infrastructure needs of some villages to see whether it is appropriate for the village to retain more CIL money than the mandatory 15%.</p> <p>The Council agrees to consult on a draft Regulation 123 infrastructure list at the same time as the Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

#### 4. Infrastructure projects highlighted through the PDCS

The table below, in alphabetical order, highlights the infrastructure projects that were identified as a result of the consultation on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. The Council has provided some commentary as to how items may be funded; however, this is not intended being a detailed list or commitment on behalf of the District.

Projects	Potential sources of funding
A14	Funded by Government
A428	A428 improvements like to be funded through s106 resulting from strategic developments
Abington and Sawston cycleway	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Abington and Wandlebury cycleway	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Abington and Whittlesford station cycleway	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Community bus services	To be included in draft Regulation 123 list
Community facilities and Youth provision	Existing facilities could be funded through CIL but new facilities necessary on strategic sites to be funded through s106
Cycling/walking routes	Existing routes could be funded through CIL but new routes as a result of strategic development could be funded through s106
Drainage	Existing drainage solutions could be funded through CIL but new measures as a result of strategic development could be funded through s106
Dualling of A505	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
East-West rail link	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Gamlingay-Potton-Sandy cycleway	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Hildersham crossroads on the A1307	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Health	Existing facilities could be funded through CIL but new facilities necessary on strategic sites to be funded through s106
Higher education	Existing facilities could be funded through CIL but new facilities necessary on strategic sites to be funded through s106
Park and ride provision	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Public open space	Onsite open space and play equipment will be secured through a section 106 contribution in accordance with policy. Strategic green space may benefit from CIL funding
Primary school places	Primary school places to be funded through s106 contributions where existing facilities cannot accommodate needs of new residents
Public transport	Existing facilities could be funded through CIL but new facilities necessary on strategic sites to be funded through s106
Roundabout improvement on A1301	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development
Sawston electrical infrastructure	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development. It is likely, however, that this would be financed through utility providers.
Strategic infrastructure projects	Strategic infrastructure necessary to facilitate the delivery of strategic developments will be funded through s106 contributions
Traffic calming	This project could benefit from CIL funding
Water supply	CIL receipts could be used to fund this item if it is necessary to facilitate the delivery of future development. It is likely that this cost will be financed by utilities providers.

<b>Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
1.1	Bourn Parish Council	57629	Support	Bourn PC supports the introduction of CIL because it should deliver an increased level of benefit that reflects local needs	Noted
1.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57662	Support	no further comment	Noted
1.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57810	Support	Yes, there is no option.	Noted
1.4	Cambridge City Council	56965	Support	Yes. Cambridge City Council is happy that the joined up approach that exists in relation to other aspects of joined up working also applies to the introduction of CIL.	Noted
1.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57740	Support	The County Council is fully supportive of SCDC introducing a CIL charging schedule. However we would query whether differential charging zones should be considered given the recent proposed reforms and potential for different CIL rates for different sizes of development.	<p>Whilst the independent viability assessment did highlight varying sales values across the District there was no demonstrable evidence to confirm where any zone could be drawn on the basis of viability.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to treat allocated strategic development sites as a separate charging zone, along with a small site adjacent to Cambridge (Land North of Teversham Drift) but only as this is part of a larger development proposal across the boundaries of the two authorities.</p> <p>The CIL charging schedule will, however, be kept under review and this matter of</p>



Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					charging zones may be reviewed subject to particular circumstances.
1.6	Mrs Kirsty Carter	56773	Support	Support wholeheartedly	Noted
1.7	Country Land & Business Association	57696	Comment	<p>We believe that a CIL has potential to stifle all forms of rural development - be it buildings erected for agricultural or forestry purposes (including dwellings subject to occupancy conditions), and rural diversification development, which may include commercial, retail, or residential use of redundant agricultural buildings.</p> <p>In reviewing charges, we ask SCDC to note that a "one size fits all" policy does not take account of the special circumstances found in parts of the countryside. CIL charges will make some rural diversification and development unviable, and affect the long-term sustainability of rural communities in terms of employment provision and housing needs.</p>	<p>This issue was subject to debate during the CIL examination for Sevenoaks District Council 13 November 2013. The examiner determined the following:</p> <p><i>Turning to housing for essential rural workers, it is clear that there is not a need for such housing upon which the delivery of the Council's Core Strategy depends. Nevertheless I can see that this is not the only consideration. However, as the Council points out, the CIL Regulations 2010, as amended, identify the types of 'social housing' that the government considers should be offered a 100% exemption from the levy where applications are duly made. Regulation 49 provides that social housing includes 'assured agricultural occupancies', where the landlord is appropriately registered, and that this provides for rural worker housing to be delivered without a requirement for CIL payments.</i></p> <p>Whilst the point as to agricultural and forestry purposes have been noted the Council does not consider it necessary to</p>

<b>Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					change its approach.  In addition the CIL Regulations 2014 provide for an exemption for self-build developments that may overcome this particular issue.
1.8	Y Emerson	57010	Support	Support, it sounds sensible.	Noted
1.9	Mrs Sarah Fordham	56767	Support	Yes, as it will be similar to the current Section 106 agreements	Noted
1.10	Gamlingay Parish Council	57116	Support	Council Supports introduction of CIL	Noted
1.11	Girton Parish Council	57783	Support	Girton Parish Council agrees that SCDC should introduce a schedule.	Noted
1.12	Great Abington Parish Council	57767	Support	We agree that SCDC should introduce a CIL charging schedule	Noted
1.13	Great Shelford Parish Council	57796	Support	Support	Noted
1.14	Haslingfield Parish Council	57727	Comment	Generally agree but only because SCDC seem to have little choice in the matter following Central Government actions. However, some of our members disagree completely because this is a central government imposition on which there has been no consultation.	The CIL Regulations 2010 (amended) were introduced under the Planning Act 2008.  It is not accepted that no consultation took place prior to the introduction of the Act and Regulations.
1.15	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57752	Support	Support	Noted
1.16	Dr Shane	58067	Object	The CIL proposals are incorrect and	The point raised as to the CIL proposals

Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Lawrence			illegal. This CIL is not passed by Act of Parliament and is therefore not law and cannot be implemented.	being incorrect and illegal is unfounded.  The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) was introduced under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008. Royal assent was obtained on 26 November 2008.
1.17	Linton Parish Council	57764	Support	Support	Noted
1.18	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57898	Support	<p>The CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) make changes to the way in which contributions can be collected by Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) for spending on community infrastructure. We therefore agree that the introduction of a CIL is appropriate to ensure that South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) are able to continue to seek contributions to mitigate the impacts of developments and to support the delivery of infrastructure to support the development of its area.</p> <p>Our concern is to ensure that the rates of CIL that are set within the adopted Charging Schedule do not render unviable those sites that are critical to the delivery of SCDC's Plan. We are also concerned that the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has carefully considered its approach to ensure that the introduction of CIL does not threaten the delivery of sites that the Local Plan relies upon.</p> <p>It is evidenced by both (i) the independent</p>

Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				required infrastructure to support the Plan can be delivered. Our representations are made on these bases.	viability study and (ii) the differential rates for zones as set out in the preliminary draft charging schedule.
1.19	Milton Parish Council	56991	Object	Do not agree	<p>Whilst the introduction of a CIL charge is not mandatory the CIL Regulations intentionally impede the District Council's ability to secure future funding through development contributions. This has been achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Putting the tests on the use of planning obligations on a statutory basis</li> <li>b) Imposing a time limit on pooled contributions from planning obligations towards infrastructure that may be funded by the levy</li> </ul> <p>The District Council have therefore agreed to work towards the introduction of CIL, such that money can still be secured from development, not least on behalf of Parish Councils.</p>
1.20	Rampton Parish Council	56882	Support		Noted
1.21	The Theatres Trust	57830	Support	Support	Noted
1.22	Aspinall Verdi Limited on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	57909	Support	We support CIL on the basis that the funds raised are used for the stated purpose to invest in NEW infrastructure which facilitates further	The Council fully acknowledges the point that CIL monies should be used to invest in new infrastructure as required by CIL Regulation 59 states that "A charging

<b>Q1. Do you agree that South Cambridgeshire District Council should introduce a CIL charging schedule?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				development and is NOT to remedy existing infrastructure deficiencies. (see section 2.2 PDCS). Furthermore contributions to CIL must not lead to "double dipping" through the requirement for paying further contributions towards local S106 or S278.	Authority must apply CIL to funding infrastructure to support the development of its area".  The Council also accepts that developers will not be asked to provide funding through both CIL and s106 agreements to fund the one item of infrastructure.
1.23	Ms A Wood	57837	Support	Support	Noted

Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
2.1	Thomas Eggar LLP on behalf of Asda Stores Ltd	57939	Support	Recommend that the Council adopt an exceptional circumstances relief. The viability of any particular development scheme is finely balanced and will fluctuate depending on the costs involved in the development and the state of the economy when the development comes forward. By adopting exceptional circumstances relief the Council will have the flexibility to allow strategic or desirable, but unprofitable development schemes to come forward by exempting them from the CIL charge or reducing it in certain circumstances.	<p>Noted but subject to the following.</p> <p>The Council does not currently intend introducing a discretionary relief policy but will keep this under review.</p> <p>Both the current and emerging policy enables the level and tenure of affordable housing to be varied to improve the viability of development. As a result there is already a mechanism in place to improve the viability of a particular development thereby ensuring its delivery.</p> <p>In May 2011 CLG published the Community Infrastructure Levy Relief Information document.</p> <p>Paragraph 71 covers the Eligibility criteria that states the charging authority can only give exceptional circumstances relief where the eligibility criteria are fulfilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the charging authority has made exceptional circumstances relief available in its area</li> <li>• the claimant owns a material interest in the relevant land</li> <li>• a section 106 agreement has been</li> </ul>

Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					<p>entered into in respect of the planning permission which permits the chargeable development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the charging authority considers that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the cost of complying with the section 106 agreement is greater than the charge from the levy payable on the chargeable development</li> <li>- requiring payment of the charge would have an unacceptable impact on the economic viability of the chargeable development and</li> <li>- granting relief would not constitute a notifiable state aid (for further information please see state aid section)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Council considers that it is unlikely that all these criteria will be satisfied not least because it would be unlikely that a section 106 agreement has been signed the value of which exceeds the amount that would be secured through CIL.</p> <p>Additional comment:</p> <p>In April 2013 Department for Communities and Local Government published the Community Infrastructure Levy: Consultation on further Regulatory Reforms and the response in October</p>

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					response.  The consultation document contained a specific question on Discretionary Relief for Exceptional Circumstances. The outcome, that will be reflected in the CIL Regs 2014 is "...to take forward the proposal (option A) where a planning obligation still needs to be in place but does not have to be greater than the levy as this will provide greater flexibility to both local authorities and developers, and it was broadly supported by the consultation responses".
2.2	Bourn Parish Council	57630	Support	Bourn PC supports the introduction of a discretionary relief policy because it will allow flexibility in CIL rate according to local criteria	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57811	Support	Yes, a discretionary relief policy should be introduced.	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.4	Cambridge City Council	56966	Comment	No. This is at the discretion of the Council. Cambridge City Council does not intend to introduce a discretionary relief policy but will keep the situation under review.	Likewise the Council (SCDC) intend keeping the discretionary relief policy under review.
2.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57741	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council in principle supports the introduction of a discretionary relief policy; however this will need to strike a balance between ensuring that relief is	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above



<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				applied to deserving cases and the impact of relief on the total of CIL revenues collected.	
2.6	Mrs Sarah Fordham	56768	Object	I think there should not be a Discretionary Relief Policy. Even if there were strict criteria, this will be challenged and it causes more paperwork and precious staff time. If discretionary relief is granted, it sets a precedent and then you open the floodgates for more requests for relief. If there are clear rules that only give mandatory relief for affordable housing and charity developments, then it cannot be challenged and will save time and money.	Noted.
2.7	Gamlingay Parish Council	57117	Support	This should be strictly monitored. Provision of Community Buildings by Parish Councils should be exempt, as should any development which provides for 'community benefit purposes only'. However, where market housing is being suggested as a mechanism to deliver affordable housing on exceptions sites, the market housing element should be liable for CIL payment.	The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule covers residential and retail forms of development and does not include a proposed rate for 'community' buildings.  The CIL Regulations exempts affordable housing from a CIL charge but market housing provided on rural exception sites will be liable for CIL.
2.8	Girton Parish Council	57784	Object	An earlier draft appeared to make an exemption for student accommodation. GPC is pleased that	At the time the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was consulted on there were no identified development proposals through

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				this exemption has been dropped. Girton Parish Council does not feel that there should be a discretionary relief policy.	<p>the Local Plan in terms of student accommodation. As such, despite the independent viability assessment highlighting that such use was a viable for of development, the Council did not include student accommodation in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.</p> <p>The Council has now been made aware of at least one student accommodation scheme being considered and as a result the Council is reconsidering its position in respect of this form of development.</p>
2.9	Great Abington Parish Council	57768	Support	We believe that SCDC should introduce a discretionary relief policy	Noted. See answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.10	Great Shelford Parish Council	57797	Support	We believe the discretionary relief policy should apply to affordable housing for local people and key workers.	The CIL Regulations exempts affordable housing from a CIL charge.
2.11	Harrow Estates Plc	57946	Support	We consider it imperative that SCDC make available exceptional circumstances relief from the date of the adoption of CIL, and that the intended approach to doing so (in conformity with the Regulations) is outlined at the next stage of consultation.	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.12	Haslingfield Parish Council	57728	Comment	Discretionary Relief Policy should help to deal with the unforeseen matters that appear inevitable from the current lack of foresight in	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				establishing policies	
2.13	Hastoe Housing Association	56770	Comment	Affordable Housing should be exempt from CIL payment on the basis of financial viability.	The CIL Regulations exempts affordable housing from a CIL charge
2.14	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57753	Object	The District Council should NOT introduce a discretionary relief policy	Noted
2.15	Shrimplin Brown Planning & Development on behalf of HPG Sawston Ltd	58018	Support	Offering Exceptional Circumstances Relief provides the Council with flexibility to permit development which may not otherwise be viable, for example because of site specific contamination or flooding issues. It thus offers the opportunity for development to come forward which the Council support, and which could deliver important wider benefits and take advantage of underused, but challenging, brownfield sites. Without this flexibility CIL might render proposals, and sites, unviable.	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.16	Dr Shane Lawrence	58068	Object	A discretionary relief policy will only apply if a CIL is introduced. This would only affect the speculator or building trade and not the ordinary person.	Noted
2.17	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57899	Support	The Community Infrastructure Levy Relief - Information Document (CLG, May 2011) outlines the Government's position on "exceptional circumstances" which could warrant	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>exception from CIL. The first matter to note from the Regulations is that the offer of relief is discretionary on the charging authority.</p> <p>It is noted that SCDC are currently undecided on whether they wish to include relief within the emerging CIL. We recognise that there are strict tests surrounding the availability and applicability of exceptional circumstances relief, therefore we believe that it will only be applicable to those schemes that can justify the need for it and which are appropriate and can meet those strict tests. We therefore consider it imperative that SCDC make available exceptional circumstances relief from the date of the adoption of CIL, and that the intended approach to doing so (in conformity with the Regulations) is outlined at the next stage of consultation. This will ensure that sites are not inadvertently prevented from bringing forward planned development.</p>	
2.18	Milton Parish Council	56992	Comment	No	Noted
2.19	Rampton Parish Council	56883	Support	Yes but it should be structured so as to encourage affordable housing	The CIL Regulations exempts affordable housing from a CIL charge.

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
2.20	Indigo Planning Limited on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited	57850	Support	To allow a degree of flexibility in exceptional circumstances, such that the individual circumstances of developers are accounted in order to present every opportunity to balance the needs of paying the CIL levy and bringing forward viable development proposals.	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.21	Savills on behalf of The Consortium comprising Barratt Homes Plc, Bloor Homes Ltd, Grosvenor, Redrow Plc, Taylor Wimpey Plc	57931	Support	The consortium considers it imperative that SCDC makes available relief from the date of the adoption of CIL, and that they clearly outline their approach to doing so (in conformity with the Regulations).	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above.  The Council is satisfied that it is not doing anything which is not in conformity with the Regulations.
2.22	The Theatres Trust	57831	Support	Under regulation 55, The Theatres Trust suggests that theatre buildings listed as Assets of Community Value should be eligible for discretionary relief under exceptional circumstances given that these buildings would be providing both for the social and cultural interests and wellbeing of the area and are unlikely to be able to bear the cost of CIL for viability reasons. Also under regulation 55, The Theatres Trust recommends that consideration should be given as to whether the charging of the CIL would have an	The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule covers residential and retail forms of development and does not include a proposed rate for 'community' buildings.

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				'unacceptable impact on the economic viability' of the theatre development (55, 3 (ii)) again, given the contribution that the theatre would make to the social and cultural wellbeing of the community, and that this should apply to both existing and new theatres.	
2.23	Aspinall Verdi Limited on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	57910	Support	The Council must introduce a discretionary relief policy as all developments are unique. In many cases retail development is used as enabling development for other non-viable uses (e.g. community, leisure uses etc) and/or to subsidise up-front infrastructure (e.g. new roads and roundabouts etc). The economic viability appraisal (EVA) by DSP does not (nor cannot) take these abnormal/special circumstances into account. The financial viability in the context of 'real' schemes is likely therefore to be overstated. A discretionary relief policy enables the Council to react to these unique circumstances and instead of CIL stymieing development; the Council can enable development, jobs and growth.	Noted but see answer to Rep number 57939 above
2.24	Ms A Wood	57838	Comment	Would need more info	Noted. See answer to Rep number 57939 above

<b>Q3. Do you have any views on the introduction of an instalment policy for CIL payments?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
3.1	Thomas Eggar LLP on behalf of Asda Stores Ltd	57938	Support	Urge the Council to adopt an instalment policy with generous timeframes which ensures that developers are not disadvantaged by the decision to submit a full planning application for a phased development scheme.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council will prepare a draft instalment policy for consultation alongside the Draft Charging Schedule consultation and welcomes comments from the development industry.</p> <p>Additional note:</p> <p>The explanatory note for the CIL Regs 2014 states that:</p> <p>Regulation 4 ensures that if any planning permission is phased, then each phase will be a different chargeable amount. Currently, this only applies in relation to outline planning permissions. Regulation 4 also changes the date at which the CIL liability is calculated for non-phased permissions. The date will now be when the permission was granted, rather than when the pre-commencement conditions are discharged.</p>
3.2	Bourn Parish Council	57631	Support	Bourn PC supports the introduction of an instalment policy and feels that it should be linked to the rate of completion of any development.	The CIL Regulations are worded such that instalments are to be payable by reference to time (to be calculated from the date the development is commenced). The Council is therefore unable to link instalments to the rate of completions.

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					See answer to Rep number 57938 above
3.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57812	Support	Yes, there should be staircased payments with trigger points during the build. This should be weighted to the start of the build for developments over a certain size.	Noted
3.4	Cambridge City Council	56967	Support	Cambridge City Council feels that an instalment policy, which would help to provide the development industry with consistency and certainty, could usefully be worked up between the two authorities. Cambridge City Council will consult South Cambridgeshire District Council prior to publishing a Draft Instalment Policy.	Likewise SCDC will consult with and aim to agree on a CIL instalment policy with Cambridge City Council to assist the development industry.
3.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57742	Comment	The County Council in principle has no objection to an installments policy but would need to see further detail of any proposal.	Noted. The Council anticipates consulting on a draft instalment policy alongside the consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule.
3.6	Y Emerson	57011	Comment	Installments should be over as short a period of time as possible	Noted.
3.7	Mrs Sarah Fordham	56769	Support	If a development is to be built in phases, the installments should also be in phases to correspond with the works.	Noted. It is expected that the CIL Regulations will be amended, following the April 2013 consultation on CIL further reforms, to take account of phased developments.
3.8	Gamlingay Parish Council	57118	Support	General support for ensuring that payments are made at the beginning	Noted



<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				of the development, to allow time for the facilities to be provided, and be ready for use by the new residents/users. Delay of the payment to the end of the development means benefits may not be experienced for many years after the development is completed.	
3.9	Girton Parish Council	57785	Object	Girton Parish Council sees no reason for the introduction of such a policy.	Without an instalment policy the full CIL liability would be payable within 60 days of the commencement of the development. This has a significant impact on the viability of all sites and in particular larger development proposals.  An instalment policy allows the CIL liability to be paid over a number of months or years thereby easing this pressure.
3.10	Gladman Developments	57941	Support	Gladman would urge the Council to adopt an instalments policy for CIL payments as this will give developers the flexibility to pay contributions in line with development phasing schemes and will facilitate cash flow and therefore development viability.	Noted. See answer to Rep number 57939 above
3.11	Great Abington Parish Council	57769	Support	We believe that SCDC should introduce an installment policy for CIL payments	Noted
3.12	Great Shelford Parish Council	57798	Support	We think there should be 3 to 4 stage payments with the final payment on completion rather than occupation of	The CIL Regulations are worded such that instalments are to be payable by reference to time (to be calculated from

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				the units as is often the case with Section 106 agreements.	the date the development is commenced). The Council is therefore unable to link the final payment to the completion or occupation of any unit.
3.13	Harrow Estates Plc	57957	Support	Strongly recommend that SCDC take advantage of the flexibility in the Regulations and publish draft instalment policies for comment at the Draft Charging Schedule stage	Noted. See answer to Rep number 57939 above
3.14	Haslingfield Parish Council	57729	Comment	Either instalment policy or full payment within 60 days might encourage developers to split bigger schemes into smaller applications which would frustrate intention of CIL. However, if planners are firm on developers meeting timing schedules, either option could work, unlike current triggers which have varying levels of success	Noted
3.15	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57754	Object	Should the Council be minded to do so, care must be taken that payments are scheduled:  a) to start within 12 months of granting of planning permission (in order to encourage implementation)  b) complete within 3 years of granting of planning permission or when development is substantially complete, whichever is the sooner	The CIL Regulations are worded such that instalments are to be payable by reference to time (to be calculated from the date the development is commenced). It is therefore not within our power to (i) charge a CIL until commencement has occurred and (ii) link a CIL payment to any completion rate.

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
3.16	Shrimplin Brown Planning & Development on behalf of HPG Sawston Ltd	58019	Support	<p>Without an Instalments Policy the whole CIL contribution would be payable upon commencement of development. This can raise problems in terms of cash flow because it is another, often significant, cost at precisely the time when the other significant costs of building the development are being incurred. Moreover, it would be payable far in advance of when the development will begin to generate any income. It can thus delay development and have significant impacts on the construction timeframes.</p> <p>An Instalments Policy can assist with this short term cash flow issue.</p>	Noted
3.17	Dr Shane Lawrence	58069	Object	<p>The instalment procedure is ineffectively managed by SCDC on all other matters and this would be no exception. Since this would only affect speculators and builders it is inappropriate to ordinary people.</p>	<p>The Council has a proven history of securing planning obligations in a timely manner in part due to careful consideration of triggers but also an effective monitoring procedure.</p> <p>Any instalment policy would be properly managed by the Council with the ability to use surcharges but the CIL Regulations also allow for penalties to be applied in the event that payments are not satisfied in accordance with the instalment policy.</p>

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
3.18	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57900	Support	<p>We welcome SCDC's consideration of an instalment policy for the payment of CIL. Given the differences in development from site to site, it is clear that an instalments policy should outline different proposed thresholds for payment by development scale. We recommend that a threshold should be defined for larger schemes for which a bespoke payment method can be agreed in writing as part of the application process. The opportunity to consider the overall approach and phasing of larger scale developments should be considered as part of setting the instalment policy, notably given the long term nature of development and as the liability for CIL is based at the time of the grant of relevant phased reserved matters (detailed planning approval). This is particularly important where some of the strategic sites may be subject to CIL on non-residential uses, even if the residential CIL rate may be nil. Ultimately, developer cash flow is an important consideration, notably in respect of upfront infrastructure costs typically associated with strategic development. A proposed instalment</p>	Noted

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				policy should aim to reflect, as closely as possible, the timing of delivery of the development, to ensure that the CIL does not put unnecessary pressure on cashflow and viability.	
3.19	Milton Parish Council	56993	Comment	No	Noted
3.20	Rampton Parish Council	56884	Object	Could lead to abuse of scheme	It is not accepted that any instalment policy will give rise to abuse of the Regulations as the Council will put into place necessary measures to prevent this.
3.21	Indigo Planning Limited on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited	57851	Support	To allow phased spending of the CIL payments where applicable. This would give much-needed certainty and confidence to developers, in particular when progressing major or complex development schemes. The aim of CIL is to increase certainty of costs up-front, leading to greater confidence and higher levels of inward investment.	Noted. It is expected that the CIL Regulations will be amended, following the April 2013 consultation on CIL further reforms, to take account of phased developments.
3.22	Swavesey Parish Council	57341	Comment	Swavesey Parish Council would like to see payments made to Parishes as soon as possible after they are due and received by SCDC. If an instalment policy is introduced, it should be on short-time regular basis, to enable Parishes to budget and have funds available as required. A quarterly installment	Noted.  The Council is yet to consider the frequency which payments are made to Parish Councils. Nonetheless Regulation 59D of the CIL Regs 2013 covers payment periods to Parish Councils and sets out the minimum time requirements as follows:

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				policy would be preferred.	<p>(1) This regulation applies where a charging authority is required to make a payment to a local council under regulation 59A or 59B.</p> <p>(2) If the charging authority and the local council agree on a timetable for payment, the charging authority must pay the local council in accordance with that timetable.</p> <p>(3) In all other cases, the charging authority must pay the local council in accordance with the following paragraphs.</p> <p>(4) The charging authority must make payment in respect of the CIL it receives from 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> September in any financial year to the local council by 28<sup>th</sup> October of that financial year.</p> <p>(5) The charging authority must make payment in respect of the CIL it receives from 1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> March in any financial year to the local council by 28<sup>th</sup> April of the following financial year.</p>
3.23	Savills on behalf of The Consortium comprising Barratt Homes Plc, Bloor Homes Ltd,	57930	Support	Strongly recommend the introduction of an installment policy in order to reduce the risk of the proposed CIL rates. Suggest that the installment policy is consulted on alongside the	Noted

<b>Q2. Do you have any views on whether the District Council should introduce a discretionary relief policy?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Grosvenor, Redrow Plc, Taylor Wimpey Plc			Draft Charging Schedule.  Recommend that the installment policy has a number of thresholds and varying percentages of contribution payable, based on scale of the liability.	
3.24	Aspinall Verdi Limited on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	57911	Support	We support the introduction of an instalment policy in order to mitigate the impact of CIL on development cashflows. This is as recommended by DSP in the EVA (paragraph 3.13.4). Upfront payment of CIL increases the costs of development through the increased costs of financing the CIL. Therefore to mitigate against increased costs and consequential adverse impacts on growth and development and instalment policy is necessary.	Noted
3.25	Ms A Wood	57839	Comment	Developers should pay once buildings sold/rented. If empty for less than 6 months, should then have to pay. Will discourage speculative but unwanted/too expensive development	The CIL Regulations are worded such that instalments are to be payable by reference to time (to be calculated from the date the development is commenced). It is therefore not within our power to (i) charge a CIL until commencement has occurred and (ii) link a CIL payment to when the building is sold/rented.

<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
4.1	Bourn Parish Council	57632	Support	BournPC agrees that there is sufficient evidence	Noted
4.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57652	Support	Significant evidence of infrastructure funding gap	Noted
4.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57813	Comment	There is not enough information to be in a position to answer this accurately.	<p>The Council has published an Infrastructure Delivery Study dated August 2012. An updated report dated August 2013 has also been published which takes in consideration (i) Local Plan site allocations and (ii) potential funding sources thereby identifying a funding gap. Both studies were jointly commissioned with Cambridge City Council and involved the input from key infrastructure providers and stakeholders.</p> <p>The Council considers that it has satisfied the infrastructure planning requirements of the CIL Regulations and the CIL Guidance.</p>
4.4	Cambridge City Council	56968	Support	Yes. The Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Infrastructure Delivery Study 2012 and Update 2013 provide sufficient evidence of an infrastructure funding gap for both authorities.	Noted
4.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57743	Support	The County Council agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate a funding gap. The County has fed into the Cambridge and South	Noted



<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which shows that there, is anticipated to be a large infrastructure funding gap across the district, given the scale of infrastructure requirements needed.	
4.6	Gamlingay Parish Council	57121	Support	Yes. Our experience identifies significant lack of community transport links to transport nodes/hubs/ sub region local market towns outside Cambridge centre. There is significant shortfall in infrastructure relating to community transport and cycling facilities and broadband provision in the South Cambridgeshire area.	Noted
4.7	Girton Parish Council	57786	Support	Yes	Noted
4.8	Great Abington Parish Council	57770	Support	Answer - We are confident that there is ample evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap	Noted
4.9	Great Shelford Parish Council	57799	Comment	How robust is the information obtained in the Peter Brett study? In the study several villages have costs allocated for provision and improvement of informal open space. In the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, two sites for open space have been allocated in Great Shelford. These sites have to be secured. Is it the case that funding been	The Council has published an Infrastructure Delivery Study dated August 2012. An updated report dated August 2013 has also been published which takes in consideration (i) Local Plan site allocations and (ii) potential funding sources thereby identifying a funding gap. Both studies were jointly commissioned with Cambridge City Council and involved the input from key infrastructure providers

<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>included in the Sawston sub-area to obtain these sites, with a commuted sum to maintain them? It would be useful to have a breakdown of the monies allocated for different parishes so they can check their needs have been included.</p> <p>There may be more of a funding gap than the report suggest.</p>	<p>and stakeholders.</p> <p>The Council considers that it has satisfied the infrastructure planning requirements of the CIL Regulations and the CIL Guidance.</p> <p>It may well be that there are more projects that are desired locally across the District. This would only further exacerbate the funding issue providing justification for introducing CIL.</p> <p>The infrastructure study is a live document and will be updated from time to time.</p>
4.10	Haslingfield Parish Council	57730	Comment	More detailed information than is given in the consultation document is needed to inform a decision on infrastructure funding gap. We look forward to such information being in the Draft Charging Schedule document	The Council has published an Infrastructure Delivery Study dated August 2012. An updated report dated August 2013 has also been published which takes in consideration (i) Local Plan site allocations and (ii) potential funding sources thereby identifying a funding gap. Both studies were jointly commissioned with Cambridge City Council and involved the input from key infrastructure providers and stakeholders and as such no further information is considered to be necessary.
4.11	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57755	Support	Support	Noted

<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
4.12	Dr Shane Lawrence	58070	Object	Infrastructure funding should come from Central Government, even for small projects, not Local Government and so the premise is incorrect.	<p>Any Council wishing to introduce CIL must identify the necessary infrastructure requirements and potential available finance to demonstrate a funding gap.</p> <p>As part of this exercise the Council has therefore taken any account of any money that may be available be it through planning obligations, grants or capital funding programmes.</p> <p>A significant funding gap exists therefore the Council may charge CIL as an additional income stream to close the gap.</p>
4.13	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57901	Object	<p>Within the revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2013 update), the tables of infrastructure do not appear to have any public funding listed against any of them.</p> <p>We would question whether this is correct and would wish to see that the infrastructure evidence supporting the implementation of the CIL clearly demonstrates that all sources of funding have been considered and are set out within the evidence (as per paragraph 14 of the CIL Guidance, DCLG, April 2013). We therefore do not believe the</p>	<p>Although it is fairly limited the Council has identified potential finding sources that includes public funding to pay in whole or in part infrastructure items necessary to deliver the Local Plan.</p> <p>The CIL Guidance issued in April 2013 'recognises that there will be uncertainty in pinpointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short term'. This was repeated in the subsequent guidance issued Feb 2014.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the funding gap is so large that even if more alternative funding sources are identified</p>

<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				infrastructure funding gap to be as significant as that shown and would request clarity on this.	there would remain a justification for CIL being introduced. The existence of a Cambridge City Deal proposal confirms that even Central Government is aware of the existence of a funding gap.
4.14	Milton Parish Council	56994	Support	Yes there is sufficient evidence	Noted
4.15	Rampton Parish Council	56885	Support	On the basis of the limited evidence given	Noted
4.16	Porta Planning LLP	57645	Object	Few infrastructure improvements are identified either for the south of the District generally or the area around the Genome Campus in particular. In reaching an assessment of evidence to demonstrate a funding gap, the Council should include the suggested highway, bus and broadband improvements.	<p>The Council has published an Infrastructure Delivery Study dated August 2012. An updated report dated August 2013 has also been published which takes in consideration (i) Local Plan site allocations and (ii) potential funding sources thereby identifying a funding gap. Both studies were jointly commissioned with Cambridge City Council and involved the input from key infrastructure providers and stakeholders.</p> <p>The Council considers that it has satisfied the infrastructure planning requirements of the CIL Regulations and the CIL Guidance.</p> <p>CIL is intended to provide a funding stream that will deliver infrastructure projects that in turn will enable more development to take place. The emerging</p>

<b>Q4. Do you agree that there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate an infrastructure funding gap?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					<p>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan does not propose significant levels of development in the South of the District and in these circumstances, and at this time, a limited number of projects have been identified.</p> <p>The infrastructure study is a live document and will be kept up to date based on emerging needs of the District.</p>

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
5.1	Bourn Parish Council	57633	Support	Bourn PC believes that emphasis should be placed on public transport infrastructure as well as cycling/walking routes	Noted
5.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57653	Comment	Add storm water and land drainage projects	Noted
5.3	Mr Francis Burkitt	56792	Comment	SCDC should prioritise projects which accord with its own and other Council's plans & objectives, but which for various reasons might not otherwise attract funding. An example of this would be Green Infrastructure Projects within the Quarter-to-Six Quadrant.	Noted
5.4	Cambourne Parish Council	57814	Comment	Projects that bring sustainability to existing communities, A428 improvements, youth provision and cycle route provision this must be done with the relevant Parish Council.	Noted
5.5	Cambridge City Council	56969	Comment	Governance arrangements for the prioritisation of infrastructure projects that have cross boundary or strategic implications need to be worked up in conjunction with Cambridge City Council and other key stakeholders, such as Cambridgeshire County Council.	Noted
5.6	Cambridgeshire County Council	57744	Comment	The County Council recommends that further work is needed on the	Noted

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>infrastructure lists, ensuring that they are up-to-date and robust. It will also be important to include related infrastructure requirements from the Transport Strategy currently under development. These lists should also include the key related strategic infrastructure requirements as well as the local infrastructure requirements. In this regard there should be recognition of the importance of such schemes as the proposed additional capacity expected to be needed along the A428, both in terms of general vehicular capacity and passenger transport to support growth in this corridor.</p> <p>As well as this, a process for prioritisation of infrastructure needs to be agreed and we are happy to work with partners on this. The County Council would welcome a discussion on the most appropriate funding mechanism for infrastructure projects particularly critical infrastructure such as Primary Schools.</p>	
5.7	Y Emerson	57012	Comment	Infrastructure should include as many decent width paths and	Noted

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				cycleways as is practical, with sheffield stands in key locations.	
5.8	Gamlingay Parish Council	57123	Comment	<p>Gamlingay-Potton-Sandy Cycleway Community bus services to local market towns</p> <p>Ongoing support for existing community and new community buildings</p> <p>Ongoing support for existing open spaces and new open spaces Access to higher education Access to health services</p>	Noted
5.9	Girton Parish Council	57787	Comment	Girton Parish Council believes that whatever projects are funded by CIL, these should emphatically not include any of the A14 highway scheme. Street safety for pedestrians, cyclists and those with disabilities, and improving infrastructure so that more people feel safe using non-motor transport.	Noted
5.10	Great Abington Parish Council	57771	Support	<p>1. We would like to see improvement to Hildersham crossroads on the A1307 in order to make the junction safer and to slow traffic down as it approaches Little Abington.</p> <p>2. We would like to see a cycle way between Abington and Wandlebury</p>	Noted



<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>3. We would like to see a cycle way between Abington and Sawston via Babraham built to appropriate standards with an accessible bridge</p> <p>4. We would like to see a cycle way between Abington and Whittlesford Station</p> <p>5. We also agree that improvements to the A14 are important</p>	
5.11	Great Shelford Parish Council	57800	Comment	<p>From Shelford's viewpoint we would like to see the following projects prioritised.</p> <p>Open spaces, cycleways, footpath links, and improvement of cycle parking at the station, the school and the east-west rail link.</p>	Noted
5.12	Haslingfield Parish Council	57731	Comment	<p>Priorities might be the A14 upgrade and the extension of park &amp; ride around north/east of the City and an increase in capacity in the south. However, the recently announced parking charges for Park &amp; Ride could have a long term detrimental effect on the use of Park &amp; Ride, particularly by low waged workers commuting and the retired who could change their shopping habits. These charges fly in the face of the declared policy of encouraging increased use of public transport.</p>	Noted

Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
5.13	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57756	Support	The following projects should be prioritised: 1) Drainage (recognising the severity of impact on individuals of flooding) 2) Community facilities (supporting localism) 3) Community & Parish Council bids (recognising local knowledge of needs) 4) Public Transport (supporting individuals and reducing car use/congestion) 5) Schools & Education	Noted
5.14	Dr Shane Lawrence	58071	Object	The District Council should present all it's considered priorities for infrastructure at the beginning of the financial year in April, at the same time as Council tax considerations, and circulated to all householders for consideration.	Noted
5.15	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57902		It is acknowledged that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been updated and that a list of infrastructure required in relation to the Cambridge East development (at Appendix D of the 2013 IDP Update) has been provided. Table 4.12 within the report summarises the cost of the infrastructure that SCDC deem to be eligible for CIL funding and which will therefore not be paid for through	The CIL Guidance April 2013 states at Para 14:  <i>In determining the size of its total or aggregate infrastructure funding gap, the charging authority should consider known and expected infrastructure costs and the other sources of possible funding available to meet those costs. This process will identify a Community Infrastructure Levy infrastructure funding</i>

Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>planning obligations.</p> <p>However, there is no explanation of which items within Appendix D are allowed for within the aforementioned summary table and which would remain to be secured through other means such as planning obligations. We would suggest that transparency on this matter is critical to enable stakeholders to assess the implications of the proposed CIL on the viability of their development sites, as well as the impact on the timing of the delivery of critical infrastructure.</p>	<p><i>target. This target should be informed by a selection of infrastructure projects or types (drawn from infrastructure planning for the area) which are identified as candidates to be funded by the levy in whole or in part in that area. The Government recognises that there will be uncertainty in pinpointing other infrastructure funding sources, particularly beyond the short-term. The focus should be on providing evidence of an aggregate funding gap that demonstrates the need to levy the Community Infrastructure Levy.</i></p> <p>When considering CIL and the strategic development sites the Council has attempted to identify those infrastructure items that are to be funded through planning obligations.</p> <p>The Council therefore considers that it has taken necessary steps to satisfy this requirement whilst recognising that the purpose of the infrastructure delivery study was not to look at the exact needs of each development area.</p> <p>In addition Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs of the Local Plan proposed submission states:</p>

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					<i>The community needs of large scale major developments (individual sites with 200 or more dwellings, or groups of smaller sites which cumulatively exceed this figure), will be established through detailed assessments and strategies prepared in consultation with service providers, and approved by the local authority in partnership with the landowners and stakeholders.</i>
5.16	Milton Parish Council	56995	Support	To be commented on when draft charging schedule is published.	Noted
5.17	Rampton Parish Council	56886	Support	A14 and impact of traffic issues associated with new developments (e.g. Northstowe and Waterbeach)	Noted
5.18	Swavesey Parish Council	57342	Comment	Local highway safety - provision of footpaths, cycleways, traffic calming, improvements at a local level to ensure development directly benefits locals at parish level.  Local education - funding provision to local schools to enable them to cope with additional pupil numbers as a direct result of local development. This should also be linked to highway improvements, eg safer routes to schools.	Noted
5.19	Porta Planning	57646	Comment	Wellcome Trust is concerned that the	Noted but see 57645 above.

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	LLP			<p>Council will prioritise infrastructure projects required in respect of the major residential developments proposed in the District. There is also concern that any current infrastructure capacity in the south of the District, particularly in respect of power and water supplies, could be taken up by these developments. It is requested that certain infrastructure projects in the vicinity of the Genome Campus are prioritised, which would benefit both the Genome Campus and other employment sites in the area in the interest of protecting and promoting economic growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dualling of the A505 and improvements to the roundabout with the A1301</li> <li>2. Upgrade of the electrical infrastructure improvements planned by UP Power Networks, particularly at the Sawston Primary</li> <li>3. Water Supply and Sewerage Infrastructure</li> <li>4. Extension of improved bus services planned for Addenbokes further south to the Genome Campus</li> </ol>	<p>The Council will also be preparing and inviting representations on a draft Regulation 123 list as part of the Draft Charging Schedule consultation.</p>
5.20	Ms A Wood	57840	Comment	Small-scale infill only	Noted

<b>Q5. Do you have a view on what infrastructure projects should be prioritised by the District Council?</b>					
	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
6.1	Bourn Parish Council	57634	Support	Bourn PC agrees with the proposed rate for residential use.	Noted
6.2	Mr Tony Broscob	57655	Support	no further comment	Noted
6.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57815	Support	Yes	Noted
6.4	Cambridge City Council	56970	Support	Cambridge City Council does not disagree with the proposed rates. Broadly speaking, the rates proposed are similar to those which have been proposed in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for Cambridge City Council, consulted on in March-April 2013. The Council welcomes the fact that the rate proposed on residential land North of Teversham Drift, which crosses boundary with Cambridge City Council is £125 per sq.m, the same as the proposed Cambridge City rate.	Noted
6.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57745	Support	Yes we support the CIL rate for residential development; this is as would be expected slightly below that of the City except in Teversham where a comparable rate with the city has been set.	Noted
6.6	The Planning Bureau Ltd on behalf of Churchill Retirement Living	57976	Object	Object to CIL being applied to retirement use on the grounds of unviability. Supporting information provided.	The independent viability assessment recommended that the Council applied a £0 psm CIL rate to care homes envisaged within Use Class C2 as

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	with McCarthy and Stone				<p>opposed to C3 but that sheltered / retirement housing development were viable for the residential CIL rate proposed.</p> <p>This issue was debated at length during the CIL examination for Sevenoaks District Council. In his report the examiner stated at para 17:</p> <p><i>“At the hearing there was some discussion as to the precise wording which might be used in a charging schedule to differentiate this form of market housing from other C3 uses. None of these were entirely satisfactory, but in any event I found the viability assessments undertaken by the Dixon Searle Partnership convincing; that generally the developments undertaken by the Representors (McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd and Churchill Retirement Living Ltd) should remain viable. Set against this I did not find the Representors case convincing to the point where I would be justified in recommending additional complexity in the Schedule”.</i></p> <p>The Council is not at this time satisfied that applying a CIL rate to this use would</p>



Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					render it unviable.
6.7	Country Land & Business Association	57692	Object	There are a number of situations where new dwellings are required to accommodate those employed in agriculture, horticulture and forestry. Such properties are not sold for development gain and are usually restricted by some form of occupancy condition. In such cases, a charge of £100 per m <sup>2</sup> would simply be an additional cost of construction and will render many such projects unviable. As these properties are crucial to the operation of rural businesses and sustainable rural communities, we ask that they be considered separately, based on a suitable viability assessment, or classified with affordable housing for CIL purposes.	Noted but see response to rep 57696
6.8	Gamlingay Parish Council	57124	Support	Support the rate. Gamlingay Parish Council are aware that this rate, however, will reduce the rate of community benefit currently being achieved in the village at this level. We understood that one of the main intentions of CIL was to achieve a greater level of community benefit from development. This is clearly not the case in South Cambridgeshire.	Noted
6.9	Girton Parish	57788	Object	Girton Parish Council does not	The Council recognises that some parts

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Council			understand the logic of the argument to choose £100 rather than £125 against advice which presumably considered all the relevant factors. If zoning is rejected we propose a flat rate of £125.	of the District Council may warrant a higher CIL charge than the one being proposed, although there is no demonstrable evidence to confirm where any zone may be drawn.  CIL guidance also requires the charging authority to not set the rates at the margins of viability and a reasonable buffer should be allowed to take into consideration changes to the housing market.
6.10	Great Abington Parish Council	57772	Support	We agree with the CIL rate for residential use proposed by SCDC	Noted
6.11	Great Shelford Parish Council	57801	Comment	This is possibly on the low side.	The Council recognises that some parts of the District Council may warrant a higher CIL charge than the one being proposed, although there is no demonstrable evidence to confirm where any zone may be drawn.  CIL guidance also requires the charging authority to not set the rates at the margins of viability and a reasonable buffer should be allowed to take into consideration changes to the housing market.
6.12	Harrow Estates Plc	57956	Object	Comments specifically relate to the Former Bayer Crop Science Waste Water Treatment Plant at Cambridge Road Hauxton.	Para 7.13 of the Proposed submission South Cambridgeshire Local Plan states that:

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>Site should be exempt from CIL based on high infrastructure/remediation costs</p> <p>CIL will render the scheme unviable despite planning policy aspirations for the 'removal of the incongruous industrial structures on the western part of the site'.</p> <p>Affordable housing profit should be 20% and not 6%</p> <p>Professional fees should be 12% and not 10%</p> <p>S106 contributions of £1,500 is too low (especially given the public art policy)</p> <p>No allowance has been made for abnormal costs as a specific cost</p>	<p><i>“Proposals for the redevelopment of the recreation buildings and waste water treatment facility on the western side of the A10 will be considered in the context of proposals for appropriate development within the Green Belt. As a planning objective it would be highly desirable to secure the removal of the incongruous industrial structures on the western part of the site”.</i></p> <p>However no area of land is specifically allocated for development, therefore the Council is unable to undertake a viability assessment and treat the land as a separate CIL charging zone.</p> <p>In the event that this particular scheme is unviable the Council would have the ability to relax other planning policies to improve the viability of the development.</p> <p>The Council would highlight that although current policy SF/6 Public Art would require a scheme to the value of 1-5% of total build costs (i) the policy within both the current and Submission Local Plan simply encourages public art, rather than requires it and (ii) an assessment of public art schemes over the previous 5 years demonstrates a value equivalent to</p>

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					<p>£500 per dwelling.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance March 2014 states that “Planning obligations should not be sought – on for instance, public art – which are clearly not necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms” meaning that the Council will not secure monies towards this policy.</p> <p>It has been widely accepted in CIL examinations that the Affordable housing profit may be set at 6%.</p> <p>It has been widely accepted in CIL examinations that the Professional fees may be set at 10%.</p> <p>The DPS viability report has not allowed for abnormal costs that may be associated with particular sites - these are highly specific and can distort comparisons at this level of review. Contingency allowances have however been made for all appraisals.</p>
6.13	Haslingfield Parish Council	57732	Comment	All members of HPC are unhappy about the residential CIL. Some members consider that a residential CIL @ £100/sq. m. on small 3 bed house (85 sq. m.) = £8,500 could be a	The independent assessment found that small infill development sites were still viable at a proposed CIL rate of £100 psm. In addition under current policy the Council would look to secure a section

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>disincentive to people developing a single local house or pair of houses.</p> <p>Other members do not agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use at all unless there were to be a reasonable minimum size below which the CIL would not be levied - in the example above the sum of £8,500 seems very steep to them and would definitely be prohibitive to many who may want to build their own homes. Perhaps it should only be applied to larger properties.</p> <p>Furthermore, although 15% (£1,275) has to go to the Parish Council, its use is still restricted. Allowing more flexibility in the use of this money is essential to permit intelligent and constructive local use of it.</p>	<p>106 contribution in the region of £4,000 based on a 3 bed property.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations restrict charging authorities as to how CIL may be applied and there is no scope for limiting CIL only to larger properties as suggested.</p> <p>Section 106 agreements are intentionally restrictive in that they are intended to mitigate the site specific impact of a particular development. CIL breaks the link between the monies levied and how they can be spent. The neighbourhood funding element passed on to Parish Councils can be spent on a wide range of things. It can be spent on supporting the development of the area by funding:</p> <p>(a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or  (b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.</p>
6.14	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57757	Object	See response to Question 12	Noted
6.15	Dr Shane Lawrence	58072	Object	The CIL is incorrect and not applicable to residential use and is therefore an illegal proposal. The ability to institute	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) was introduced under Part 11 of the Planning

Q6. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for residential use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				further taxes on residential homes can only be induced by governmental legislation.	Act 2008. Royal assent was obtained on 26 November 2008.
6.16	Milton Parish Council	56996	Comment	No view	Noted
6.17	Savills on behalf of The Consortium comprising Barratt Homes Plc, Bloor Homes Ltd, Grosvenor, Redrow Plc, Taylor Wimpey Plc	57926	Object	<p>The profit on affordable housing should be set at 20% of GDV, not 6%.</p> <p>The £1,500 used to cover planning obligations is too low and should be reconsidered, especially when considering the adopted public art policies.</p>	Noted but please see response to representation 57956
6.18	Ms A Wood	57841	Object	Residential - strategic should be same as one above (one below too). Gallaghers etc stand to make enough money from this as it is. Understand land was very cheap purchase.	The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
7.1	Thomas Eggar LLP on behalf of Asda Stores Ltd	57940	Object	<p>Concern that the viability analysis did not take s106 and s278 contributions into account when assessing the viability of commercial developments.</p> <p>Suggest a flat rate levy be applied across the District for all forms of development based on the total infrastructure needs over the plan period.</p> <p>Alternatively suggest that the Council reduces the CIL charges for large scale retail developments to that of small scale retail developments to ensure consistency and applies a nil rate to all development uses within the strategic development areas.</p>	<p>The Council does not have experience of significant forms of retail development in the District and as a consequence evidence is difficult to identify.</p> <p>The Council would welcome receiving detailed information from the industry to help better assess the viability of such schemes.</p> <p>The viability evidence demonstrated that there was a distinct viability difference based on the scale of retail development although the Council is aware that examiners have in other authorities removed the threshold and applied the higher rate.</p> <p>Additional note:</p> <p>Regulation 5(2) of the CIL Regs 2014 allows charging authorities to set differential rates by reference to the intended floorspace of development, or the intended number of units or dwellings.</p>
7.2	Bourn Parish Council	57635	Support	BournPC agrees with the proposed rate for retail use.	Noted
7.3	Mr Tony Broscumb	57656	Support	no further comment	Noted

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
7.4	Cambourne Parish Council	57816	Support	Yes	Noted
7.5	Cambridge City Council	56971	Support	Cambridge City Council has no objection to the proposed rates for retail use.	Noted
7.6	Cambridgeshire County Council	57746	Support	Yes we support the CIL rate for Retail development.	Noted
7.7	Country Land & Business Association	57704	Comment	We are concerned that these retail charges could have an adverse impact on the provision of rural shops and services, such as village stores or farm shops. Such businesses are usually relatively small enterprises generating marginal returns, but provide essential facilities for rural communities. Without such shops, people are forced to travel to the nearest market town, usually by private car, which puts more pressure on local infrastructure. By encouraging the provision of rural retail, the impact on infrastructure could actually be reduced. We therefore ask that rural shops be given separate consideration, based on a suitable viability assessment.	It is not common for rural shops and services, such as village stores or farm shops to be new build development that attracts a CIL liability. The Council would expect such new business enterprises being a conversion from existing use and therefore exempt from CIL.
7.8	Girton Parish Council	57789	Object	Again we do not understand why you reject the advice of your consultants.  We support a rate of £125, noting that retail puts a greater strain on	The independent advice was for a small shops rate of between £50-75 psm with a larger format retail rate of £125 psm.  The Council has consulted on a



Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				infrastructure, especially roads, than residential development.	<p>Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule that proposes £50 psm for retail development under 280 square metres and £125 psm for retail development over 280 square metres.</p> <p>In all likelihood there are going to be very few new build retail developments coming forward over the life of the plan therefore this particular charge is not a significant income generator.</p>
7.9	Great Abington Parish Council	57773	Support	We agree with the CIL rate for retail use proposed by SCDC	Noted
7.10	Great Shelford Parish Council	57802	Comment	This is possibly on the low side.	Noted
7.11	Haslingfield Parish Council	57733	Comment	No objection.	Noted
7.12	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57758	Object	See response to Question 12	
7.13	Shrimplin Brown Planning & Development on behalf of HPG Sawston Ltd	58021	Object	<p>The Viability Report claims that larger scale retail development is "not central to the development plan delivery as we understand it" (paragraph 3.5.4). However, it can play a central role in terms of achieving many of the Local Plan's key objectives.</p> <p>The Viability Report concludes that the CIL rate for larger format retail should not be more than £125/m<sup>2</sup>. This was</p>	<p>In order to explore future needs for retail development, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned the Cambridge Sub-Regional Retail Study 2008.</p> <p>This showed that retail in Cambridge was performing well and provided an assessment of the need for new floorspace for both comparison goods (items not generally purchased on a</p>

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>already at the higher end of the range of possible charges they investigated.</p> <p>The proposed level of CIL is amongst the highest in the East of England region and considerably higher than that being proposed by Cambridge City Council.</p>	<p>frequent basis e.g. clothing, shoes, electrical goods, furniture, books.) and convenience goods (every day and essential items e.g. food and drink) to 2021.</p> <p>It identified that additional needs were generally related to serving the planned major developments such as Northstowe.</p> <p>The Local Plan therefore is not premised on retail development fulfilling wider key objectives.</p> <p>In addition to the Council is aware that supermarkets wishing to operate in a neighbouring charging authority have not been put off by similar rates being charged. There is therefore evidence that retail development is not rendered unviable through the introduction of CIL.</p>
7.14	Dr Shane Lawrence	58074	Object	CIL applies to speculators and builders and not to retail activities. This is a false and incorrect basis for taxation of small business and is not of legal standing.	<p>Noted but see response to 58072.</p> <p>CIL is applicable to all forms of development where a detailed analysis of the evidence demonstrates that it would be remain a viable proposition.</p>
7.15	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge	57903	Object	As per the discussion within the Viability Study produced by Dixon Searle, particularly paragraphs 3.5.6,	The Council agrees that as strategic sites are likely to have viability issues (even without a residential CIL) that retail

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	(Holdings) Limited			<p>3.6.2 and 3.6.15 (July 2013), we believe that the strategic sites that are subject to a nil residential rate should also have a nil retail rate. The reason being that the additional costs associated with bringing forward a strategic site, such as site enabling costs, remediation/servicing costs, promotion costs and more onerous planning obligations, are not limited only to the residential elements of a scheme but also impact the viability of the retail elements of the development. In a comprehensive development where there are a mix of uses proposed, some higher value uses often cross-subsidise the less viable uses on the scheme to ensure overall viability and deliverability. It is therefore very important that the viability of uses such as retail, when proposed as part of a larger scheme, are not assessed in isolation.</p> <p>We therefore support the conclusions of Dixon Searle that zero CIL rates should have been considered for retail within the strategic sites identified. The narrative within the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule in relation to the proposed retail CIL rates (paragraph</p>	development located in these sites should also have a full CIL exemption to allow for a simpler discussion to take place.

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				3.5) does not refer to the consideration of nil rates within the strategic sites. We would therefore ask SCDC to reconsider the imposition of retail CIL rates within the strategic sites or to provide specific evidence as to the viability of such retail elements when taken as part of a wider mixed use scheme.	
7.16	Savills on behalf of Martin Grant Homes Limited	57849	Object	Within the strategic development areas, both retail and business rates should also be set at zero. The provision of specific s106 agreements for these sites allows for payments to be made towards any impacts of these types of uses, with the flexibility required to maximise the impacts of contributions.	Noted but see comment 57903.  Business rates are proposed being £0 psm throughout the District.
7.17	Milton Parish Council	56997	Comment	no view	Noted
7.18	Indigo Planning Limited on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited	57852	Object	We object to: 1. The £125/sqm for larger retail because this is a significant deterrent to development. A differential rate for large retail runs contrary to guidance contained in paragraph 37 of CIL Guidance December 2012, which is clear in stating that charging schedules "should not impact disproportionately on particular sectors or specialist forms of development", and;	Noted. See comment 57903

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>2. The 280sqm threshold for a higher CIL rate because this is outside the scope of Regulation 13, and discriminates against this type of foodstore. Furthermore, since this type of development does not give rise to significant impacts on a range of infrastructure, the proposed charge is clearly disproportionate and contrary to the Guidance. Paragraph 21 of the recent DCLG Consultation paper on CIL clearly indicates that differentiation by scale is not permissible.</p>	<p>Regulation 5(2) of the CIL Regs 2014 allows charging authorities to set differential rates by reference to the intended floorspace of development, or the intended number of units or dwellings.</p>
7.19	Andrew Martin - Planning Limited on behalf of The Taylor Family & Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	57834	Object	<p>Chapter 4 of the PDCS sets a zero residential rate for strategic development sites. The Taylor family and Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd support this zero residential charge and the use of planning obligations to fund and deliver infrastructure on strategic development sites.</p> <p>However, the same approach does not appear to have been used for new retail floorspace. The table in Chapter 4 suggests that any new retail floorspace at the strategic development sites would incur a CIL charge of £50 / sq m for the first 280 sq m and £125 / sq m thereafter.</p>	Noted. See comment 57903

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				To be consistent with the approach taken for residential, a zero retail charge should be applied to the strategic development sites. This is in the event that new retail floorspace is proposed as part of new local or neighbourhood centre at any of the strategic development sites. A modest quantum of retail floorspace could be delivered in this way at Bourn Airfield, to provide for the day-to-day needs of new residents. The delivery of this or any associated infrastructure would be secured best through the use of planning obligations.	
7.20	Aspinall Verdi Limited on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	57915	Object	<p>Threshold Land Value</p> <p>The RLV must achieve a TLV of level 3 (in between industrial/commercial and residential land values)</p> <p>Information relating to supermarkets is lacking</p> <p>Retail rents are historic</p> <p>Typology</p> <p>Typology in the order of 5,000 to 6,000 sqm more appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted but see comment 57903</p> <p>There are three CIL charging authorities that either border or are very close to South Cambridgeshire that all charge CIL on large forms of retail development on all sites – whether they are strategic</p>

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>Site Density</p> <p>Assumed site coverage for a 2,500sqm is 40%. This should be 30%.</p> <p>Build Cost</p> <p>These do not reflect the rebased median build costs on BCIS. Median figure for hypermarkets/supermarkets between 1,000 and 7,000 sqm (the scheme size modelled) is £1,106psm (September 2013, adjusted for Cambridgeshire area). DPS have used a rate of £1,019.</p> <p>Rate for Small Retail up to 1,000 sqm on BCIS is £947 psm. DSP used £706.</p> <p>Professional Fees</p> <p>10% is too low. This should be 12-15%. For larger convenience retail, given costs around planning, survey and design the professional fees are in the order of 14-15%.</p> <p>Cashflow period</p> <p>The appraisals for large retail have</p>	<p>sites or not. The Council has given significant weight to these charging schedules given that all three were subject to robust assessment during their respective examinations. The details of these charges are as follows:</p> <p>Bedford Borough Council Convenience based supermarkets and superstores and retail warehouses (net retailing space over 280 sq m) = £120 psm</p> <p>East Cambridgeshire District Council Retail development1 (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5) and sui generis uses akin to retail (e.g. petrol filling stations and motor-sales units) = £120 psm</p> <p>Huntingdonshire District Council All A Class Uses &gt;500 sq m = £100 psm</p>

Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				used a 15 month build. Suggest a minimum a period of 36 months from project inception.	<p>The Council is aware that several supermarkets are planning on building new stores in these authorities and that a planning application on behalf of WM Morrisons Supermarkets Plc has submitted a planning application for a new supermarket with a Net Tradable Area of 5922 square metres in St Ives where Huntingdonshire District Council charge £100 psm.</p> <p>The Council is not persuaded by the representations submitted in response to the preliminary draft charging schedule such as to believe that the proposed rate of £125 would render development unviable.</p> <p>It is the Council's view that the proposed rates are informed by and consistent with, the evidence on economic viability across the charging authority's area and that this is also consistent with the fact that relevant retail development is coming forward in neighbouring authorities.</p>
7.21	Ms A Wood	57842	Object	Encourage small businesses. So greater than 280 sqm should be £300.	The CIL Regulations do not permit charging authorities to use CIL charges to deliver wider policy objectives. All CIL



<b>Q7. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rates for retail use?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					charges have to be based on evidence of economic viability.

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
8.1	Bourn Parish Council	57636	Object	BournPC does not agree with a zero rate for business use given the rates being applied for retail. It would prefer a rate to be set and then discretionary powers being exercised to protect SME / start-up businesses.	<p>The independent viability assessment demonstrated that whilst retail use was sufficiently viable to justify a CIL charge the same was not the case for business use developments. This assessment is supported by evidence of business site allocations/permissions that have not come forward for development.</p> <p>As explained in response to Rep number 57939 above the Council would be unable to apply a discretionary relief policy to protect SME / start-up businesses as this would likely constitute as state aid.</p>
8.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57657	Object	There should be a variable rate for business use. Some business projects impose a significant demand on infrastructure (e.g. Transport Hub) and should make appropriate contribution. SCDC should have flexibility to impose CIL rates from £0 to £150 for business use.	<p>It is accepted that some business projects do have an impact on infrastructure; however the evidence does not support any CIL charge on business use.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations do allow the local planning authority to continue to use planning obligations to secure certain infrastructure so long as the following tests are satisfied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms</li> <li>• Directly related to the development</li> <li>• Fairly and reasonably related in scale</li> </ul>

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					and kind to the development
8.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57817	Support	Yes	Noted
8.4	Cambridge City Council	56972	Support	Cambridge City Council has no objection to the proposed rates for business use, as it is borne out by the approach already taken by Cambridge City Council for this type of use	Noted
8.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57747	Object	The County Council question the £0 rate proposal for South Cambs and whether a charge isn't viable especially given the thriving local economy and specifically in those most sought after areas	<p>The independent viability assessment demonstrated that business development was viable in the District.</p> <p>The Council notes that both Huntingdonshire and East Cambridgeshire District Councils are not charging CIL on business uses and that the Cambridge City Draft Charging Schedule also proposes a zero charge.</p> <p>This will be kept under review and be subject to scrutiny with any future CIL charging schedules.</p> <p>This approach does not preclude the local planning authorities from securing works or financial contributions so long as the relevant tests are satisfied.</p>
8.6	Country Land & Business Association	57711	Comment	Many buildings required by rural businesses are replacing obsolescent ones with no consequential impact on	CIL Regulation 13 allows a charging authority to set differential rates based on 'intended uses of development'. The

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>infrastructure at all. Any increase in the value of the property is directly related to the costs of the new building, with little or no enhancement in the overall land value. They are generally not buildings into which people normally go.</p> <p>We suggest that "agricultural, horticultural and forestry development" is clearly added to the uses already set at a zero charge to avoid any confusion over the matter. This approach has already been taken by other authorities in the East of England.</p>	Council does, however, intend to use the use class order to help define the development that is to be charged CIL.
8.7	Girton Parish Council	57790	Object	We do not see why business should be exempt and reject the proposal to exempt business development.	The independent viability assessment demonstrated that whilst retail use was sufficiently viable to justify a CIL charge the same was not the case for business use developments. This assessment is supported by evidence of business site allocations/permissions that have not come forward for development.
8.8	Great Abington Parish Council	57774	Support	We agree with the CIL rate for business use proposed by SCDC	Noted
8.9	Great Shelford Parish Council	57803	Comment	This is possibly on the low side.	Noted
8.10	Haslingfield Parish Council	57734	Comment	No objection.	Noted
8.11	Histon & Impington	57759	Object	See response to Question 12	Noted

Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Parish Council			In addition, loss of contribution to area transport plans	
8.12	Shrimplin Brown Planning & Development on behalf of HPG Sawston Ltd	58022	Support	The Council's viability evidence makes clear that business development (B Class) is not viable enough to support a CIL charge. As highlighted by the viability evidence, the same conclusion has been reached by other local planning authorities throughout the country.	Noted
8.13	Dr Shane Lawrence	58075	Object	CIL applies to speculators and builders and not to general business activities on the same basis as residential and retail application. It is illegal and not correct.	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) was introduced under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008. Royal assent was obtained on 26 November 2008.
8.14	Milton Parish Council	56998	Comment	no view	Noted
8.15	Porta Planning LLP on behalf of Wellcome Trust	57647	Support	Wellcome Trust supports the nil charge proposed for business uses. Most development at the Genome Campus is funded from either charitable or public sector means and often on a competitive or bid basis that is national or international in nature.  If a CIL charge were to be applied to Class B1(b) research and development activities, this would adversely affect the ability of the	Noted

<b>Q8. Do you agree with the proposed CIL rate for business use?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				Genome Campus to continue to attract investment on the Campus and to operate competitively.	
8.16	Ms A Wood	57844	Comment	"All other uses"? No should be same as retail psm	Noted

Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
9.1	Bourn Parish Council	57637	Comment	BournPC would consider some leisure activities related to tourism as a valid candidate for CIL	The independent viability evidence concluded that this use type had marginal viability at best and therefore the Council is not proposing a CIL charge.
9.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57658	Comment	Include Agricultural development such as barns, storage and handling facilities	CIL is exempt on buildings into which people do not normally go or where they go intermittently for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery. As such it would likely be the case that these suggested uses would not be charged CIL.
9.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57818	Object	No	Noted
9.4	Cambridge City Council	56973	Comment	The supporting viability evidence identified the potential to levy a charge of up to £125 per sq.m on student accommodation, if occurring at or near to the District/City border. The decision not to levy a charge may relate to the scale of development set to come forward in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan but Cambridge City` Council would like a clear explanation as to why South Cambridgeshire District Council have opted not to levy a charge.	At the time the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was consulted on there were no identified development proposals through the Local Plan in terms of student accommodation. As such, despite the independent viability assessment highlighting that such use was a viable for of development, the Council did not include student accommodation in the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule.  The Council has now been made aware of at least one student accommodation scheme being considered and as a result the Council is reconsidering its position in respect of this form of development.

Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Country Land & Business Association	57713	Comment	<p>We are concerned to note that there is no specific reference to "agricultural, horticultural and forestry development" in the charging schedule.</p> <p>As we explained in our response to Q8, many buildings required by rural businesses replace obsolescent ones and have no consequential impact on infrastructure at all. There is little or no enhancement in the overall land value. We suggest that "agricultural, horticultural and forestry development" is clearly added to "all other uses" already set at a zero charge to avoid any confusion over the matter.</p>	CIL Regulation 13 allows a charging authority to set differential rates based on 'intended uses of development'. The Council does, however, intend to use the use class order to help define the development that is to be charged CIL.
9.5	Girton Parish Council	57791	Comment	Extraction of raw materials - quarrying, mineral extraction and gravel extraction - should incur CIL	<p>The independent viability assessment confirmed that there was no evidence to support a CIL charge of these forms of development but the Council would welcome additional information on viability if consultees considered that they would be able to support a CIL charge.</p> <p>It should also be noted that CIL is only charged on building that people normally go (and not on buildings that people go for the purpose of inspecting machinery</p>



Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					etc)
9.6	Great Abington Parish Council	57775	Comment	We are not aware of any other use the CIL rate should apply to	Noted
9.7	Great Shelford Parish Council	57804	Support	The CIL should apply to distribution centres. With the growth of on-line shopping it seems unfair that retail shops should pay but centres which are effectively retailing on line do not. They require the transport network for their business and should therefore contribute.	The CIL charging schedule is worked up alongside the emerging Local Plan which stated at policy E/11 that 'Large scale warehousing and distribution centres will not be permitted in the District'.  As such the Council do not consider it necessary to have a CIL rate specifically for that type of use.
9.8	Haslingfield Parish Council	57735	Comment	Suggest that there should be a small CIL rate for industrial/workshop development outside strategic development sites	The independent viability assessment confirmed that there was no evidence to support even a modest CIL rate for industrial/workshop development.
9.9	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57760	Support	All but long term charitable (including faith) and Council (County/District/Parish) developments should make some contribution to transport and road infrastructure	In accordance with the CIL Regulations and guidance the proposed rates are to be informed by and consistent with evidence on economic viability.  An independent assessment has confirmed the use types that are able to support a CIL charge therefore the Council is unable at this time to apply CIL to other forms of development.  This approach does not preclude the local planning authorities from securing works or financial contributions so long

<b>Q9. Do you consider that the District Council should apply a CIL rate for any other use?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					as the relevant tests are satisfied.
9.10	Dr Shane Lawrence	58076	Object	The CIL is not lawful and not actively supported by an Act of Parliament. Therefore the Council is not at liberty to use CIL proposals in any other way than speculation considerations.	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) was introduced under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008. Royal assent was obtained on 26 November 2008.
9.11	Milton Parish Council	56999	Comment	no view	Noted
9.12	The Theatres Trust	57832	Support	We support the setting of a nil rate for 'All other uses' as D1, D2 and some sui generis uses (e.g. theatres) often do not generate sufficient income streams to cover their costs. Consequently, they require some form of subsidy to operate. This type of facility is very unlikely to be built by the private sector.	Noted
9.13	Ms A Wood	57843	Comment	Not sure what else is meant? Parks and leisure e.g. pubs, cafes (e.g services) should be £50 psm	In accordance with the CIL Regulations and guidance the proposed rates are to be informed by and consistent with evidence on economic viability.  An independent assessment has confirmed the use types that are able to support a CIL charge therefore the Council is unable at this time to apply CIL to other forms of development.

<b>Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
10.1	Bourn Parish Council	57638	Object	BournPC does not agree with a zero rate for strategic sites because this implies that nearby communities will get no direct benefit from such developments - even though these can have a major impact on those communities with respect to traffic, services and landscape degradation.	<p>The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.</p> <p>The section 106 agreement would secure all necessary on and offsite infrastructure thereby mitigating the impact of the development.</p> <p>The Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule proposes to apply a £0 CIL on residential development but that other forms of development would still be liable. As such Parish Councils would still benefit from a Neighbourhood contribution.</p>
10.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57659	Support	no further comment	Noted
10.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57819	Support	Yes as this approach allows all infrastructure requirements to be considered this should involve the local Parish Councils in identifying their needs.	Noted
10.4	Cambridge City Council	56974	Support	Yes. This is the most appropriate approach for sites of this scale.	Noted

<b>Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Cambridgeshire County Council	57748	Support	The County Council supports the use of Section 106 and Section 278's for strategic development sites. This ensures that all the key pieces of infrastructure that are needed to support a site are funded and delivered. However we would also look to the possible use of S106 offsite particularly on two 2 strategic sites land north of Newmarket Road, Cambridge East (Wing) and Cambourne West where we would expect to be seeking developer contributions for offsite facilities - the proposed new Barnwell Community Hub which will include Barnwell Road library and the existing Cambourne Library.	<p>The section 106 agreement for these developments would secure all necessary on and offsite infrastructure thereby mitigating the impact of the development.</p> <p>The Council will, however, be restricted in this approach in that it will not be able to secure more than 5 planning obligations towards one item of infrastructure.</p>
10.5	Y Emerson	57014	Support	So long as it doesn't mean developers try to fulfil obligations on the cheap.	Noted
10.6	Gamlingay Parish Council	57128	Support	Yes - the wider implications of how large developments and new settlements affect the local environment require a more strategic approach. There should also be scope for using traditional s.106 approach for rural centres and minor rural centres where provision for health and/or education falls to a neighbouring authority. In Gamlingay	<p>The CIL Regulation do not preclude the Council securing financial contributions via a section 106 agreement on small scale development so long as the relevant tests are satisfied.</p> <p>The Council will not be able to secure section 106 contributions on any item that is on the infrastructure list (Regulation 123 list).</p>

<b>Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				for example provision for Upper School education and health falls to Central Bedfordshire and Beds/Herts/Essex Health PCT. The requirement to ring fence monies to be spent on projects benefiting local communities who have their affiliation to neighbouring market towns outside the district needs to be addressed.	The Council will, however, be restricted in this approach in that it will not be able to secure more than 5 planning obligations towards one item of infrastructure.
10.7	Girton Parish Council	57794	Support	Yes but this need not be exclusive	Noted
10.8	Great Abington Parish Council	57776	Support	We agree that SCDC should maintain the use of planning obligations for onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites	Noted
10.9	Great Shelford Parish Council	57805	Support	Support.	Noted
10.10	Haslingfield Parish Council	57736	Comment	Use of planning obligations (status quo) on strategic sites has not always been successful in getting developers to implement community needs early enough in the time scale of a development. It is still up to SCDC to negotiate hard, enforce hard and include penalties on developers for non-compliance	Noted
10.11	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57761	Support	Support	Noted
10.12	Dr Shane Lawrence	58078	Object	The Council cannot use planning obligations to further infrastructure	Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a Local

Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				projects and the legal justification of this does not exist. Infrastructure can be funded from Central Government only.	Planning Authority to enter into a legally-binding agreement or planning obligation with a landowner in association with the granting of planning permission. The obligation is termed a Section 106 Agreement. These agreements are a way of delivering or addressing matters that are necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.
10.13	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57904	Support	Strategic sites that have a requirement for onsite infrastructure to mitigate their impacts will benefit from having certainty of delivery of those items of infrastructure. This certainty cannot necessarily be guaranteed through CIL due to the pooled nature of the funds and the onus on the LPA to facilitate delivery. There is therefore a preference, in certain site specific circumstances, for onsite infrastructure to be able to be delivered through planning obligations. However, where there is an assumption and intention to proceed with planning obligations for the funding and delivery of infrastructure items that could potentially be funded through CIL, SCDC must make clear that intention	<p>The Council intends publishing an infrastructure list that will demonstrate how CIL receipts will be used and therefore how planning obligations will be restricted.</p> <p>CIL guidance also requires the charging authority to be clear on how it will continue to use section 106 agreements to avoid any double dipping.</p> <p>This information will be set out clearly at the time the Council consults on the Draft Charging Schedule.</p>

Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				from the outset. It must be made clear within the assumptions and allowances within the viability evidence and, critically, SCDC must be absolutely transparent that there is no double counting, in accordance with the CIL Guidance (paragraphs 84 to 91, DCLG, April 2013).	
10.14	Savills on behalf of Martin Grant Homes	57847	Support	<p>The strategic development sites will have very specific needs arising directly from the proposals. The detail of such payments and their timing can be tailored through the use of individual s106 agreements to ensure that the benefits arising from the development are maximised. For instance, the specific timing of payments towards highways or education can be co-ordinated so that payments are made only when relevant infrastructure is needed. This allows impacts of infrastructure costs on viability to be kept to a minimum, assisting deliverability.</p> <p>The use of s106 agreements would also allow flexibility in the provision of affordable housing and infrastructure.</p>	Noted
10.15	Milton Parish Council	57000	Comment	Yes	Noted

Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
10.16	Rampton Parish Council	56887	Support	Yes, seems to work well to date.	Noted
10.17	Andrew Martin - Planning Limited on behalf of The Taylor Family & Countryside Properties	57835	Support	<p>By their very nature and scale, strategic development sites generate their own specific infrastructure requirements and have the capability of accommodating infrastructure in a way that smaller or windfall development sites typically cannot.</p> <p>Although the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) provides greater transparency as to the charges new development will incur in a particular district / borough, the non-negotiable nature of CIL makes it unsuitable for the largest development projects which, more often than not, will deliver infrastructure as part of the development itself. Indeed in such cases it is desirable for strategic development sites to provide infrastructure directly, rather than a standard charge through CIL that is likely to deliver infrastructure elsewhere, in order to create sustainable new communities and ensure that new residents have easy access to services and facilities.</p>	Noted



<b>Q10. Do you agree that the District Council should maintain the use of planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure on strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				For these reasons the Taylor family and Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd support the District Council's decision to maintain the use of planning obligations to fund and deliver infrastructure on strategic development sites.	
10.18	Ms A Wood	57845	Support	Support	Noted

<b>Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
11.1	Bourn Parish Council	57639	Object	BournPC does not agree with a zero rate for strategic development sites. Rates should be set that are commensurate with other smaller sites.	<p>The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.</p> <p>If the Council was to pursue a strategy of applying a residential CIL to strategic development sites it would have to reduce the amount of infrastructure funded by way of a section 106 agreement which in turn would have implications for delivery.</p>
11.2	Mr Tony Broscomb	57660	Support	Yes as long as all on-site infrastructure is fully funded through S106	Noted
11.3	Cambourne Parish Council	57820	Support	Yes as long as the s106 is above the CIL level for the development (including residential and Retail)	Noted
11.4	Cambridge City Council	56975	Support	Cambridge City Council recognises that the proposed rate is a matter for the appropriate charging authority in terms of striking an appropriate balance and acknowledges that the ability to develop viably the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan should not be threatened by inappropriate CIL rates.	Noted

Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
11.5	Cambridgeshire County Council	57749	Support	Yes we agree that there should be a zero rate applied to development sites. Should CIL be charged on a strategic development site then this can take money away from the S106 contribution and create viability issues for the developer and mean that important pieces of infrastructure go unfounded.	Noted
11.6	Y Emerson	57015	Object	No, CIL should be applied to strategic development sites too; it's not enough for the developer to do the bare minimum then walk away.	The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.
11.7	Gamlingay Parish Council	57148	Comment	Zero rating for residential may be acceptable, as long as strategic impact of other use classes are comprehensively identified and levies secured. Neighbouring communities which are significantly affected by new settlements need to be empowered with CIL contributions at a level which enables them to actively influence how moneys are spent for their benefit.	Noted
11.8	Girton Parish Council	57792	Object	No, we do not see why they should be exempt from the rates applied elsewhere in the District	The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable

Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
					<p>housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.</p> <p>If the Council was to pursue a strategy of applying a residential CIL to strategic development sites it would have to reduce the amount of infrastructure funded by way of a section 106 agreement which in turn would have implications for delivery.</p>
11.9	Great Abington Parish Council	57777	Support	We agree that SCDC should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites	Noted
11.10	Great Shelford Parish Council	57806	Support	Support initially but once a development has reached a critical mass it should contribute otherwise the strategic site will continue to suck in funding for which other villages will be paying.	If the Council grants planning permission for the whole strategic development site, while at the same time operating a CIL charging schedule that includes residential development of strategic sites at a zero rate, it would be unable to then activate CIL for this development.
11.11	Haslingfield Parish Council	57737	Comment	Use of nil CIL should be effective in holding prices as low as possible, helping sales and lead to the success of strategic development site projects	Noted
11.12	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57762	Support	Support	Noted
11.13	Dr Shane Lawrence	58079	Object	Strategic development sites are nominal sites only and not therefore rateable. There is no legal basis for	Noted

Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/object/comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				this action at all.	
11.14	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57905	Support	<p>We support the zero residential rate proposed for the Strategic sites. Delivery of the relevant and related infrastructure to facilitate the bringing forward of these sites remains critical, but we welcome the consideration by SCDC of the site specific costs associated with such types of sites.</p> <p>We would welcome engagement on the drafting of the Regulation 123 list of infrastructure as well as further discussions about the ongoing use of planning obligations to secure site specific infrastructure, to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure is not jeopardised in any way.</p> <p>With regard to the boundaries and locations of the 'strategic sites' allocated a nil residential CIL rate, we would suggest that the proposed 'nil' rated sites extend to the land allocated for housing within the Adopted Cambridge East Area Action Plan north of Cherry Hinton. This land will be subject to similar constraints and costs as with the other strategic sites identified and should therefore have the same CIL rate applied for</p>	Noted

Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				consistency.	
11.15	Savills on behalf of Martin Grant Homes Limited	57848	Support	The payments towards impacts of residential properties should be zero rated to allow full flexibility in s106 negotiations.	Noted
11.16	Milton Parish Council	57001	Comment	No view	Noted
11.17	Rampton Parish Council	56888	Object	As with the instalment proposal it is complication that could lead to abuse. Aim for uniformity and simplicity in regulations.	The Council considers that in order to achieve simplicity and ensure the delivery of all necessary infrastructure, section 106 agreements should be used.  The independent assessment demonstrated that once the Council had applied the necessary 40% affordable housing provision with a section 106 agreement totalling £20,000 per dwelling there was no ability to levy a residential CIL charge as well.
11.18	Andrew Martin - Planning Limited on behalf of The Taylor Family & Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd	57836	Support	The infrastructure requirements of strategic development sites will be met best through the use of planning obligations and not CIL - as set out in the response to Question 10. Therefore to avoid the potential for double charging, it is appropriate for a zero residential CIL rate to be set for the strategic development sites. Setting a zero residential rate also provides the strategic development sites with certainty that a significant	Noted

<b>Q11. Do you agree that the Council should have a zero residential rate for strategic development sites?</b>					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>CIL charge will not be thrust upon them mid-way through the Local Plan or planning application process - which may take several years to conclude.</p> <p>Accordingly the Taylor family and Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd support the District Council's approach in this regard.</p>	
11.19	Ms A Wood	57846	Object	See question 6	Noted

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
12.1	Mr Tony Broscumb	57661	Comment	SCDC should work with neighbouring councils (e.g. St Edmundsbury) to ensure that major development across the border contributes to infrastructure within South Cambs. e.g. major residential development in Haverhill must contribute to road and transport infrastructure in South Cambs.	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Study was undertaken by South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Councils with input from Cambridgeshire County Council.</p> <p>On service delivery (i.e. allocating CIL funds) the Council will look beyond its borders to the needs of the Council as a whole.</p> <p>However, St Edmundsbury are yet to give an indication that they are to introduce CIL.</p>
12.2	Cambridgeshire County Council	57750	Comment	None	Noted
12.3	Gamlingay Parish Council	57149	Comment	Gamlingay parish Council would like to be further consulted on how and when CIL payments will be made to Parish Councils and what monitoring and restrictions will be placed on them with regard to expenditure and administration of CIL resources. Further details are sought with regard to how the Infrastructure Delivery Plan details the process of how parish councils put forward local projects to meet identified needs of their local community and how these are prioritised.	The detailed Governance arrangements for how CIL receipts will be allocated are yet to be worked up but it is expected that this process will involve input from service providers including Parish Councils.
12.4	Girton Parish Council	57795	Comment	No	Noted



Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
12.5	Great Abington Parish Council	57779	Comment	We would like to state how important we feel the role of the Parish Council is in the Community Infrastructure Levy process. The Parish Council should be able to make its own decisions about how its proportion of Community Infrastructure Levy funds are spent and should not be forced into larger schemes by the other authorities unless these match with its own priorities.	<p>The detailed Governance arrangements for how CIL receipts will be allocated are yet to be worked up but it is expected that this process will involve input from service providers including Parish Councils.</p> <p>Parish Councils will have full control over the Neighbourhood contribution that they receive, although Parish Councils will also have the ability to put this contribution towards larger infrastructure projects that the Parish Council is not responsible for (i.e. transport improvements).</p>
12.6	Harrow Estates Plc	57961	Comment	Request that the Regulation 123 list is made available for comment at the earliest opportunity.	Noted.
12.7	Haslingfield Parish Council	57738	Comment	No further comments at this stage of CIL development	Noted
12.8	Histon & Impington Parish Council	57763	Object	<p>1. No allowance for changing expectations on land value return.</p> <p>2. Possible range of up to £150 psm. No justification for use of a 'round figure' of £125 psm. Sensitivity should have focussed on differences in £1 psm.</p>	<p>The Levy is expected to have a positive economic impact on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.</p> <p>This balance is at the centre of the charge-setting process and as such the</p>

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>3. No case for single residential rate. Difference in sales values should affect CIL rates.</p> <p>4. No allowance for current contributions.</p> <p>5. No information on the likely level of funding generated from CIL and comparison against s106 payments.</p> <p>6. Need to identify what projects will be funded.</p>	<p>charging schedule is not expected to exactly mirror the evidence. The CIL Guidance February 2014 also requires that a buffer be included so that the levy is able to support changes in economic circumstances.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are a wide range of residential sales values across the District. However, viability the evidence did not highlight that these values were reflected in distinct zones that would be defensible during a public examination.</p> <p>The viability assessment has allowed for a s106 contribution to mitigate site specific impact</p> <p>The Council will publish supporting information highlighting the historic success of s106 agreements and how this compares with CIL</p> <p>A Regulation 123 infrastructure list will be consulted on alongside the Draft</p>

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>7. No reference to CIL rate monitoring and review.</p> <p>8. Concern regarding the Parish Council contribution against historic s106 payments and how shortfall will be met.</p>	<p>Charging Schedule</p> <p>Charging authorities commonly commit to reviewing CIL every 3 years</p> <p>The Council acknowledges this and will enable Parish Councils to help shape the final Regulation 123 infrastructure list</p>
12.9	Dr Shane Lawrence	58080	Object	The whole preliminary draft charging schedule is not based on law, either existing or proposed and is therefore invalid and unworkable.	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) was introduced under Part 11 of the Planning Act 2008. Royal assent was obtained on 26 November 2008.
12.10	Linton Parish Council	57765	Comment	<p>There are concerns that CIL will just go to SCDC and will be used to fund their shortfalls in finance. CIL should go to the area that is affected by development. For example, if it is in-fill housing, then the Parish should get the money - and Parishes should always be asked how CIL is allocated. The area affected should have its voice heard. Councils should be transparent and publish how their CIL money has been spent.</p> <p>CIL should be applicable to all</p>	<p>In England, where there is a neighbourhood development plan in place, or permission was granted by a neighbourhood development order (including by a community right to build order), the charging authority must pass 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy funds to the parish councils in whose area the chargeable development takes place. Where there is no neighbourhood development plan this amount is 15%, subject to a cap of £100 per household in the parish council area per year.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations restrict the Council</p>

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				new-build, including extensions to homes and business premises. To restrict it to build of over 100 sq.m. will see applications coming in at just less than this, and being exempt of charge even if they cause problems for the locality. We could see greater demand on infrastructure and facilities without anything to mitigate the effects of this expansion.	is what may be liable for a CIL charge. Proposed changes to the Regulations will exempt residential extensions from being CIL liable.
12.11	Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	57906	Comment	<p>Site Boundaries</p> <p>The maps provided at Appendix 7 of the PDCS show the boundaries of the 'strategic' sites that are subject to a zero rate for residential. In respect of the boundary for the site at Map 2 - Land North of Newmarket Road - given the scale of the map used (which has not been but should be stated) we would recommend allowing a tolerance on the site boundary to ensure that the entire development area is captured and that there is no inadvertent exclusion of peripheral areas. As the masterplan for the Wing site is progressed, it is recommended that SCDC and Marshall of</p>	Noted.

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>Cambridge liaise to ensure that the site boundaries are consistent.</p> <p>Payment in Kind</p> <p>We would strongly suggest that SCDC also implement a payment in kind policy to allow for the transfer of land in lieu of CIL liabilities. This is particularly important for those developments where there will be a requirement for the provision of land to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure via CIL. We also understand that the proposed amendments to the CIL Regulations may allow for the delivery and transfer of infrastructure itself in lieu of payment of CIL. SCDC should therefore have a policy in place to capitalise on the benefit of this flexibility within the Regulations, whether existing or proposed.</p>	<p>Noted. Due to the approach taken in respect of strategic sites the Council does not anticipate those smaller sites being necessary to provide onsite infrastructure and therefore a payment in kind policy is not necessary. The Council will however keep this under review.</p>
12.12	Milton Parish Council	57002	Comment	If zero residential rate for strategic development sites then SCDC must use planning obligations to fund onsite infrastructure.	Noted
12.13	Rampton Parish	56889	Comment	There is a proposal to abate levy	Noted

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	Council			payout from 25% to 15% where villages do not have Neighbourhood plans. Many small villages (Rampton is one) have looked at the need for such a plan and decided they are not needed given their size, yet it is in such small villages that facilities are lacking,rural deprivation is most acute and funds could have the greatest impact.	
12.14	Swavesey Parish Council	57343	Comment	In comparison to S106 community open space and indoor community facilities funding which currently comes to parish councils, it seems that parishes with low level development (such as Swavesey) will be approx 50% worse off in community funding receipts under CIL. What consultation with parish councils and communities will take place to decide how the District and County Councils will spend the remaining CIL funding? Only 15% will come through to parishes. How much influence can parish councils have on how that remaining funding is to be spent?	The detailed Governance arrangements for how CIL receipts will be allocated are yet to be worked up but it is expected that this process will involve input from service providers including Parish Councils.
12.15	Savills on behalf of	57928	Comment	Concern that without sight on the	Noted. See comment 57905

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
	The Consortium comprising Barratt Homes Plc, Bloor Homes Ltd, Grosvenor, Redrow Plc, Taylor Wimpey Plc			<p>R123 list there could be a situation of 'double dipping'</p> <p>Request for supporting information in respect of CIL calculation, appeals procedures, relief application, payments in kind etc</p> <p>Recommend that a review mechanism is adopted whereby the CIL charging schedule is reviewed on a 6 monthly basis with the findings published on the Councils website.</p>	<p>This information will be made available in accordance with the Regulations.</p> <p>The Council intends reviewing CIL on a regular basis (suggestion at this moment is every 12 months) in response to changing market conditions.</p>
12.16	The Theatres Trust	57833	Comment	Paragraph 2.2 lists types of infrastructure, but does not include infrastructure as defined by the National Planning Policy at item 156 which states that Local Plans should set out strategic priorities to deliver the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities. Community and cultural facilities should be included in the list.	Noted. See comment 57905
12.17	Aspinall Verdi Limited on behalf of Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	57916	Comment	In summary further work and testing needs to be undertaken to explore the robustness of the CIL rate for Retail. The key elements	Noted.

Q12. Do you have any other comments on the preliminary draft charging schedule that have not been covered by the previous questions?					
Internal no	Respondent	Rep number	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of response	South Cambridgeshire District Council response
				<p>to be reviewed are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transactional evidence is needed to support the land values, and current rents used in the appraisal;</li> <li>2. The development density for large retail needs to be reviewed;</li> <li>3. The construction cost, professional fees and the additional costs all need to be reviewed and adjusted.</li> </ol>	