

Merton Council

Cabinet

14 January 2019

Supplementary agenda 1

- | | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 4 | Reference from scrutiny - strategic approach to parking charges | 1 - 4 |
| 12 | Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy Ward Allocation Scheme | 5 - 20 |

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Cabinet

Date: 14 January 2019

Wards: All

Subject: Reference from the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel – public health, air quality and sustainable transport, a strategic approach to parking charges

Lead officer: Julia Regan, Head of Democracy Services

Lead member: Councillor Laxmi Attawar, Chair of the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Contact officer: Julia.regan@merton.gov.uk; 0208 545 3864

Recommendations:

-
1. The Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel recommends that Cabinet take into account its reference set out in paragraph 2.8 below when making future decisions on the strategic approach to parking charges and on the associated public consultation.
-

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. At its meeting on 9 January 2019 the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel received a report on a strategic approach to parking charges that was referred to the Panel by Cabinet at its meeting on 10 December 2018. The Panel was asked to discuss and comment on the report and agree any reference it wished to make back to Cabinet.
- 1.2. The Panel agreed to make a reference to Cabinet, as set out in paragraph 2.8 below.

2 DETAILS

2.1. Scrutiny process

- 2.2. The Panel received a detailed report setting out the proposals and background information including an equality impact assessment.
- 2.3. The Panel heard representations from Sustainable Merton, LOVE Wimbledon and a local resident. The speaker from Sustainable Merton urged the council to use positive communication and other tools to encourage changes in driver behaviour instead of pursuing higher parking charges. The speaker from LOVE Wimbledon regretted that the business community had not been involved in the development of the strategy so far, questioned the impact that the proposals would have on the level of traffic and asked that the policy of charging for parking after 6pm be reviewed. The local resident said that she thought the proposals discriminated against residents in Wimbledon and doubted that the proposals would have an impact on pollution, she thought drivers would seek avoidance measures such as paving over gardens.

2.4. Panel members asked questions and sought responses to concerns raised. Responses were provided by the Director of Environment and Regeneration and the Director of Public Health. They explained the rationale behind the proposed strategy and cited research from a study carried out by Leeds University which demonstrated that charging policy had an impact on car use.

2.5. Full details of points made in the discussion will be published in the minutes of the meeting.

2.6. **Scrutiny response**

2.7. The Panel discussed whether to respond to Cabinet or to make a referral to Council. Three motions were debated and subsequently fell;

- A motion to refer the matter to Council on the basis that the proposal falls outside the Budget and Policy Framework was defeated. (Three voted in favour, four against)
- A motion that 'recommends to Cabinet that targeting one half of the borough and not the other is deeply unfair on the residents of Wimbledon and Raynes Park and that until such time that the public transport links and by association air quality are improved in Mitcham, the parking tax proposals be rejected' was defeated. (Three voted in favour, four against)
- A motion that 'refers back to the Cabinet that a different solution is needed to help bridge the health gap between the East and West of the borough which the current proposal does not achieve' was defeated. (Two votes for, five against, one abstention)

2.8. Panel RESOLVED (five votes for, two against and one abstention) to make the following reference to Cabinet:

"The Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel welcomes this opportunity to comment on the report and to raise issues for consideration by Cabinet. The Panel recognises the need to improve public health and air quality in the borough and welcomes this attempt to use the parking charges strategy as one of the levers to address these important issues. The Panel has previously taken an active role in scrutinising air quality issues and has examined the link between air quality, vehicle emissions and traffic speed through pre-decision scrutiny and two call-ins relating to the diesel levy. Cabinet is asked to note that the Panel plans to monitor the implementation of the diesel levy to assess whether the policy is beginning to have an impact on desired outcomes. The Panel also plan to take an active role in contributing to the terms of reference for a review of the levy in 2019/20.

The Panel request that Cabinet should receive additional evidence to demonstrate that increasing parking charges results in a decrease in traffic, and on the link between higher costs for high polluting cars and changing the behaviour of drivers.

The Panel welcomes Cabinet's plan for public consultation on these proposals and recommends that Cabinet share the results with the Panel so that it can contribute additional thoughts prior to a final decision being made by Cabinet.

The Panel also welcomes the review planned 6-12 months after implementation of the new charges (paragraph 2.3.26 of the report) and recommends that the Panel also has an opportunity to carry out pre-decision scrutiny of the findings.”

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1. None – Cabinet is required under the council’s constitution to receive, consider and respond to references from overview and scrutiny.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 4.1. Invitations to provide submissions to the Panel were sent to a wide range of residents’ associations and local community organisations.

5 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. These are included in the report to Cabinet on 10 December 2018 and the subsequent report to the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 9 January 2019.

6 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. Cabinet is required under the council’s constitution to receive, consider and respond to references from overview and scrutiny. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 requires Cabinet to respond to reports and recommendations made by scrutiny committees within two months of written notice being given.

7 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. These are included in the report to Cabinet on 10 December 2018 and the subsequent report to the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 9 January 2019.

8 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. These are included in the report to Cabinet on 10 December 2018 and the subsequent report to the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 9 January 2019.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. These are included in the report to Cabinet on 10 December 2018 and the subsequent report to the Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 9 January 2019.

10 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- None

11 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 11.1. None

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Cabinet

Date: 14th January 2019

Agenda item:

Wards: All wards

Subject: **Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy ward allocation scheme**

Lead officer: James McGinlay, Assistant Director for Sustainable Communities

Lead member: Councillor Martin Whelton, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

Contact officer: Tim Catley CIL and S106 officer, FutureMerton

Reason for Urgency: The legal requirements for Access to Information have not been met. The Chair has approved the urgent submission of this item for the following reason: given the need to ensure that there is no delay to the availability of Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy Funding and associated bidding.

Recommendations

- A. Consider the outcome from the £5k per ward pilot project carried out in 2018
- B. Approve the ward allocation scheme including £15k per ward as set out at paragraph 2.17
- C. Note that the second bidding round for the Neighbourhood Fund will be carried out early in 2019 separately from the ward allocation scheme in accordance with the governance and allocation arrangements approved by Cabinet in 2017, as set out at paragraph 2.19.

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. In January 2018 Cabinet resolved to award each of Merton's 20 wards £5,000 from Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy to spend on public realm improvements determined by the ward councillors.
- 1.2. This was to be a pilot project that could be taken forward for subsequent years if it worked well
- 1.3. This report sets out the lessons learnt from this pilot project and recommends that Cabinet approves the Neighbourhood CIL ward allocation scheme including £15k per ward set out at paragraph 2.17.
- 1.4. The report also notes that the second bidding round for the Neighbourhood Fund will be carried out early in 2019 separately from the ward allocation scheme in accordance with the governance and allocation arrangements approved by Cabinet in 2017, as set out at paragraph 2.19.

2. DETAILS

- 2.1. In September 2017 Cabinet approved governance and criteria for allocating the Neighbourhood proportion of Merton's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income. The process involves bids being submitted by internal services and external organisations for funding from a central pot of Neighbourhood CIL received from developments across the borough. This pot is called the "Neighbourhood Fund". Bids are assessed against the bidding criteria which includes the priorities identified by the 5 different neighbourhoods in Merton during a consultation carried out over the winter 2016-17.

Pilot project - £5k per ward

- 2.2. In addition to the Neighbourhood Fund which is the central pot of Neighbourhood CIL to which the governance and criteria would be applied it was considered that each ward should have its own smaller pot of Neighbourhood CIL with the idea being that schemes could be delivered in advance of the local elections in May 2018.
- 2.3. On 15th January 2018, Cabinet resolved to award each ward £5,000 to be spent on a limited range of public space and public realm improvements. This was to be a pilot project with lessons learnt during the year to be used to inform any formalisation of a Neighbourhood CIL ward allocation scheme in the future.
- 2.4. The Public Space team led the project and asked councillors to put forward ideas for their wards in late February. There was very variable interest from ward to ward.
- 2.5. The potential expenditure of the £5k for each ward covered a wide range of different issues which included highway repairs, environmental spending, new benches, plants and money passed on to community groups to spend. Any expenditure has to (a) meet the Neighbourhood CIL criteria and (b) were not already expected to be provided under existing contracts with Veolia, IdVerde and FM Conway.
- 2.6. Other expenditure (e.g. for specialist cleaning) was reliant on quotes from Veolia or other contractors) to carry out the works.

Lessons learnt from the pilot

- 2.7. The following is a list of issues that arose from the pilot project:
 - **Unclear project scope:**

Councillors had many questions for a variety of council teams before they could make a decision as to which proposals to put forward.

The report to Cabinet in January 2018 needed to be clearer on what was achievable with £5k with projects submitted by councillors far exceeding the money available.
 - **Point of contact for proposals not clear:**

There needed to be clearer lines in how the consideration of project ideas by councillors should be managed internally. As a result, this resulted in a delay in deciding whether they could be funded, but also in seeking estimates for the project and organising delivery.

- **Lack of clarity on timing of project/scope creep/pooling:** The initial idea was that councillors would suggest projects in January /February which would be delivered within three months. However, some projects were subject to seasonal constraints (e.g. planting bulbs in autumn) or wanted to extend the scope of the project. Other ward councillors proposed pooling their £5k allocation with funding available in subsequent years to generate a larger pot of funding.
 - **Delays in feedback on what to do with ward's £5k** although some councillors were enthusiastic in suggesting potential projects, others did not submit projects or asked for the £5k to be held until they could come up with an idea later in 2018 / 2019. This may have been down to the timing and the upcoming election in May 2018 but it led to mixed funding allocations across neighbourhoods.
 - **Clarity as to whether Works were additional to or within contract?** The council delivers most street scene and public realm contracts through three large contracts Veolia (waste, cleaning and gullies), IDVerde (parks, open space, landscaping) FM Conway (highways and street lighting). Officers had to determine whether projects such as street cleaning, planting or painting lamp columns were *additional* to the council's existing contracts and therefore could be carried out via the £5k or were *within* existing service delivery and therefore should not be paying a contractor additional funds to carry out the works. On some occasions, this required officers to undertake site visits to determine the exact situation.
 - **Complex financial arrangements:**

It took until the end of May 2018 to confirm cost codes for raising purchase orders; this has been resolved for future years.
- 2.8. In short the original scope of the £5k per ward pilot project was not clearly enough defined and there was greater administration, governance and communication required than the £5k per ward pilot project allowed for.
- 2.9. In order to address the issues officers have reflected upon how other boroughs are approaching Neighbourhood CIL and are proposing a way forward that retains the basic principles identified for the equitable distribution of CIL to small scale public space projects but provides additional funding and more certainty than the pilot project.

Other borough approaches

- 2.10. Other authorities have taken various approaches to spending Neighbourhood CIL. Appendix 1 sets out the approaches followed across London.
- 2.11. Some authorities are spending their Neighbourhood CIL on projects approved centrally as a priority for the council generally. Others are allocating all

Neighbourhood CIL for ward councillors (to make a decision on projects) for the ward where the development that provided the funding is located. Some are taking a tiered or hybrid approach that seeks to direct funding towards important larger scale priorities while facilitating local councillor/community committee involvement in allocating funding to smaller scale projects.

- 2.12. Speaking with representatives from other councils, authorities that keep all the funding for projects within the wards that the development that provides the funding is located have been accused of not fairly distributing NCIL. For authorities that hand all the money over to the ward councillors/local committees to authorise allocations, representatives have reported stalemates in agreeing priorities between councillors/committee members or between them and the authority, leading to only a small proportion of money being spent.
- 2.13. Reflecting upon these approaches and experiences at other authorities it would appear that approaches should be carefully tailored to reflect the characteristics and priorities of the individual borough.

Merton's approach

- 2.14. Merton is comprised of overlapping geographies without distinct settlement boundaries or neighbourhood committees set up for approving funding allocations. Merton sees a large proportion of small scale development which isn't overly concentrated in any particular part of the borough.
- 2.15. In order to best respond to these characteristics, our approach to spending Neighbourhood CIL should seek to strike a balance between giving local communities a say on how CIL is spent and ensuring projects that help support demands of development in the borough are funded unfettered by local disputes between interest groups. Given the spread of development in the borough the approach should ensure that all areas benefit from some funding.
- 2.16. Allocation of a proportion of Neighbourhood CIL to be shared equally between each ward through a ward allocation scheme would:
 - allow for the continued operation of the allocation of Neighbourhood CIL to bids prioritised by the Council in accordance with the selection criteria/neighbourhood priorities approved by Cabinet in September 2017; while
 - ensuring each ward benefits equally from a share of the funding for public realm projects.

Way forward - Formalisation of Ward Allocation Scheme

- 2.17. Officers consider that there should be a ward allocation scheme, provided that it addresses the lessons learnt from the pilot project above by:
 - a) ***Examining the projects that qualify for funding and are straightforward to implement and maintain.***

All bid submissions would be checked against the qualifying list of schemes and checked by officers as deliverable and whether proposals are supportable. The types of projects would need to be outside existing contracts and have no unacceptable maintenance implications. The types of projects currently under consideration for inclusion/exclusion are:

included	excluded
Bulb planting	Gum removal
Graffiti removal (outside contract e.g. private walls)	Benches on highways
Supporting volunteer clean ups e.g. of River Wandle	Traffic calming measures
Grants to community groups for painting fences,	Street tree planting
Footway & street structures (decluttering, renewal, vegetation clearance)	
Painting street light columns	
Highway and public right of way vegetation full cut-back & deweeds/spray	
Park bins	
Park fence railings (painting, replacing, revitalisation)	
Seating in parks	
Playground items	
Alleygate schemes	

The list of projects will be finalised internally in time for the promotion/publicity set out at (f) below.

b) *Have an implementation period/spend deadline for proposals of 3 years.*

This would allow for flexibility in dealing with seasonal constraints and where proposals have a longer implementation programme and the timeframe in aligning with the electoral term would be better suited to councillors and provide more time for officers to agree a list of bids for each ward before scheme term ends.

c) *Providing for £15k allocation to qualifying proposals per ward during the 3-year implementation period.*

Rather than £5k per ward per year, £15k would be available for each ward to bid for/spend across the remaining three years of the current electoral

term. Bids would be accepted (for consideration by senior officers) for each ward for expenditure from 2019-20 until the end of 2021-22, or until the £15k is fully allocated to bids (whichever happens first). This would facilitate the longer implementation programme and provide more scope for larger proposals helping to maximise the take up of the allocation per ward.

d) Designates an individual responsible officer for each type of project as per a) above. Up to £50k to be set aside in case additional business resource is required to deliver allocations.

This would help to streamline the process allowing for a point of contact for proposers for specific types of proposals from start to finish. Their responsibility would include:

- Point of contact/liaison for proposers for specific project types (start to finish).
- Validation of applications for bidding
- Putting together and submitting the bid to coordination officer
- Appointing contractor
- Implementation project management (raising purchase orders, supervision/inspection, updating and reporting to coordinator etc.).

The £50k allocation would be taken from the neighbourhood proportion of CIL receipts and would act as a contingency in case additional resource (over and above existing resources in terms of existing staffing in-house) is required to implement approved allocations. This amount would be shared across the 20 wards and is in addition to the £15k per ward and be kept under review so that the amount could be revised depending on demand particularly given the objective (set out at (a) above) that projects would be straightforward to deliver.

Key coordination/monitoring the scheme overall would be carried out by officers in Future Merton/Finance and would include receiving applications, notifications, allocating responsible officers, processing bids, financial arrangements, delivery monitoring, unlocking issues, updates and reporting.

e) Introduction of clear governance arrangements and pooling across wards

There would be a standard application/approval process which would involve the following steps:

1. Standard application form filled out by member of the public or Council officer
2. Application form submitted to a ward councillor
3. If all the ward councillor supports the scheme they forward the application form to the Council (to the Ward Allocation Scheme email address)
4. The Council will assess the application to ensure that it falls within the parameters of the scheme and complies with the criteria set out at a) to c) above and can be put forward as a bid for approval.

5. Bid approval for single ward bids (i.e. for bids up to £15k) will be authorised by the Assistant Director for Sustainable Communities (with delegation permitted to level 3/4 managers in accordance with existing financial approval protocols). Bids will be assessed against the parameters of the scheme including the criteria set out at a) to c).

Ward councillors for each ward would need to work collaboratively in a coordinated manner with each other, as they would be responsible for prioritising applications to be sent to the Council so that the funding for their ward is not over subscribed in applications.

Pooling across wards

It would be possible for multiple wards to pool together their £15k and support a joint application. In this instance all of the ward councillors in each of the respective wards would need to confirm their support as part of step 3 above and proposals would need to comply with the parameters of the scheme in all other respects. The level of authority required to approve bids will depend on the amount of funding required, as follows:

- Below £30k – Assistant Director for Sustainable Communities
- £30k and above – Director of Environment and Regeneration

f) *Promote the scheme and publicise the requirements for bids with Ward Councillors in advance*

A briefing session on CIL will be organised for all ward councillors which will include a list of project types that can be subject of bids, individual responsible officer contacts for different type of proposals and what to expect in terms of governance, bidding and implementation process. This would take place in advance of April 2019. The publicity would explain the standard application/approval process as set out at e) above setting out how members of the public can be involved in making applications and the role of ward councillors in supporting applications that meet the criteria including their responsibilities with respect of prioritising applications for submission to the Council.

The Neighbourhood Fund – main Neighbourhood CIL funding

- 2.18. The criteria for proposals to qualify for funding under the Ward Allocation Scheme as recommended above would be very specific and funding is only available for proposals costing up to £15k per ward. Any schemes above that threshold can be considered for funding under the Neighbourhood Fund, which comprises the amounts of Neighbourhood CIL available to projects more generally.

- 2.19. Proposers can submit bids under the second call for bids for the Neighbourhood Fund, which is due to be carried out early in 2019 in parallel with promotion and publicity of the Ward Allocation Scheme set out at (f) above. The process to bid for both sources of funding will be made clear in the associated publicity. The bids will be considered for the Neighbourhood Fund in accordance with the governance arrangements and selection criteria approved by Cabinet on 18th September 2017. Funding will be available for spending in 2018-19 financial year.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1 Continuing with the £5k per ward allocation per year would not be an effective use of Neighbourhood CIL funding given the issues identified at para 2.7 above.
- 3.2 Other authorities have taken various approaches to spending Neighbourhood CIL. Some authorities are pooling their entire Neighbourhood CIL to spend on projects approved centrally as a priority for the council generally. Others are allocating all Neighbourhood CIL for ward councillors (to make a decision on projects) for the ward where the development that provided the funding.
- 3.3 The recommended approach would help avoid the issues experienced at other boroughs that have been accused of not fairly distributing NCIL or, for authorities that hand the money over to the ward councillors, problems with getting ward Councillors to agree on projects between themselves or with the authority, leading to only a small amount of money being spent.
- 3.4 It would allow for the continued operation of the allocation of Neighbourhood CIL to projects preferred by the Council in accordance with the selection criteria/neighbourhood priorities approved by Cabinet in September 2017 while providing a significant portion of the money to be shared equally between all wards for public realm projects deliverable within one electoral term.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 4.1 None for the purposes of this report.

5 TIMETABLE

- 5.1 Funding would be available for each ward to be allocated to projects from the first quarter of 2019-20 financial year for the remainder of the current electoral term or until the £15k allocation runs out.
- 5.2 As set out in paragraph 2.17(f) information will be presented to Ward Councillors in advance of April 2019 setting out parameters of the scheme and points of contact.

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Allocations under the proposed Ward Allocation Scheme would commence from 2019-20 and last until 2021-22.

- 6.2 Allocations to specific projects from the £5k per ward scheme in 2018-19 to date will be retained. Any balances from the £5k per ward funding yet to be allocated to specific projects will be put back in to the main Neighbourhood CIL pot available for allocations from 2019-20 onwards.
- 6.3 Objective d) of Paragraph 2.17 sets out provision for £50k of Neighbourhood CIL funding across all wards (subject to review/revision) to help support additional in-house administration/support with respect of delivery of approved projects not covered by existing staffing allowances.

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Under the CIL Regulations Neighbourhood CIL must be spent on local projects to support the demands development places on the area.
- 7.2 The Ward Allocation Scheme would accord with these requirements and Government guidance which states that local authorities should engage local communities and agree with them how to best spend Neighbourhood CIL, and that administration should be proportionate to the level of receipts

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 None for the purposes of this report.

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None for the purposes of this report.

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 N/A

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- 11.1 Appendix 1 – London Borough Neighbourhood CIL Arrangements

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1 [Item 9, Agenda, Cabinet Meeting 15th January 2018 – Merton's Neighbourhood Fund](#)
- 12.2 [Item 4, Agenda, Cabinet Meeting 18th September 2017 – Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy Governance](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough Neighbourhood CIL Arrangements

	London Borough	Neighbourhood CIL Arrangements
1	Redbridge	<p>Redbridge has set up a CIL Local Project Fund to which residents can bid for funding. Funding is allocated on a regional level or ward level depending on the scale and location of development providing the funding. Funding available in each area is published on the website.</p> <p>http://www2.redbridge.gov.uk/cms/planning_and_the_environment/planning_policy_regeneration/community_infrastructure_levy/cil_local_project_fund.aspx</p>
2	Wandsworth	<p>6 neighbourhoods designated for CIL purposes with funds from a particular development limited to projects in the neighbourhood where that development is located. The Council has approved 5 waves of projects since 2015 and were to re-consult the community about their priorities of spend in Summer 2018.</p> <p>Neighbourhood CIL is allocated through a 4 stage process:</p> <p>Stage 1 – setting priorities – based on a survey of residents, businesses and organisations, repeated every 4 years, analysed by neighbourhood.</p> <p>Stage 2 – Development of criteria, documentation and an application process open to anyone living or working within the borough.</p> <p>Stage 3 – Evaluate applications against criteria via a Cabinet Member meeting and cross-Council officer board.</p> <p>Stage 4 – Recommendations are made and agreed via the Committee cycle process.</p>
3	Hackney	<p>Cabinet agreed in February 2015 to separate the borough into five neighbourhood zones for the pooling of contributions. Currently scoping out the process for agreeing projects for the neighbourhood proportion.</p>

APPENDIX 1

4	Barking and Dagenham	A separate report will go to Cabinet in November 2018. It is proposed that the whole borough will be designated as a neighbourhood area to allow flexibility on where CIL is spent. The “Community Alliance” (previously Renew) will be the means of administrating the funding with a rep from each ward making recommendations on the top three priorities for their area to the Board.
5	Lambeth	<p>In Lambeth, it has been decided that 25% of CIL receipts (15% neighbourhood proportion plus 10% for strategic infrastructure) will be spent via Co-operative Local Investment Plans (CLIPs) – there are 7 CLIP areas.</p> <p>Distribution of CIL across proposed CLIP areas will vary significantly, according to the level of development occurring in each area.</p>
6	Croydon	Now starting to look into how this can be delivered.
7	Tower Hamlets	<p>It has been agreed by Cabinet that the approach to be taken forward in Tower Hamlets is that 25% of CIL receipts (15% neighbourhood proportion plus 10% for strategic infrastructure) should be allocated as the CIL Neighbourhood Portion across the whole borough.</p> <p>The Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) is the term the Council uses for the CIL Neighbourhood Portion. The Mayor of Tower Hamlets approved 4 boundary areas for the purpose of LIF in 2016. LIF receipts are ring-fenced for spending within the LIF boundary areas that the development that pays them is located.</p> <p>The usual consultation with residents will be undertaken for the spending of LIF and this process will be repeated every 2 years.</p> <p>Stage 1 – LIF Evidence Base containing the IDP and Proposed Priorities and Projects List for each LIF Area and existing public consultation and engagement feedback from other service areas in the council. Stage 2 - Public Consultation on Local Infrastructure Priorities and Project Nomination Stage 3- Project Development and Evaluation Stage 4 - Decisions and Reporting Stage 5 - Project Delivery</p>

APPENDIX 1

8	Islington	<p>The 15% Neighbourhood CIL would go towards local initiatives, as nominated by ward councillors (funding from developments in the ward spent in the ward approved by the ward councillors).</p> <p>This is based on our Ward Improvement Plans (WIPs) – local priorities for each of the 16 wards would be decided by the Ward Partnerships, led by ward councillors, and then formalised by Executive (or under delegation).</p>
9	Bexley	<p>Similar approach to Wandsworth and LBBD.</p> <p>Two-tier process where CIL from larger schemes (10 or more units of more than 250sqm non-resi space) is allocated to Core Strategy Geographic Region, and CIL from smaller schemes is allocated to the relevant ward.</p>
10	Hillingdon	<p>Neighbourhood CIL receipts are pooled with other sources of capital finance e.g. capital receipts, grants etc to fund eligible expenditure in the capital programme as a whole as the Council's infrastructure related spend far exceeds CIL receipts.</p> <p>Examples of projects that benefit the Neighbourhood Community and are eligible to be financed from CIL income include Schools Expansions, Highways structural works and other Neighbourhood Projects.</p>
12	Hammersmith and Fulham	<p>Trialling using Spacehive to use the funds to support crowd funding projects in the borough. This is to be launched shortly</p>
13	City of London	<p>Neighbourhood portion is pooled and allocated by Priorities Board as the City of London has no designated neighbourhood forums. Local amenity and other groups can bid to the Priorities for funding for projects which accord with the City's Reg 123 List.</p>
14	Brent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 5 'CIL Neighbourhoods' covering the whole borough with funding available from developments in a neighbourhood ring-fenced to projects benefiting those neighbourhoods • 15% of funds received are allocated (25% to Neighbourhood Forum) • Priorities for each CIL Neighbourhood are set for 3 years following consultation • Community Groups and stakeholders, including Members residents, Business etc. and council officers can submit bids • Shortlisting is via Member and Officer panel <p>More Info on www.brent.gov.uk/cil (spending CIL)</p>

APPENDIX 1

15	Waltham Forest	No allocation process defined at present. This is currently being looked at.
16	Barnet	Allocation of the neighbourhood portion is the responsibility of the Council's 'Area Committees'. The Council have agreed that each of the 3 area committees can allocate up to £150,000 per annum as neighbourhood CIL. The funds have mostly been spent on small scale highways projects so far. https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s24360/Delegating%20a%20proportion%20of%20Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy%20CIL%20income%20to%20the%20Councils%20Area%20Committe.pdf
17	Hounslow	The existing boundaries of the Area Forum will be used to identify the 'local' neighbourhood area in which to carry out formal consultation with members and community in order to identify priorities and schemes with which to spend the 'local' neighbourhood portion in their area.
18	Harrow	Neighbourhood CIL is allocated on a ward basis, except where the receipts are from development located within the Harrow and Wealdstone Opportunity Area, where it is pooled (four different wards) given the scale of development and receipts. Projects are identified by ward members and officers and need to secure 2/3 support of members. The process is administered by the Community Engagement Team, utilising mechanisms used to allocate ward budgets in the past (until funding was withdrawn).
19	Westminster	The process for engagement with neighbourhoods about spending of neighbourhood portion of CIL will start shortly. Officers will work proactively with neighbourhoods to support them in identifying what local projects may be eligible for this funding, in conjunction with the work to support the neighbourhood planning process.
20	Camden	Ward councillors determine funding priorities for Neighbourhood CIL generated in their areas. Investment priorities as identified in Neighbourhood Plans will be carried across into ward priority lists unless there is good reason for doing otherwise.
21	Richmond	The process in Richmond was developed in consultation with local groups and ward Councillors. The borough has been divided into 5 cluster areas using the Supplementary Planning Document Village boundaries consulted upon during the Village Planning programme and the one Neighbourhood Plan due for adoption. Neighbourhood CIL is allocated through a 4 stage process: Stage 1 – Application

APPENDIX 1

		<p>Stage 2 – Assessment by officers against criteria Stage 3 – Valid projects put out for public consultation, a poll. Stage 4 – Final decision is taken jointly by the Cabinet Member for Environment, Business and Community and the Cabinet Member for Planning and Strategic Development.</p> <p>The Council has approved its first round of projects in December 2017. We are currently open for a second application period with a decision due in August 2018.</p> <p>Arrangements for allocating and spending NCIL Are set out in a Cabinet Paper March 2016.</p>  <p>Final dispatch Village Planning Phase 3 NCIL</p>
22	Kensington and Chelsea	<p>NCIL funds will be allocated in line with legislation and national guidance - 15% to Wards where CIL liable development has taken place; 25% to Wards where a neighbourhood plan is made and CIL liable development has taken place.</p> <p>A draft proposal is for local communities and Ward Members to engage with each other on an ongoing basis to establish Ward priorities and projects for potential NCIL funding. Funding decisions will be agreed by all Ward Members and the executive director for planning and borough development.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank