



King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1EX  
Telephone: 01553 616200

To: Councillors F Bone, A Bubb, M de Whalley, J Kirk, T Parish and D Whitby

Dear Member

**CIL Governance Task Group**

You are invited to attend a meeting of the above-mentioned Panel which will be held on **Thursday, 23rd January, 2020 at 2.00 pm** in the **Kempe Room - Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ** to discuss the business shown below.

Yours sincerely

Chief Executive

**AGENDA**

1. **Apologies for absence**
2. **Members Present Under Standing Order 34**
3. **Notes from the Previous Meeting** (Pages 2 - 4)
4. **CIL Distribution and Spending** (Pages 5 - 7)
5. **Any Other Business**
6. **Date of the Next Meeting**

Officers will present the attached report which consolidates the comments made by Members of the Task Group at the previous meeting.

Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 11.00am in Meeting Room 2:4 – Detailed Processes for Distribution.

**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**

**CIL GOVERNANCE TASK GROUP**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the CIL Governance Task Group held on Wednesday, 4th December, 2019 at 2.00 pm in the Kempe Room - Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillors T Parish (Chair), F Bone, T Bubb, M de Whalley, J Kirk and M de Whalley.

**PRESENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 34:** Councillor Kemp

**OFFICERS:** Alan Gomm, LDF Manager and Amanda Driver, CIL Officer

1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

2 **MEMBERS PRESENT PERSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillor Kemp.

3 **NOTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The notes from the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record.

4 **CIL DISTRIBUTION AND SPENDING**

The Task Group discussed CIL Distribution and Spending and the comments that had been submitted by Members of the Task Group in advance of the meeting. Members were reminded that they were looking at the procedure for how the money should be distributed, but were not looking at specific or individual projects.

The Task Group was reminded that development which had been agreed prior to the introduction of CIL would not be liable for CIL, neither would Custom or Self Build Development. It was noted that unparished areas, such as King's Lynn, would not receive Parish CIL payments, but did get other sources of funding, such as Section 106. The LDF Manager provided the Task Group with information on how Section 106 money, collected by NCC, had been spent.

The Task Group also received a document which showed how the Parish money had been distributed. Parishes were required to produce an annual report to show how CIL money had been spent and these were available to view on the website at [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20223/cil\\_financial\\_reports/686/cil\\_parish\\_reports](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20223/cil_financial_reports/686/cil_parish_reports)

The following comments were made by the Task Group:

- Models would need to be tested and the process would need to be reviewed in the future to see what does and doesn't work.
- Parishes which were unlikely to have any significant future development would not receive a lot of the Parish fund.
- Consideration needed to be given to how requests from Norfolk County Council for County statutory functions should be dealt with.
- The Task Group generally agreed that the money should be portioned to strategic, smaller and community projects. It was suggested that it should be split evenly into thirds, or a 60/20/20% split. The Task Group was informed that CIL could not be used for maintenance of projects or paying of wages.
- Match funding should be considered for strategic projects and the Task Group would need to consider if match funding would be a requirement for the smaller and community projects as this could be a problem in unparished areas as they would not have a Parish precept.
- Criteria for projects would need to be considered.
- Community groups and Parishes would need to work together to ensure that there was no duplication.
- The Task Group considered different ways that CIL could be distributed and examples were provided such as using all funds for large strategic infrastructure projects such as dual carriageways/bypasses etc. or having a five year plan for the distribution of funds.
- County funding could be used to match fund CIL for strategic projects.
- Reference was made to the workshop sessions that Councillors present at recent Panel meetings had participated in, which asked for their Corporate Priorities. The feedback from these sessions could be used to determine priorities and criteria for strategic CIL spend.

Members were informed that once they had concluded their work they would need to present a report to the Regeneration and Development Panel. Any recommendations from the Panel would then need to be presented to Cabinet.

**AGREED:** Officers would take the comments and suggestions from the Task Group and produce distribution and spending options for the Task Group to consider at their next meeting.

5

### **SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Future meetings would be scheduled as follows:

9<sup>th</sup> January 2020 at 2pm – CIL Distribution/Spending Options  
23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 at 2pm – Detailed Processes for Distribution

6<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 2pm - Selection Criteria

26<sup>th</sup> February 2020 at 2pm – Administration and Accounting Processes

6                    **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was none.

7                    **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2020 at 2.00pm in Meeting Room 2:4, Kings Court.

**The meeting closed at 3.13 pm**

### **Task Group – Distribution Proposals**

Based on discussions at the last Task Group Meeting on 04 December, the officers have prepared a summary of the submitted proposals, for the next meeting on 9 January 2020.

To assist future discussions, the officers have produced a perceived pros and cons list and some notes on each submitted proposal. These details have been prepared without prejudice, and are aimed at supporting the task group and not to give weight to any specific proposal.

The proposals are based on a projected income of £1m.

### **Proposal 1 – Split 60/20/20:**

#### **Strategic Projects 60% £600k**

- 2 x £200k Controlled by BCKLWN
- 1 x £200k 3<sup>rd</sup> party controlled and monitored by BCKLWN
- Fund matched by recipient.
- Allocated to:
  - Education related to employment (post 18 college based education)
  - Transport, linked to Lynn Transport Plan
  - Environment – green areas linked to Climate Change Policy

#### **Community Projects 20% £200k**

- Parish(es)/Ward requests
- £10k and £50k (Max 20/Min 4 Projects)
- Identified through the Local Plan
- To support infrastructure
- Parishes to contribute subject to budget constraint
- Scope:
  - Education (local initiatives)
  - Health
  - Economic Development

#### **Smaller Projects 20% £200k**

- Very local projects
- Parish Council and other organisation requests
- £1k - £2k (Max 200 projects)
- Fund matched by recipient
- Scope:
  - Community Facilities
  - Green Infrastructure
  - Open Space and Leisure
  - Community Transport

- Surplus to be devolved to Community Projects Fund

**Pros:**

- Overall
  - Projects, no matter where in the Borough, would have the same opportunity to get CIL funding
  - Match funding will make the CIL fund go further and show buy in from the recipient party
- Strategic Projects:
  - scope could be reviewed annually to meet changing corporate priorities
  - could support the Local Plan developments
- Community Projects & Smaller Projects:
  - the scope seems to match Parish Council possible projects
  - will spread money to different projects and places
  - scope could be reviewed annually to meet changing Parish priorities

**Cons:**

- Strategic Projects:
  - may be too restrictive to stipulate specific cost e.g.£200k per project
  - excluding NCC may not be in the best interest of the community
- Community projects:
  - education/health – State Aid (cannot subsidise private businesses)
- Smaller Projects:
  - potential admin burden of 200 projects

**Notes:**

- Overall: Maybe more weight given to areas with significant development taking place
- Strategic Projects: Maybe have more flexibility and not stipulate specific cost per project.
- Smaller Projects: Maybe increase the maximum from £2k to £10k
- Community & Smaller Projects: Payment on completion of project, to reduce monitoring/admin requirements

**Proposal 2: All Parishes**

Based on merit including where significant development has taken place, reflecting planning application approvals.

**Pros:**

- Simple and makes sense to match planning development

Cons:

- Distribution not as obvious – could be perceived as less transparent
- Difficult to scope/set selection criteria

Notes:

- The selection criteria of a % split option, could give more weight to areas with significant development taking place.

### **Proposal 3 - Split 3 ways:**

**1/3 £333k** – Requests up to £1,000 (possible 333 projects at 1k)

**1/3 £333k** – Requests between £1,001 and £10,000 (possible 33 projects at 10k)

**1/3 £333k** – Major projects over £10,000

Pros:

- Simple division of funds
- Transparent

Cons:

- Difficult to scope/set selection criteria
- Heavy admin burden due to large amount of projects
- Will not reflect strategic level spending to support development

Notes:

- Similar to proposal one but less money spent on larger infrastructure projects