

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

CIL SPENDING PANEL

Minutes from the Meeting of the CIL Spending Panel held on Tuesday, 29th July, 2025 at 10.00 am in the Meeting Room 2-4 - Second Floor, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn

PRESENT: Councillor J Moriarty (Chair)
Councillors R Blunt, F Bone, C J Crofts and M de Whalley

OFFICER PRESENT:

Senior CIL Officer – Amanda Driver
CIL Officer – Robyn Walkey
Planning Control Manager – Hannah Wood-Handy
Planning Policy Manager – Alex Fradley

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology of absence was received from Councillor S Sandell.

2 NOTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

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

3 MATTERS ARISING

There was no matters arising.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business to consider.

6 MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34

Councillor F Bone (on Zoom) and C Crofts was present under Standing Order 34.

7 CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE (IF ANY)

There was no chair's correspondence.

CIL SPENDING PANEL REPORTS

[Click here to view a recording of this item on YouTube.](#)

The Senior CIL Officer gave a presentation on the following:

- CIL Regulations - Statutory Requirements
- Infrastructure Planning & Delivery
- Project Workflow
- Adopted Local Plan Policies
- Summary of PAS Recommendations
- Strategic Projects - Decision Making Options

It was highlighted to the Panel, recommendations made during the meeting were to be recommended to Cabinet and not Council and it was discussed this could be scrutinised by CPP or R&D.

The Chair invited questions and comments from the Panel.

In response to Councillor Blunt, the Senior CIL Officer explained the Panel were to make decisions during the meeting on different options on prioritisation of projects.

Councillor de Whalley referred to the West Winch Growth Area and commented there was a dilemma with not applying for CIL however if infrastructure was required, CIL would need to be applied for.

The Planning Policy Manager explained the next local plan would have to look at viability, as would a review of the CIL, and this would review the rates charged for CIL based on the viability evidence in the financial climate at that time. He added last time this was reviewed in 2014/2015 there was a few strategic sites which were rated zero. He explained why and also provided further context with neighbouring authorities and their position in relation to CIL.

The Planning Control Officer explained in relation to West Winch developments, lessons have been learnt, and the overall Borough needs to be sustainable not just one area.

The Chair, Councillor Moriarty commented CIL was not applicable to the private sector but highlighted the private sector were raising issues in relation to developments, and he provided the example of Anglian Water.

The Senior CIL Officer explained if the infrastructure had been identified as a requirement, then strategic CIL may be spent on infrastructure to support new developments.

Councillor Blunt referred to the viability exercise previously carried out in 2014/2015 and commented this was to have a big impact on developers.

Strategic Projects – Decision Making Options

[Click here to view a recording of this item on YouTube.](#)

The Senior CIL Officer highlighted the three decision making options available. She commented option 3 was not achievable as it was business plan led resulting in additional work for Members and Officers as this meant working with external partners.

Councillor de Whalley questioned the impact of Local Government Reorganisation in relation to CIL.

The Senior CIL Officer explained CIL was to be spent in the Borough on infrastructure which had been identified. She commented there was risk CIL funding may be spent in another Borough following LGR under the statutory requirements therefore a forward planning approach on infrastructure needed to be taken.

The Chair commented foundations for CIL needed to be put in place before LGR.

In response to Councillor Blunt, the Senior CIL Officer explained even though the Borough Council would no longer exist in 2028, the infrastructure and projects were still identified for the area.

Councillor de Whalley commented if a priority programme was identified, what preventions were in place to stop a successor authority spending the CIL funding elsewhere.

The Senior CIL Officer explained there was a statutory obligation for each collecting authority to provide a list of how the CIL funding was spent. She added if the CIL Spending Panel allocated funding to projects this would not to be unallocated.

The Planning Policy Manager provided the Panel with context with how CIL and the Local Plan has worked with authorities which have already been through LGR

The Planning Control Manager commented the focus was the CIL Spending Panel ensuring appropriate spend for the next two years.

The Panel were reminded to focus on the money which was being collected currently and how this was to be spent.

The Senior CIL Officer advise there was currently £3 million being collected per annum.

In response to Councillor de Whalley, the Planning Control Manager explained the priorities came from the Corporate Action Plan and Local Plan.

The Panel unanimously recommended Option 2: Priority Programme was the decision making option.

RESOLVED: The Panel agreed Option 2: Priority Programme was the decision making option.

CIL Policy Document

[Click here to view the recording of this item on YouTube.](#)

The Senior CIL Officer highlighted the Terms of Reference were also to be included in the policy document.

In response to the Chair, the Senior CIL Officer explained the CIL income was separated into three; 5% Admin, 15% or 25% for Parish Neighbourhood Fund and the remainder for Strategic CIL. She referred to paragraph 29 which outlined the applicant must maintain a regular communication and provide information within seven days if requested.

The Chair asked if tighter guidance was needed for updates on successful applicants, i.e every six months. He commented his concerns for not receiving updates on projects.

The Senior CIL Officer explained there was a new system in place called Exacom which monitored progress and issued reminders at certain trigger points. She added a more stringent approach was needed for withdrawing for non-compliance.

Councillor de Whalley asked if there was a reasonable route of warning before funds are withdrawn.

Councillor Blunt asked if monitoring referred to timetable or costs.

The Senior CIL Officer advised costs were unable to be monitored and CIL payments were only made once evidence of expenditure had been received. In response to Councillor de Whalley, she advised Parish Councils had a statutory obligation to provide reports and updates on Neighbourhood CIL annually.

The Planning Control Manager added once CIL funding was allocated, an agreement had to be signed to ensure compliance and governance.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Crofts sought clarification on areas which do not have a neighbourhood plan.

The Senior CIL Officer explained the Parish Neighbourhood CIL money which was paid to Parish Council's with or without a Neighbourhood

Plan. She added Parish Council's received the higher percentage if they do have a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chair commented Parish Council's needed to become disciplined in relation to CIL funding and Members were responsible for assisting with discipline.

The Senior CIL Officer added members needed to understand and support their Parish Councils to meet their obligations.

Councillor de Whalley sought clarification on training available for Members and Parish Councils. The Chair questioned how training was to be approached.

The Senior CIL Officer explained that as part of Stage 3 of the Project Plan, training will be provided to Parish Council's and Members. The website pages will be updated and will include guidance.

RESOLVED: The Panel agreed the Terms of Reference were to be included in the Policy Document.

CIL Spending Strategy

[Click here to view the recording of this item on YouTube.](#)

The Senior CIL Officer advised the Panel this was document 2 and page 22 of the agenda.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding point 15 – Parish Infrastructure Investment Plan (PIIP's) and how they were to be introduced; the Senior CIL Officer explained this was a new process to ensure the Parishes were spending the CIL funding more effectively. She referred to further detail from East Suffolk example.

The Planning Control Manager clarified the training and guidance were to be provided by Officers however applications and evidence would be required from the Parish Clerks.

Councillor Bone commented a neighbourhood plan for King's Lynn as an unparished area provided challenges and questioned if King's Lynn was at a disadvantage.

The Senior CIL Officer explained King's Lynn was zero rated in relation to CIL and the area had previously benefited from CIL distribution. She added King's Lynn could be included in the priority programme.

The Chair asked for a form to be created along with guides and training for all Parishes.

The Senior CIL Officer explained the proposed process to validate applications with no scoring criteria, so that the panel will review all valid applications.

Councillor Blunt expressed his concern with the changes in scoring proposed as part of new governance.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Crofts commented he felt that without scoring this was unfair and the scoring provided a fair way of allocation of public money.

The Senior CIL Officer explained previously there was criticism surrounding the scoring as short-term projects were prioritised. Previously decisions were based on the quality of the application and not their community value. In response to Cllr Blunts concern, she commented scoring could continue if meaningful criteria were used.

Councillor de Whalley highlighted a scoring system provides transparency which relates to the Corporate Plan.

The Senior CIL Officer advised the Panel further discussions were to be had at the next meeting on scoring as part of the stage two of the decision process.

The Chair and Councillor Blunt both commented the scoring system had been unfair as this was dependent on local support from Members.

The Chair highlighted to the Panel, the significant change to point 33 G and the certainty of other funding sources in relation to point 33 R.

Councillor de Whalley raised concerns in relation to point 40 B if a project comes forward in an area without development, but would support a wider area.

The Senior CIL Officer explained if a Parish can demonstrate and evidence a wider area and community would be supported then this was to be viewed favourable by the Panel.

Councillor Blunt questioned if 20% for community project was feasible based on expectations of £600,000 per annum.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Crofts, agreed the split of 20% Local CIL fund and 80% Strategic CIL Fund was fair as the 80% would reflect the Corporate Plan.

The Chair questioned point 53 B in relation to Local Infrastructure Projects.

The Chair commented the suggestion from 53 B was that the 20% could be drawn down to 0% if there was a higher demand for statutory funding.

The Senior CIL Officer explained 53 B could be removed. She added the Panel was to review each project and decided how money was allocated.

The Chair questioned if guidance and support would be timely for applicants to be ready for February 2026.

The Planning Control Manager commented additional wording was to be added where planning permission may not be required, to include evidence can be demonstrated.

The Senior CIL Officer advised point A and B between point 56 to 57 was to be removed.

The Senior CIL Officer clarified in relation to a query raised by Councillor Blunt, if the application was not from a Parish Council then match funding would need to be identified elsewhere.

The Senior CIL Officer explained to the Panel how Strategic CIL Fund should be link to new developments in relation to the Local Plan allocations and spent on infrastructure to support these developments.

The Planning Policy Manager questioned 61a i) which referred to proposed developments with planning permission and highlighted that the wording should be reviewed to allow for situations in which infrastructure could be sought first before the housing, for strategic residential developments

The Senior CIL Officer reminded the Panel that Strategic CIL Funding would only provide a maximum of 20% of infrastructure required for new development.

The Planning Policy Manager provided examples of CIL being used for strategic projects such as sports centres, swimming pools and roundabouts in other councils.

The Senior CIL Manager commented that the panel needed to manage expectations and there was not enough money collected to fund major infrastructure such as roundabouts.

The Panel discussed and considered two rounds of applications in 2026 and for this to be reviewed to decide if feasible for the future.

The Panel agreed point 65 to be taken out and the Senior CIL Officer highlighted applications will no longer go to Corporate Leadership Team in relation to point 69.

The Planning Control Manager added the Corporate Leadership Team had a strategic overview linked to the Corporate Plan rather than know the detail.

The Panel agreed to remove point 70. The Panel agreed to increase the Local CIL from £50,000 to a maximum of £100,000 which could be applied per project. This would mean that no Local Project would need to go to Cabinet if £100k delegated responsibility was approved.

Councillor Blunt queried if written support from Local Members were going to be amended to Norfolk County Councillors and MP's written support.

The Chair commented only local Borough Councillors written support was to be considered.

Councillor de Whalley questioned if the process needed to be reviewed after one year to ensure it was working effectively. The Panel agreed the process was to be reviewed..

RESOLVED:

The Panel agreed the split of 20% Local CIL fund and 80% Strategic CIL Fund

The Panel agreed to remove point 53 B from the policy.

The Panel agreed two rounds of application for 2026 to be reviewed for the following year.

The Panel agreed to remove point 65 and 70.

The Panel agreed to increase from £50,000 to a maximum of £100,000 per project.

The Panel agreed the process was to be reviewed if an issue arises.

9

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday 9th September 2025.

The meeting closed at 12.14 pm