

Meeting date: 16th November 2022

Report to: Stronger Communities and Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Board

Report title: Process for Allocating Funds from the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) – Update Note

1. Purpose of Note

- 1.1 This update note provides a summary of responses from Members who were invited to consider and comment on the report if they wished to do so.

2. Summary of Comments Received

- 2.1 The following comments have been received:

Councillor R Grinsell:

- 2.2 **Not support creation of a non-ward specific ward fund to detriment of host ward.** However, if top slice is to be introduced should be maximum of 10%.
- 2.3 Commercial organisations¹ (inc. private members clubs) should not be allowed to bid for NCIL funds.
- 2.4 More assistance should be given to smaller community groups to access NCIL funds. Larger organisations sometimes employ professional fundraisers which is to detriment of smaller groups.
- 2.5 Ward Members should have greater involvement in decision making process – in the past some comments have been overlooked/ignored.
- 2.6 NCIL funding should operate more frequently, at least on a biannual basis. This would assist smaller groups.

Councillor Meeson:

- 2.7 Areas where a neighbourhood plan has been approved should be treated equally, whether parished or not.
- 2.8 Agree that urban areas often have shared impact from development and shared benefit from local schemes, especially Shirley & Lyndon/Elmdon/Olton. Town centre schemes can have wider impact/benefit, depending on size of centre.
- 2.9 **Preference is for option 4B** as this recognises the different accountabilities of rural

¹ Not including schools and religious organisations who would be allowed to bid for funds.

areas, which are parished (with exception of KDBH which has an approved forum).

- 2.10 Notes North Solihull is excluded from CIL for reasons given, but this may need to be revisited in light of developments around UK Central/HS2.

Councillor Pinwell (on behalf of all Knowle Members):

- 2.11 No justification for equal distribution approach under option 2, 4A, 4B, 5A or 5B. Purpose of CIL is to provide infrastructure in areas affected by development and funds should be retained in communities for which it is collected.
- 2.12 Unspent CIL should be carried forward in the same ward to allow a larger pot to be built up.
- 2.13 Argument that unfair to wards with little of no CIL holds no weight due to abilities of communities to raise funds from multiple sources. Examples provided by Three Trees Community Centre, Cars Area Smith Wood and Meriden Adventure Playground show what can be achieved.
- 2.14 Justification for mutually agreed arrangements between adjacent wards in contiguous communities.
- 2.15 In Knowle & Dorridge there is a strong case for some controlled pooling of funds where in agreed common interest of the communities. This would be where the Knowle Society and DDRA agree with the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum that a proposed project and NCIL bid based on pooled funding is in the mutual interest of the communities of this conurbation and support has also been gained by an open meeting of the Forum.
- 2.16 Option 3 – Strategic CIL should be retained for strategic project, but important communities have a voice on how it is used and an opportunity to promote larger scale projects.
- 2.17 **Option 1 is favoured**, with some added ability for cross boundary pooling (under agreed consultative process)