

EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Community Infrastructure Levy Working Party held at online via zoom on 2 March 2021

Attendance list at end of document

The meeting started at 2.10 pm and ended at 3.25 pm

14 Declarations of Interest

Minute 16. CIL Spend Options 2021.

Councillor Dan Ledger, Personal, Seaton Town Councillor.

Minute 16. CIL Spend Options 2021.

Councillor Mike Howe, Personal, Bishops Clyst Parish Councillor.

Minute 16. CIL Spend Options 2021.

Councillor Olly Davey, Personal, Exmouth Town Councillor.

Minute 16. CIL Spend Options 2021.

Councillor Paul Hayward, Personal, Parish Clerk to All Saints, Chardstock and Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Councils that have received CIL.

Minute 16. CIL Spend Options 2021.

Councillor Sarah Chamberlain, Personal, Broadclyst Parish Councillor and lives in an area that has been expanded out from Cranbrook under the new CIL charging.

15 Community Infrastructure Levy Terms of Reference

The Working Party noted the role of the Community Infrastructure Levy Working Party was to consider community infrastructure funding bids received and make recommendations to the Strategic Planning Committee on Community Infrastructure Levy spend.

The Working Party also noted the terms of reference. These were:

1. To advise and recommend a strategy for the expenditure of the Community Infrastructure Levy.
2. Where the agreed strategy for expenditure includes a bidding process to advise and recommend a scoring criteria for assessing Community Infrastructure Levy bids.
3. Where 2. Above applies to consider community infrastructure funding bids received.
4. To consider and recommend Community Infrastructure Levy spend to the Strategic Planning Committee.

16 CIL Spend Options 2021

The Working Party considered a paper by the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management that sought guidance from Members on the CIL Spend Options for 2021 and put to Members two key options that had been explored in the past.

Option 1

- To invite funding bids for infrastructure projects through a bidding application form and a scoring criteria. Members noted that this process had not been successful in the past. In 2017 only 6 applications had been received which had provided inadequate information and did not meet the threshold for the scoring criteria.

Option 2

- To consider the Priority One project within the East Devon Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is significant in delivering the Local Plan Strategy. Members noted that infrastructure providers would be contacted to help understand what their priorities were for funding over the next 2-3 years, to find out how this sits in terms of match funding for those projects and provide Members with a list of key projects identifying key priorities.

To help provide some context the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management referred to page 8 of the agenda that listed the key projects that had been identified in 2019 for funding commitments.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management pointed out that option 1 would be difficult to achieve as it would be resource intensive and highlighted the current pressures that the Section 106 Officer and the Planning Policy Team were currently under. He advised his preference would be to opt for option 2 as it had been tried in 2019 and had been more successful in allocating monies and identifying key projects.

Discussion on the options report included:

- Suggestion to include an option 3 to defer until there was money available to spend as all the money was spent last year. In response the Chair advised as stated on page 6 of the agenda the available balance was £2,172,816.27. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management agreed there was money available but highlighted that Members may wish to defer any spend decision this year to save up for the larger projects.
- The need to consider whether we want to try and contribute to the larger projects or spend the money in smaller amounts on projects that do not make a material difference.
- The need to be mindful of the current pandemic and the need to spend the money to support the local economy.
- The money should be spent as soon as possible to invest in our local area.
- Concerns raised about spending the council's money within education as virtually all schools now are run as academies which are funded from Central Government and not funded by Devon County Council.
- Concerns raised about spending money on the passing loop on the Waterloo Line and although it is a very important project it is a National Government project and not a District Council project. There are better causes within the district to spend money on. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy Development Management highlighted that these type of projects look for government match funding in order to deliver which could be the difference between getting the national support in terms of funding.
- The need to focus on the priority 2 projects to try and give as much community benefit to as many people as possible. There are a lot of bids under £250,000 that could easily be fulfilled which would do a lot of social good to many different towns in the district. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that the priority one projects were needed to support the delivery of the local plan and said there was a danger that some

allocation sites would not come forward because the infrastructure would not be delivered to support them.

- Clarification sought on the process for the two options. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy Development Management outlined the two key choices which had been pursued in the past. Option one was the less successful bidding process and option two was the more successful and less formal approach by contacting the infrastructure providers.
- Preference was shown for the less formal approach.
- Clarification sought on the process of contacting the infrastructure providers and the relevance of our local plan. In response Keith Lane advised the need to focus on delivering the local plan and referred to the projects listed in the East Devon Infrastructure Plan that were either included in the local plan or linked to delivering the housing and employment growth.
- Suggestion to limit the projects listed in priority two to the more senior partners.
- The Council needs to be assertive and commit this money to projects that have much shorter timescale and reference was made to the 123 list,
- All projects are very important in their own right in their own area as every area has their own priorities.

The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management welcomed all comments highlighting more information was needed from infrastructure providers before decisions could be made about individual projects to be able to prioritise the money and to make sure we get best value for money by trying to match fund with other monies.

RECOMMENDED to the Strategic Planning Committee:

- 1. That option two for the less formal approach of contacting our partners be agreed**
- 2. To consider the priority two projects to include a caveat to only look at major providers from DCC, EDDC and NHS be agreed**

Attendance List

Councillors present:

M Armstrong
M Howe
S Chamberlain
O Davey (Chair)
P Hayward
N Hookway
D Ledger
E Wragg

Councillors also present (for some or all the meeting)

P Arnott
G Jung
E Rylance

Officers in attendance:

Ed Freeman, Service Lead Planning Strategy and Development Management
Keith Lane, Planning Officer (Planning Policy)
Sulina Tallack, Planning Obligation Officer
Wendy Harris, Democratic Services Officer

Councillor apologies:

G Pook
P Skinner

Chairman

Date: