



NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)



The London experience

**A report from
Neighbourhood Planners.London
September 2016**



NEIGHBOURHOOD ELEMENT OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY The London experience

**A report from Neighbourhood Planners.London
September 2016**

Summary

In January 2013, the Government announced new arrangements for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and its relationship to neighbourhood planning. Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) explained that *“Neighbourhoods that take a proactive approach by drawing up a neighbourhood development plan, and securing the consent of local people in a referendum, will receive 25% of the revenues from the Community Infrastructure Levy arising from the development that they choose to accept.”*

This supplemented the 15% proportion of CIL receipts already passed to Parish and Town Councils under CIL legislation. Nick Boles, DCLG Minister in 2013, said *“This government is determined to persuade communities to accept more house-building by giving them a tangible share of the benefits it brings. By undertaking a neighbourhood plan that makes space for new development, communities can secure revenues to make the community more attractive for everyone.”*

This report from Neighbourhood Planners.London (www.neighbourhoodplanners.london) assesses whether the introduction of this financial incentive for neighbourhood planning has had any significant impact in London. It is based on an analysis of what London Boroughs are saying on their websites about the neighbourhood element of CIL and about neighbourhood planning. This is supplemented by the experience of London’s neighbourhood planners and all who have fed in to the report have supported its conclusions. The results show marked variations between local authorities in the profile given to this aspect of Government policy.

The key finding is that most Boroughs have not promoted arrangements for consultation on the 15% element of Neighbourhood CIL and there is limited recognition given by the Boroughs to the part that the 15% Neighbourhood CIL can play in fostering public interest in neighbourhood level investment. Only a handful of Boroughs have well developed plans on how to address issues around the 25% element to be allocated in neighbourhood plan areas, and most of these vary significantly in their approach. Furthermore, there is almost no reference to the availability of 25% of CIL for neighbourhood projects, in areas with a made neighbourhood plan. It is also notable that some

London Boroughs consider it acceptable to provide no information at all on neighbourhood planning on their websites.

Current national position on Neighbourhood CIL

DCLG's Planning Practice Guidance states:

"Fifteen per cent of Community Infrastructure Levy charging authority receipts are passed directly to those Parish and Town Councils (in England) and Community Councils (in Wales) where development has taken place (see [Regulation 59A](#) for details). Where chargeable development takes place within the local council area, up to £100 per existing council tax dwelling can be passed to the Parish, Town or Community Council (see [Regulation 58A](#) for details) this way each year to be spent on local priorities (see [Regulation 59C](#) for details). Areas could use some of the neighbourhood pot to develop a [neighbourhood plan](#) where it would support development by addressing the demands that development places on the area.

In England, communities that draw up a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order (including a community right to build order), and secure the consent of local people in a referendum, will benefit from 25 per cent of the levy revenues arising from the development that takes place in their area. This amount will not be subject to an annual limit. For this to apply, the neighbourhood plan must have been made (see section 61E of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38C of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) before a relevant planning permission first permits development (as defined by [Regulation 8](#), as amended by the [2011 Regulations](#) and the [2014 Regulations](#) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations). This higher amount will also apply when the levy is paid in relation to developments which have been granted permission by a neighbourhood development order (including a community right to build order)."

The current DCLG review of the CIL regime is expected to report soon and may well impact on current arrangements.

Current position on Neighbourhood Plans in London

Neighbourhood Planners.London has identified 97 areas in London which have engaged in neighbourhood planning, with 59 neighbourhood forums formally designated by the relevant local planning authority (or authorities in the case of cross-boundary neighbourhood areas).

Three neighbourhood plans have been successful at referendum and subsequently made as part of the Local Plan for the Borough (Norland, Sudbury Town, Fortune Green & West Hampstead). Two further neighbourhood plans have succeeded at referendum and await being made (St Quintin & Woodlands, and Kentish Town).

Issues around the 25% allocation of CIL to be prioritised through agreement with neighbourhood forums have thus become a live issue for London, with more neighbourhood plans now reaching an advanced stage. Yet fewer than one third of Boroughs have put in place arrangements for consultation on the 15% Neighbourhood CIL, and none appear to have yet addressed clearly the issues around the 25% element to be allocated in neighbourhood plan areas.

Government guidance on Neighbourhood CIL

DCLG Planning Practice Guidance is clear on the need for neighbourhood level involvement in the allocation of the 15% element of Neighbourhood CIL. In areas with Parish or Town Councils, 15% is passed direct to these bodies. Paragraph: 073 (Reference ID: 25-073-2014061) of Planning Practice Guidance on CIL goes on to say:

“If there is no Parish, Town or Community Council, the charging authority will retain the levy receipts but should engage with the communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding. Charging authorities should set out clearly and transparently their approach to engaging with neighbourhoods using their regular communication tools e.g. website, newsletters, etc. The use of neighbourhood funds should therefore match priorities expressed by local communities, including priorities set out formally in neighbourhood plans.

The Government does not prescribe a specific process for agreeing how the neighbourhood portion should be spent. Charging authorities should use existing community consultation and engagement processes. This should include working with any designated neighbourhood forums preparing neighbourhood plans that exist in the area, theme specific neighbourhood groups, local businesses (particularly those working on business led neighbourhood plans), and using networks that ward councillors use. Crucially this consultation should be at the neighbourhood level. It should be proportionate to the level of levy receipts and the scale of the proposed development to which the neighbourhood funding relates.”

Such consultation is clearly meant to be more than tokenistic, as it is intended to result in ‘agreement’ with local communities on priorities for this element of CIL spend. In the London context of multiple planning authorities, more direction and guidance is needed to ensure consistency in the way that CIL spending priorities in a neighbourhood plan are identified, negotiated and agreed between a neighbourhood forum and the local authority, prior to examination and referendum stage. The outcome should subsequently be incorporated within an authority’s Regulation 123 List.

More clarity on the precise stage in the planning process at which the Neighbourhood CIL element should be calculated and set aside by a local authority would also be welcomed by London’s neighbourhood forums.

How Neighbourhood CIL is being approached by London Boroughs

Despite CIL being in place for several years, the level of recognition of this framework by individual London Boroughs is very patchy. This may in part result from the fact that Boroughs have introduced their CIL regimes at different times, with some coming into force recently (or yet to start).

The table set out below is based on what Boroughs (and the two Mayoral Development Corporations) say on their websites about CIL and about neighbourhood planning. In some instances this may not reflect current actual practice, but it does reflect how London’s planning authorities are communicating with their public on the use of CIL, and on the availability of 25% Neighbourhood CIL as a positive incentive for local communities to prepare a neighbourhood plan.

The table shows that the Government's 2013 policy commitment on 25% Neighbourhood CIL being made available to areas with a neighbourhood plan in place, aimed at incentivising neighbourhood planning across England, has been very largely lost in transmission as far as London is concerned.

This no doubt reflects in part the comparatively low number of neighbourhood plans in London which have yet made it to the finishing line, as compared with the rest of England (where over 200 neighbourhood plans have now been made). Most London Borough planning departments, dealing with CIL, seem to have concluded that the 25% Neighbourhood CIL in neighbourhood planning areas is not an issue that needs addressing with any urgency.

In terms of information published on their websites, a worrying number of Boroughs still seem to consider it acceptable to publish no information on neighbourhood planning, let alone on the link between neighbourhood plans and availability of CIL.

The 2012 report by the London Assembly's Planning and Housing Committee on Neighbourhood Planning in London captured some of the 'challenges' faced by London's local communities in neighbourhood plan preparation. Recommendation 5 of this report was that *"London Boroughs should also consider reviewing how they can adjust their current structure and approach to support neighbourhood planning, given the constraints of resources and workload."* There is little evidence that these recommendations have been followed up, by the Mayor, the Assembly, or London Councils.

Since 2012, some Boroughs have proved more proactive than others in encouraging and supporting neighbourhood planning. While Westminster has designated 21 neighbourhood areas and Camden 12, there remain 12 London boroughs with no neighbourhood forums or areas designated. This is, four years after the Neighbourhood Planning regulations came into force following the 2011 Localism Act. These 12 are Barking and Dagenham, Bromley, City of London, Croydon, Harrow, Havering, Hillingdon, Kingston, Merton, Newham, Redbridge and Wandsworth. In most cases there is a correlation between a lack of information on Council websites and a lack of designated neighbourhood areas in the Borough in question (see table below).

In relation to CIL, nine London Boroughs provide information on their websites on the arrangements put in place for consulting on and allocating the 15% neighbourhood element of CIL (Camden, Lambeth, Barnet, Brent, Redbridge, Haringey, Richmond, Tower Hamlets, and Wandsworth). Camden and Lambeth have chosen to increase this percentage to 25% in all areas, and not just those with made neighbourhood plans. Merton is currently getting internal agreement for its approach. In some other Boroughs, Council web pages refer to arrangements for allocating Neighbourhood CIL as being in preparation, or work in progress. For some Boroughs, there is no indication on Council websites that the neighbourhood element of CIL has been considered in any way.

Conclusions

As a policy for incentivising local communities to become more involved in prioritising infrastructure spend, the 15% Neighbourhood element of CIL has to date had an impact in only a minority of London Boroughs.

The potential for neighbourhood plans to set priorities for 25% of CIL spend, without an upper limit, has barely featured in terms of London Borough publicity and awareness-raising on neighbourhood planning or on CIL. Any incentivising effect, as envisaged by Government Ministers in 2013, has been negligible. The message has been lost in transmission at London-wide and Borough level.

It is not clear whether this has been by accident or design. London Boroughs have shown greater reluctance than planning authorities outside London to raise awareness of the potential of neighbourhood planning (with some honourable exceptions – see table below). When it comes to decisions on CIL spend, it is perhaps unsurprising that many local authorities are choosing to retain maximum control to themselves, while minimising their efforts to publicise Neighbourhood CIL.

Such an approach is not how public confidence and support for the national planning system will be strengthened. Nor is it compatible with Government policy on the Community Infrastructure Levy and on neighbourhood planning. Local communities are very aware of the mismatch between what is being said nationally and how it is being delivered locally.

Neighbourhood Planners.London looks to the Mayor of London (and to London Councils) to take a more active leadership role on this issue. This could be achieved by:

- Publishing Mayoral best practice guidance for Boroughs on consultation and engagement on Neighbourhood CIL, to achieve greater consistency across Boroughs
- The Mayor and/or Assembly committing to review annual monitoring reports on Borough CIL spend, and publishing an assessment of the extent to which neighbourhood level priorities (including those set out in made neighbourhood plans) have been realised. This could be done alongside the annual report on the use of Mayoral CIL
- In the absence of any action by the Mayor of London, London Assembly or London Councils, DCLG issuing specific guidance on the use of Neighbourhood CIL in London, where land values create issues which do not apply elsewhere in England
- Strengthening the current Neighbourhood Planning Bill to align more closely the position of neighbourhood forums with that of parish and town councils in controlling and allocating the 25% element of Neighbourhood CIL
- An awareness raising program for the importance of neighbourhood planning and CIL across the capital
- Recognising the role of neighbourhood planning and CIL in delivering on London-wide priorities, such as improvements in air quality, in Mayoral initiatives

We would welcome a response from the Mayor, the Chair of London Councils, and DCLG Ministers on these suggestions.

REVIEW OF LONDON BOROUGH AND MAYORAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION WEBSITES APPROACH TO NEIGHBOURHOOD CIL

BOROUGH	CIL REGIME ADOPTION	APPROACH TO NEIGHBOURHOOD CIL
Barking and Dagenham	25/11/2014	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on Council's CIL web page. No web page on neighbourhood planning. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Barnet	16/04/2013	Policy in place under which Area Committees are allocated 15% of CIL receipts for their local area, capped at a total of £150,000 per area and ring-fenced to be spent on infrastructure schemes. No 'made' neighbourhood plans yet in place, but issues beginning to arise over allocation of Neighbourhood CIL to the priorities of Mill Hill Neighbourhood Forum.
Bexley	02/03/2015	Awaiting outcome of CIL Review before finalising proposals for allocating Neighbourhood CIL. One neighbourhood area designated.
Brent	25/02/2013	The Council has set up a CIL 'Neighbourhood Fund' allocated across 5 local areas, with sums in each area ranging from £4,000 to £523,000 (for Wembley). No reference on website to how 25% allocation is implemented (Brent has one 'made' neighbourhood plan at Sudbury Town).
Bromley	Not known	No page on Borough CIL on Council website. No page on neighbourhood planning. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Camden	02/03/2015	Policy decision on what the Council terms 'Local CIL' under which 25% of the CIL collected in each ward is allocated to local projects. A ward based system is used as the basis for allocation, but with flexibility to allocate across boundaries. Ward members take the lead on consultation. CIL does not feature in neighbourhood planning guidance. Camden has two NPs made/successful at referendum (Fortune Green and West Hampstead and Kentish Town)
City of London	08/04/2014	2014/15 CIL Annual Monitoring Report states that 15% of total CIL receipts (£22,837) have been set aside for neighbourhood projects, in accordance with Regulation 62(4). No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on neighbourhood planning web page. No neighbourhood areas

		yet designated
Croydon	26/02/2013	Local community and amenity groups to suggest projects that neighbourhood CIL could be spent on. The Infrastructure Finance Group will manage this funding to ensure that over the course of a four year period each of the sixteen Places of Croydon (identified in the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies) receive some investment. No reference to CIL on neighbourhood planning pages. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Ealing	29/04/2016	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page. LB Ealing does not anticipate adopting its CIL regime until December 2016.
Enfield	23/03/2016	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page, Neighbourhood Planning web page explains that one designation application has been accepted, one refused, and one appears to be in limbo.
Greenwich	25/03/2015	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page.
Hackney	25/02/2015	CIL web page states Areas where development is taking place will receive a proportion of the receipts to be spent in the local neighbourhoods. Further information on the neighbourhood element of Hackney CIL (it does not relate to London Mayoral CIL) will be made available shortly. It appears that the neighbourhood proportion received from development within specific clusters of wards will be available to those specific clusters. 5 Step Governance process including 2 stages of community engagement and corporate group proceeding on allocations based on the priorities identified by the clusters. No reference to CIL on neighbourhood planning web page.
Hammersmith and Fulham	20/05/2015	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page. One (unnamed) neighbourhood area designated but inactive.
Haringey	21/07/2014	Review by the Haringey Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel focused on governance arrangements needed to ensure that Neighbourhood CIL is spent to best effect on those infrastructure projects that matter most to the local community. An element if CIL is apportioned to an amalgam of wards, with estimates of total annual income from CIL reaching £2million in future years, of which 15% (£300k) will

		be required to be spent in local neighbourhoods
Harrow	16/09/2013	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page. No web page on neighbourhood planning. Brief reference to NPs in 2012 Statement of Community Involvement. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Havering	23/02/2015	Preliminary CIL Draft Charging Schedule published. No web page on CIL, or on neighbourhood planning. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Hillingdon	24/04/2014	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page. No web page on neighbourhood planning. Application for designation of Ickenham neighbourhood area at consultation stage. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.
Hounslow	14/07/2015	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page. Two neighbourhood areas designated within the Borough.
Islington	26/06/2014	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page, nor in the Council's Neighbourhood Planning Guide. Two neighbourhood areas designated. It is understood that the allocation of Neighbourhood CIL will be based on Ward Improvement Plans (WIPs) - local priorities for each of the 16 wards would be decided by the Ward Partnerships, led by the ward councillor.
Kensington and Chelsea	21/01/2015	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page, or on web page on neighbourhood planning. CIL consultation document referred to further consultation on Neighbourhood CIL in autumn 2015, but now due to take place in 2017. Consultation with local communities intended to be via the Council's established City Living Local Life programme. RBKC has two neighbourhood plans made/successful at referendum (Norland, St Quintin and Woodlands)
Kingston upon Thames	13/10/2015	No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page. Local sources report that there is no current mechanism visible in any documentation that describes how consultation will be carried out with neighbourhoods or neighbourhood forums in prioritising how CIL will be spent on local projects. An Infrastructure Funding Gap Assessment and R123 List in January 2014 identified a large funding gap, suggesting that neighbourhood-level

		<p>proposals will find it hard to be prioritised for Neighbourhood CIL spend.</p> <p>No neighbourhood areas yet designated</p>
Lambeth	23/07/2014	<p>Section on website on Neighbourhood CIL states The way that developers fund improvements to the local area such as parks, roads and schools has changed. This process was managed through Section 106 agreements (S106) but will now primarily take place through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for new developments. A percentage of CIL, known as Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL), will be invested in local projects.</p> <p>In 2014, Lambeth’s Cabinet agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the percentage of Neighbourhood CIL (NCIL) for local projects from 15% to 25% • Develop Co-operative Local Investment Plans (CLIPs) to give people a greater say in priorities and proposals for spending Neighbourhood CIL • Establish seven CLIP areas along ward boundaries to facilitate community consultation at a workable local and administrative level. <p>Seven CLIP areas have been identified by the Council. Two neighbourhood areas designated.</p>
Lewisham	25/02/2015	<p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page, or on web page for neighbourhood planning. Five neighbourhood areas designated in the Borough.</p>
Merton	20/11/2013	<p>Report September 2016 to Cabinet recommends an approach based on the following:</p> <p>Engage communities for the 5 areas identified for the 2014 consultation on themes (e.g. open space, education health etc...) that they would support.</p> <p>This approach (consulting on themes) is recommended over consulting communities on specific projects.</p> <p>The council pools the money into one single neighbourhood pot for the whole borough. The council adopts a Lambeth/Croydon style centralised approach by allocating neighbourhood funding to projects that fit within the themes</p>

		<p>supported by the local communities during the engagement exercises where and when the council consider projects are needed.</p> <p>Officers would supply specific project proposals that had already been consulted on (e.g. FutureWimbledon, Rediscover Mitcham, Raynes Park enhancement plan) and allow the council to concentrate its resources towards scrutinising bids for projects that are more effective in “addressing the demands that development places on an area.”</p> <p>It is recommended that some flexibility should be allowed where major development places specific demand on a defined area that cuts across boundaries.</p> <p>No Council web page on neighbourhood planning, although some PDF material available for download from website.</p> <p>No neighbourhood areas yet designated.</p>
Newham	30/09/2013	<p>Web page on CIL examination (2013) does not refer to Neighbourhood CIL. No web page on neighbourhood planning. Brief reference on Local Plan page stating If we receive neighbourhood plans, they will be added to the Local Plan once the council adopts (agrees) them. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.</p>
Redbridge	17/11/2011	<p>The Council has a dedicated web page for its Community Infrastructure Levy Local Project Fund. This states The Council allocates 15 per cent of CIL money for local projects, which were previously decided by Council committees. This process has been opened up so it’s now easier for all residents to bid for funding. Subsequently, the Council is now seeking suggestions from the community for potential projects, within their area, to be funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy 'Local' Project.</p> <p>Funding available in each area is published on the Council's website.</p> <p>Funds are allocated on a ward and (for large infrastructure projects) a 'region' basis within Redbridge.</p> <p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on neighbourhood planning web page. No neighbourhood areas yet designated.</p>

<p>Richmond upon Thames</p>	<p>22/07/2014</p>	<p>The Council’s CIL Guidance document states Richmond Borough has produced 14 Village Plans – one for each ‘village’ area within the borough, and there is currently one Neighbourhood Forum in the borough producing a Neighbourhood Plan for Ham and Petersham. CIL monies will be allocated to the Village Plan areas and the Neighbourhood Plan area in line with the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>In line with legislation, the Council will allocate 15% of CIL revenue (capped at £100 per Council tax dwelling) collected from development within each Village Plan area to be spent in consultation with the local community in each Village Area.</p> <p>No further reference to Neighbourhood CIL on the Council’s neighbourhood planning web page.</p>
<p>Southwark</p>	<p>25/03/2015</p>	<p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page nor on neighbourhood planning web page</p>
<p>Sutton</p>	<p>03/03/2014</p>	<p>Still considering. Four options as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) local committees be allocated the local portion of CIL 2) apply the local CIL funds to strategic priorities with guidance/prioritisation to be agreed with local committees 3) a "mixed" approach viz. that some of the local CIL funds are spent on "local" schemes and some on "strategic" schemes 4) to use this money to support community infrastructure across the borough e.g. affordable housing <p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page</p>
<p>Tower Hamlets</p>	<p>04/02/2015</p>	<p>The Council’s neighbourhood planning guide includes a statement on Neighbourhood CIL as follows: The spend of S106 and CIL funding on infrastructure is a matter for the Mayor of Tower Hamlets to consider. In January 2016, the Mayor in Cabinet agreed an accountable and transparent process for decision making in this respect, setting up the Infrastructure Delivery Framework. The CIL Regulations and Guidance require the local authority to engage with local people about the spend of a proportion of CIL funding, known as the CIL Neighbourhood Portion. Engagement is required regarding 15% of CIL receipts. Where there is an</p>

		<p>adopted Neighbourhood Plan in place, engagement is required regarding 25% of CIL funds collected from developments in the Neighbourhood Planning Area granted planning permission from the date of adoption onwards. The Council are currently developing a process for engaging local people (including Neighbourhood Forums) and decision making regarding the CIL Neighbourhood Portion. It is expected that this will be presented to the Mayor in Cabinet in autumn 2016 and subject to approval, subsequently implemented.</p> <p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on the Council's CIL web page. Local NP sources report confidence that the Mayor of Tower Hamlet will adhere to these commitments.</p>
Waltham Forest	19/03/2014	<p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page or on neighbourhood planning web page</p>
Wandsworth	11/07/2014	<p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on the Council's CIL web page.</p> <p>The Council's CIL annual monitoring report for 2014/2015 states that The process for allocating neighbourhood CIL to projects was approved by the Executive in November 2013 Significant progress has been made with this process which is outlined in the main report. The first projects with a total value of £1,379,450 were approved in June 2015 and associated payments are expected to be made in 2015/16. Further projects, with a total value of £1,135,000 are recommend for approval in the main report, the majority of payments relating to which are expected to be made in 2016/17.</p> <p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on neighbourhood planning web page</p>
Westminster	20/01/2016	<p>No reference to Neighbourhood CIL on CIL web page. The Council's web page on neighbourhood planning states It is also suggested that plans include lists of local projects to support development in order of priority to help inform decisions around CIL spending.</p> <p>The Council's web page on CIL states The council is now working on CIL governance issues including how the processes of collection, spend, monitoring and reporting will be overseen. Recommendations will be brought forward by consideration by cabinet shortly. It is worth noting that we</p>

		are a long way off appreciable CIL receipts as CIL is not payable until the commencement of development, and allocation of CIL receipts is unlikely to happen until 2017 or 2018 at the earliest
LDDC	29/01/2015	CIL web page states CIL regulations provide for a 'neighbourhood portion' of the funding to be spent in consultation with the local community. The Legacy Corporation will consult later in 2015 on arrangements for spending the neighbourhood portion. The Legacy Corporation will follow government advice on engaging with local communities in the Legacy Corporation area to agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding portion of CIL funds. No sign of recent consultation. No reference to CIL on neighbourhood planning web page.
OPDC		<p>CIL regime being considered by OPDC Board on 21st September 2016. OPDC report states 'However, in London, where generally there are no local councils, the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets out that the 15 or 25 per cent (when the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted) neighbourhood portion of the CIL raised should be retained by the Charging Authority to be spent in consultation with the local community. Therefore, the OPDC as charging authority will retain the neighbourhood portion and, in line with the NPPG, will seek to engage with the communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding element. OPDC is committed to working positively with the community to ensure that the appropriate proportion of CIL is used to best meet the infrastructure needs arising within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>CIL regime not yet in force</p>

This table has been researched by Henry Peterson and informed by the views of neighbourhood planners from across the capital.

Please let us know of any comments, corrections or updates to the table via info@neighbourhoodplanners.london

Neighbourhood Planners.London

Neighbourhood Planners.London exists to support neighbourhood planners in London and raise the profile of neighbourhood planning in the capital.

We're a voluntary initiative in response to direct experience of the first wave of neighbourhood planning in London. The benefits of neighbourhood planners getting together, sharing experience and know-how was demonstrated by major conferences in Ealing in 2014 and on the South Bank in 2015 as well as the more informal London Neighbourhood Planning Gatherings, happening since spring 2013.



www.neighbourhoodplanners.london



<https://twitter.com/nplannerslondon> @NPlannersLondon



info@neighbourhoodplanners.london

