

**Appendix E – Summary of Member Feedback on draft CIL Governance & S106  
Member Protocol from Joint TECC & Member Working Group - 10<sup>th</sup> May 2021**

<b>AREA/MEMBER</b>	<b>MEMBER FEEDBACK</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
<b>City Wide CIL</b>		
Councillor Theobald	Recognised that the funds received for CIL would have a slow start & monies received are subject to size of schemes and when they are built.	No action.  NB: the majority of CIL liable schemes will be smaller/medium sized development and CIL is liable on one dwelling unit.
Councillor Miller (supported by Councillor Childs & Littman)	Concern that the initial decision making should be taken in public at P&R rather than in private session at Strategic Delivery Board Need for transparency. Suggested that the process to agree schemes to be funded should be decided by P&R and not go to SDB	Recommendation that annual (or more frequent) report on schemes to be funded through City Wide CIL is considered direct by P&R committee. Further discussion to consider suggested recommendation being undertaken.
<b>Neighbourhood CIL</b>		
Councillor Evans	Concern that not all major developments would have a ripple effect into other wards (as suggested for Toads Hole Valley) & should not therefore be cash limited to a maximum ward receipt of £150k.	Process to amend and require a report to TECC committee on a case by case basis where Neighbourhood CIL receipt would exceed £150k to agree split between ward and citywide neighbourhood pots.
Councillor Osbourne	Supported the ward based approach but wanted to examine how members could be involved in cross boundary bids/decisions.	As neighbourhood CIL will be approved at TECC committee neighbouring ward councillors will have the opportunity to comment & identify any cross boundary needs as part of the annual engagement and reporting process.
	How can we ensure that bid opportunities are widely publicised in wards?	An annual communications plan will be published and promoted across the city using all established channels and local/social media.
Councillor Littman	Agreed with Councillor Evans that some city centre developments would not have a ripple effect into neighbouring wards so much. There might be the possibility to use averaging out of CIL receipts.	Review this proposal if the report process to TECC for large receipts does not work effectively.

Councillor Theobald	Recognised that there was a need to recognise that some adjoining wards with only small amounts of Neighbourhood CIL from in ward developments would not necessarily see any major benefit overall.	Should be addressed in some instances with TECC considering use of CityWide Neighbourhood CIL for some of the funds generated through £1M plus CIL developments. Citywide CIL could also bring benefits.
<b>S106 Member Protocol</b>		
Councillor Osbourne	Welcomed clarity around CIL & S106, advice on how the transition will happen and encouragement for members to be involved in the process earlier	No action - comment
Councillor Miller	Welcomed the proposals & wanted to see more detail on how the ward process for annual spend could work and if it could harness the use of accrued interest in the S106 account.	Feedback to be addressed in the final scheme proposals to be submitted for agreement by TECC
Councillor Theobald	Wanted to understand more clearly what S106 sums for artistic component had been spent on	Summary report of historic installations funded to be circulated to Planning Committee members. Items funded since 2019/20 are identified in the Annual Infrastructure Funding Statement approved by TECC each Autumn.
Councillor Littman	Identified that the artistic component could be incorporated into a renewed series of completed schemes site visits by the Planning Committee (post lockdown.)	Head of Planning to explore arrangements in conjunction with Design South East.