



## Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

**Date:** TUESDAY, 29 JUNE 2021

**Time:** 3.00 pm

**Venue:** <https://youtu.be/Qn96hk9EIHU>

**Members:** Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)  
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Keith Bottomley  
Tijs Broeke  
Karina Dostalova  
Anne Fairweather  
Tracey Graham  
Sheriff Christopher Hayward  
Shravan Joshi  
Alderman Vincent Keaveny  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Jeremy Mayhew  
Deputy Tom Sleigh  
Sir Michael Snyder  
Deputy James Thomson  
Alderman Sir David Wootton

**Enquiries:** Joseph Anstee  
[joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

<https://youtu.be/Qn96hk9EIHU>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location. Any views reached by the Committee today will have to be considered by the Town Clerk after the meeting in accordance with the Court of Common Council's Covid Approval Procedure who will make a formal decision having considered all relevant matters. This process reflects the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court of Common Council's decision of 15th April 2021 to continue with virtual meetings and take formal decisions through a delegation to the Town Clerk and other officers nominated by him after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee is known in open session. Details of all decisions taken under the Covid Approval Procedure will be available on line via the City Corporation's webpages. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link

following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

**John Barradell**  
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**

## **AGENDA**

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the Sub Committee meeting held on 26 May 2021.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 5 - 10)

4. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND (CILNF) - APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL**

Report of the Managing Director of Bridge House Estates and Chief Charities Officer

**For Decision**  
(Pages 11 - 36)

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**For Decision**

### **Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda**

8. **CITY OF LONDON OPERATIONAL TENANTS - RENTAL SUPPORT REPAYMENT PLANS FROM JUNE 2021**

Report of the City Surveyor

**For Information**  
(Pages 37 - 48)

9. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

10. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

### **Part 3 - Confidential Agenda**

11. **TARGET OPERATING MODEL: INSTITUTIONS**  
Report of the Town Clerk

**For Discussion**

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 26 May 2021

Minutes of the hybrid meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held in Committee Rooms 3 & 4, Guildhall, and via Microsoft Teams, on Wednesday, 26 May 2021 at 10.00 am

### Present

#### Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)  
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)  
Deputy Keith Bottomley  
Tijs Broeke  
Karina Dostalova  
Tracey Graham  
Sheriff Christopher Hayward

Shravan Joshi  
Alderman Vincent Keaveny  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Jeremy Mayhew  
Deputy James Thomson  
Alderman Sir David Wootton

#### In Attendance

Marianne Fredericks  
Deputy John Tomlinson

#### Officers:

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk
Gregory Moore	- Town Clerk's Department
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlain's Department

#### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Anne Fairweather and Deputy Tom Sleigh.

#### 2. MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were no declarations.

#### 3. MINUTES

The Sub Committee noted a correction within Item 4 wherein 'process of electing Sheriffs elsewhere' should read 'process of appointing Sheriffs elsewhere'.

**RESOLVED** – That, pending the above amendment, the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 12 May 2021 be agreed as a correct record.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding capital prioritisation and the 2020/21 and 2021/22 rounds of annual capital bids. The Chamberlain introduced the report and outlined the proposals recommended.

**RESOLVED** – That the Resource Allocation Sub Committee:

- (i) Review the schemes summarised in Table 1 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time;
- (ii) Agree the release of up to £2.93m for the schemes in Table 1 from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash, subject to the required gateway approvals;
- (iii) Note that in order to maintain sound financial discipline a review of unallocated central project funding provisions will be brought to Members before the summer recess.

5. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW: COMMITTEE STRUCTURE - PRINCIPLES**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk concerning the Governance Review in respect of principles underlying the Committee structure.

Introducing the report, the Chair reflected on the structured and piecemeal consideration of Lord Lisvane's recommendations to date. Whilst this had been productive so far, now that consideration turned to the overall committee structure itself she was minded that a more holistic approach would be beneficial. With that in mind, she sought and obtained the Sub Committee's endorsement for the proposal that, rather than continuing to press ahead on a piecemeal basis, a revised approach seeking to draw together the totality of Members' emerging views into an overall proposition for consideration, be adopted.

During discussion, the following points arose:-

- It was agreed that the application of "executive or non-executive" nomenclature was not an appropriate one for Members, given their varying responsibilities and the Corporation's differences with other organisations. However, it was agreed that a serious look at the level of delegations in place and getting that balance right was important, with it observed that in some areas Members perhaps had a tendency to micro-manage issues where it would be more beneficial to take a more strategic approach.
- With reference to the scheme of delegations, Members agreed that there was a need to undertake a holistic review with the aim of seeing where improvements to efficiency and the speed of decision-making could be

made. Ultimately, Members would need to determine to what level they were comfortable in delegating to officers, with it stressed that the review needed to happen through a partnership approach between officers and Members, rather than being officer-driven, so that relevant Chairs in particular could be engaged prior to amendments being presented. It was noted that timescales for achieving this review would be challenging, particularly in the context of current resource constraints, and the Chair undertook to liaise with the Town Clerk following the meeting with a view to identifying how this could be progressed expeditiously. The Deputy Chamberlain suggested that early proposals could be drawn up on the key financial and policy aspects by the recess.

- There was support for revisiting committee meeting cycles and frequencies, as well as implementing a limit on the number of committees which could receive any given report.
- Several Members commented on the issue of the same reports being considered by multiple committees, observing that this caused complication and delay. The approach of the European Parliament was highlighted as an example of an established alternative system, whereby one committee was identified as being responsible for decision-making and where any other committees had an interest they could submit their opinion ahead of the primary committee considering the matter.
- With reference to minutes, whilst there was some support for streamlining committee minutes and moving away from a detailed account of debate, it was argued that there still needed to be a reflection of the broad differences of opinion expressed, representing the balance of views sensibly, rather than simply recording decisions. It was also observed that, for certain areas, minutes would need to be fuller to comply with various inspection regimes. It was also argued that Court minutes should continue in their current format.
- Support for expressed for the tightening of terms of reference and a more rigid approach to prevent “mission creep” by committees.
- There was an endorsement for minimising “for information” reports and giving consideration as to how they might best be taken under the new system.
- In relation to proposals around limiting the numbers of sub-committees and related bodies, it was observed that the present total must not just be reduced but that mechanisms must be in place to prevent the proliferation of new bodies in future. It was suggested that with careful oversight, requiring perhaps a business case to be submitted to Policy & Resources for consideration and setting out resourcing implications each time, would be appropriate. A much greater use of Task and Finish Groups with fixed lifetimes, rather than permanent sub-committees, should also be pursued.
- The use of joint meetings where appropriate was supported, with particular reference made to recent examples and it being observed that they represented a good opportunity to bring multiple committees together, perhaps where there was a report scheduled to go to several bodies, thereby minimising repeat consideration of items.

- There was an endorsement for appropriate training and appraisals for Chairs.
- The proposals relating to green impact assessments were supported, with it noted this was already being implemented in any case.
- It was agreed that there was universal opposition to the proposition of a Governance & Nominations Committee and that this recommendation should be rejected; however, there was support for the greater use of skills matrices, together with more intelligent advertising and use of data, to help inform Members' voting.
- Whilst there was broad in-principle support for smaller committees, it was recognised that a blanket approach could not be taken and that a more nuanced approach, utilising the right size committee for right type of body, was necessary; for instance, committees such as Policy & Resources would need to retain a larger membership.
- Similarly, whilst there was in-principle support for reducing the numbers of committees or outside bodies one might serve on, this would need to be handled carefully so as not result in an abundance of vacancies, as well as facilitating the clear benefits of cross-pollination of service on various committees. Continued use of the ability to waive service limitations once a vacancy has been open for a certain period was suggested as prudent.
- With reference to the practice of having three Deputy / Vice Chairs of Policy and Resources, following debate there was support for moving away from this and reverting to the practice of having a single Deputy Chair. Whilst the heavy workload was noted, it was suggested that the use of rapporteurs or lead Members was a preferable alternative which allowed for peoples' specialisms or interests to be engaged whilst also minimising any complication or confusion around the committee's leadership.
- However, it was cautioned that the Deputy Chair should not be seen as the natural successor when elected several years in advance of the Chair's term ending; rather, any lead members or sub-committee chairs, for instance, might be considered in the round as potential successors.
- Discussing the automatic right for outgoing Chairs to take up the Deputy Chair role, Members felt on balance that this should be a matter for the committee to determine in each instance. In some cases there was a clear value to this handover process and continuity, whereas in others, it could be seen differently; ultimately, Members felt that the democratic approach would be preferable and the outgoing Chair should be eligible to stand as Deputy Chair but be required to be elected.
- With specific reference to Policy & Resources, the Chair suggested that there should be a sort of "purdah period" for outgoing Chairs, similar to that in place for Lord Mayors.
- On the question of term limits, there were a range of views, with it ultimately felt that they were clearly essential in those areas where there was a statutory or regulatory expectation to have them, or where there was a lack of obvious turnover in membership; however, they were not necessarily always appropriate for all committees.



- On the question of the convention whereby Aldermen did not stand for certain chairmanships, it was clarified that the Aldermen were supportive of no substantive change in this area and did not necessarily support Lord Lisvane's proposal to remove the convention. Another Member suggested that this issue perhaps needed to be considered in the round, potentially looking at what other organisations did, although it was observed that very few organisations had such a structure and so it was unlikely relevant benchmarks existed.

The Chair thanked Members for the positive discussion.

**RESOLVED:** That:-

- (i) The proposals made by Lord Lisvane in relation to general issues and principles for the committee structure be noted (Appendix 1).
- (ii) The feedback provided by Members through the informal engagement process be noted (Appendix 2).
- (iii) The views of the Sub Committee in respect of the various proposals, as set out in the above minute, be collated and reflected in composite proposals to be presented to the Policy & Resources Committee in due course.

**6. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

**7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

The Chair then thanked Members and Officers for their attendance and contributions before closing the meeting.

**The meeting ended at 11.02 am**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee**  
**joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee – For decision	<b>Dated:</b> 29/06/2021
<b>Subject:</b> Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund – Applications for Approval	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Managing Director of Bridge House Estates and Chief Charities Officer	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Jack Joslin, Head of Central Grants Unit James Lee CILNF Programme Manager	

## Summary

The City Corporation adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014. National CIL Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts be reserved for neighbourhood funding. Local authorities are required to engage with communities on how this neighbourhood funding should be used to support development of the area. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of funds allocated to neighbourhood funding.

An amended policy for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) was agreed by this committee in May 2019, with agreement that a proportion of funding applications by officers under delegation, whilst retaining the role of the Committee to determine applications in excess of £50,000; a normal upper limit on funds for any one project of 15% of outstanding funds at the time of application; clarification of the reporting requirements for the Fund; clarification on those organisations that would be eligible to apply for funding, but allowing applications from constituted resident and business organisations in the City; and amendments to make the Fund more responsive to community-led projects and to allow for use of the Fund to cover robustly justified, time limited applications for revenue funding and maintenance.

The CILNF application process is managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations.

Members are asked to approve the grants recommended for their consideration at a meetings of the CILNF Officer Panel in April and May 2021.

## **Recommendation**

Members are recommended to:

1. To approve the recommended grant of £198,633 over two years to Globe Studios Limited at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in April 2021 (**Appendix 1**).
2. To approve the recommended grant of £737,807 over three years to the Barbican Centre Trust Limited at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in May 2021 (**Appendix 2**).

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. Under the 2008 Planning Act and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), a local authority may adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) setting out how it will require contributions from development towards the cost of providing new infrastructure. A local authority adopting a CIL must set out the infrastructure it will fund through the CIL in a document known as a Regulation 123 List. CIL regulations allow for up to 5% of CIL receipts to be used to fund the administrative costs incurred in operating a CIL. Regulations also require that 15% of CIL receipts shall be reserved for neighbourhood funding, or 25% where there is a neighbourhood plan. Neighbourhood funding must be passed to a neighbourhood forum, parish or town council, where they exist. Where they do not exist (as in the City of London), the local authority will retain CIL neighbourhood funds but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend this element of CIL.
2. In accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance, local authorities should set out clearly and transparently how they will engage with communities and the use of the neighbourhood fund should match the priorities expressed by these local communities.
3. Regulations require that the neighbourhood fund must be used to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area. CIL Regulation 59F allows a wider scope of projects to be funded through the CILNF than that allowed for other CIL funding, including:
  - a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; (the same criteria as for other CIL funds) or
  - b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area (additional flexibility for neighbourhood fund).

In delivering against (b) above, the neighbourhood fund does not have to be spent in accordance with the local authority's CIL spending priorities (set out in its Regulation 123 List).

4. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of CIL Neighbourhood Funds and how they have been used.

### **Current Position**

5. The City CILNF launched on 1 September 2020. At June 2021, the neighbourhood portion of the City CIL stood at £6 million in available funds, excluding the amounts under consideration at this meeting.

### **Process**

6. Management of the City CILNF process is aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the Central Grants Unit (CGU).
7. The CGU is co-located with the City Bridge Trust (CBT) team in order to facilitate consistency of approach and harmonise service standards across grant-making activities by the City Corporation (in its various capacities, including as trustee of a number of charities which form part of the Central Grant Programme).
8. The CILNF will have a normal minimum level of funding for which applications can be made, of £1,000, to ensure that very small applications do not lead to disproportionate administrative cost. A normal upper limit of 15% of CIL Neighbourhood Funds available at the time of application, to ensure that funding is not exhausted on a small number of schemes. Applications in excess of 15% can be considered in exceptional circumstances where there is demonstrable benefit to more than one of the City's communities and the proposal aligns with published City Corporation strategies. Full criteria can be found at **Appendix 3**.
9. It was agreed at this meeting in May 2019 that provision for delegated authority would determine a proportion of applications, whilst retaining the requirement for Committee approval for larger value applications. Delegated provision is outlined as follows:
  - a.i. Applications under £25,000 – to be determined by officer delegation
  - a.ii. Applications between £25,000 and £50,000 – to be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee.
  - a.iii. Applications over £50,000 – determined by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, with advice from the officer Priorities Board.
10. Delegated funding decisions and advice to Committee are made by an Officer Panel, chaired by the Policy and Performance Director from the Department of Built Environment and drawn from a broad range of departments, reflecting a diversity of views and interests. Applications over £50,000 will be brought to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee for decision.
11. Where an application will have an impact on a specific ward, your Officers will consult with Members of that ward as part of the assessment process. The

feedback provided by ward Members has been in favour of funding the application being considered by this Committee.

12. The CGU is now able to bring a request for approval of two grants to this Committee: following assessment by your Officers, positive feedback from your fellow Members and approval by your Officer Panel.
13. This Committee is now asked to approve a grant of £198,633 over 2 years to Globe Studios Limited to develop a creative studio and architecture/design library. The studio will feature a regular weekly schedule of public, private and corporate classes hosted by professional makers. Further detail of the project can be found at **Appendix 1**.
14. This Committee is now asked to approve a grant of £737,807 over 3 years to Barbican Centre Trust Limited to deliver a Creative Communities programme, collaborating with partners across the City to strengthen connections with and between neighbours and the culture on their doorstep. Further detail of the project can be found at **Appendix 2**.
15. The proposed grant of £737,807 to the Barbican Centre Trust represents an ask of 12% of the total CILNF currently available. This sits just under the normal upper threshold for grants of 15% of the total CILNF available, as outlined in point 8 of this report.
16. Should this Committee choose to approve both grants presented to you for decision today, the total CILNF remaining budget will be £5,098,358.
17. This Committee is asked to note that the CILNF and Central Grants Unit will play an active role in the monitoring and evaluation of these grants to ensure the considerable sums being committed are spent appropriately and for the maximum benefit of the City of London. Regular progress reports will be made available to this Committee.

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

18. Corporate Plan Implications: Adoption of a mechanism enabling City communities to bid for funding from the City CILNF will enable community-led infrastructure improvements across the City and contribute towards meeting the 3 aims of the Corporate Plan 2018-23, particularly Contribute to a Flourishing Society and Shaping an Outstanding Environment.
19. Security Implications: The proposal to create a Neighbourhood Fund fulfils a statutory requirement for the spending of CIL. There are no direct security implications, though future funded projects may bring security benefits.
20. Financial Implications: The proposed City CILNF would make use of that proportion of City CIL monies which are required by statute to be used to assist in the delivery of new infrastructure to meet community needs (15% of CIL funds). The costs of management of the grant application process will be met through the 5% of CIL funds set aside by statute to cover CIL administration.

21. Equalities and resourcing implications: The proposed City CILNF has been subject to an Equality Analysis Test of Relevance. This has concluded that there are no impacts arising from these proposals for protected groups and that a full Equality Analysis is not required.
22. Volunteering programme: Projects funded by the CILNF may provide volunteering opportunities which can be offered to Officers via the Corporate Volunteering programme when appropriate.
23. Delivery of the Fund will be through existing staff resources in Departments. Staff resource requirements will be met through allocation of some of the City CIL funds set aside by statute to cover administration costs.

## **Conclusion**

24. Community Infrastructure Levy legislation requires local authorities to reserve between 15% and 25% of CIL receipts for neighbourhood funding. Where there is no recognised parish or town council or neighbourhood forum, the local authority will retain the neighbourhood fund but must spend it on infrastructure which meets community needs. The local authority must consult the community on how these funds will be used.
25. The Neighbourhood Fund application process is managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations. The programme launched on 1 September 2020.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Globe Studios Limited – Assessment Report  
Appendix 2 – Barbican Centre Trust Limited – Assessment Report  
Appendix 3 – CIL Neighbourhood Fund - Criteria

## **Background Papers**

Report to Policy & Resources Committee 02/05/2019: City of London Community Infrastructure Levy – Approval of Neighbourhood Fund

### **Jack Joslin**

Head of Central Grants Unit

E: [jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



## **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND**

**Globe Studios Limited**  
(ref.18558)

**Amount requested: £198,633**

**Amount recommended: £ 198,633**

**Purpose of grant request: Developing a creative studio and architecture/design library. The studio will feature a regular weekly schedule of public, private and corporate classes hosted by professional makers.**

**Type of cost: Mixture of revenue & capital**

**Ward(s) benefitting:** *Portsoken*

### **The Applicant**

Globe Studios Limited is a private limited company with the company number 10225028 that trades under the name of 'Benk + Bo'. The applicant has four full-time staff and three part-time staff.

Benk + Bo provides an accessible, creative and community orientated space located on Gravel Lane in the Portsoken Ward. The applicant occupies three floors of a commercial unit on the estate. The ground floor is home to a public cafe and lounge area, from which they provide culinary workshops for the public. The lower ground floor is a free-to-use open workspace which becomes an event space during evenings and weekends. The first floor is currently home to a piano room, a meeting room and a yoga/fitness studio.

The applicant seeks to support culture and the arts within the City and in turn to change perceptions about the area and all that it offers. It is a popular space with London's creative enthusiasts, artists, makers and thinkers: providing engaging classes, activities and events. Encompassing a range of different projects from food to furniture, book clubs to talks and events: Benk + Bo promotes the building of communities, skills and sustainable choices.

### **Background and detail of proposal**

Benk + Bo is seeking £198,633 over two years to convert the first floor of the premises they currently occupy on Gravel Lane into a craft studio space and to run a programme of creative classes that will be accessible to the public.

This will involve amending the existing space and adding work benches, storage, various tools and equipment to facilitate a range of small-scale craft activities. The applicant is seeking support from the CILNF for the upfront costs of making alterations to the space (£20,000), craft equipment (£35,000) a proportion of rent for the first floor space (£42,733 over two years), the salary for a Craft Studio & Community Coordinator role (£50,000 over two years) and various other costs related to delivery of the project.

The applicant has provided a supplementary document to this application which demonstrates extensive planning and market research to evidence the viability and appetite for this proposal. The proposed activities fall within the Craft Sector and tap into what is known as 'The Experience Economy'. The Craft Council 'Market For Craft Report' shows craft sales in the UK between 2006 and 2019 increased from £883m to £3b - an increase of around 240%. Benk + Bo seek to tap into this growing market by offering physical space and facilitated classes to the community of the Square Mile and beyond.

Benk + Bo has a history of strong community engagement with residents in the ward of Portsoken, where they are based. Residents of the Middlesex Estate on Gravel Lane regularly use Benk + Bo's facilities and during the pandemic, the provision of free-to-use workspace proved to be popular with the local community.

The applicant has also demonstrated an ability to attract a diverse community of creatives from across London to the workshops and events that it hosted pre-pandemic. This project will help the applicant grow its offering and drive footfall back into the Square Mile through the renewed and expanded provision of workshops and events. This work has the support of the Aldgate Business Improvement District and the applicant has been put forward as a potential lead for a number of workstreams in the Culture & Commerce Taskforce that is Chaired by the Lord Mayor.

An important aspect of this application is the intention to provide an architecture and design library on the premises. Whilst many libraries will have resources available on architecture and design as part of their wider offering, the only dedicated resource for this subject in London is the library at the Royal Institute of British Architects. The applicant has secured the support of the Barbican Centre and other stakeholders in the field of architecture and design, who will provide the materials to fill this library, should this application prove to be successful.

The applicant expects around 700 people per year to benefit: a realistic (and perhaps somewhat conservative) figure, given that Benk + Bo was seeing over a thousand people attend workshops, events and classes that were being hosted pre-pandemic. The applicant has a history of working with and listening to the communities that access its space: the content of this proposal and the planned workshops have all been informed by extensive research conducted by the applicant with over 100 stakeholders.

The initial range of creative classes on offer will include options such as woodwork; sewing and textiles; jewellery making; life drawing; sculpture; book binding; writing and cooking. The common thread throughout these classes will be a focus on sustainability and care for the environment: a core ethos at Benk + Bo.

The facilities which the CILNF is being asked to fund have the potential to become a key part of the culture landscape for both the City and Greater London. The applicant has a track record of delivering high quality workshops that have attracted interest from the Square Mile and beyond. Whilst they have been badly affected by the pandemic, the organisation has proven to be resilient and quickly moved to reduce its expenditure this year to ensure a viable long-term future.

## **Financial Information**

Globe Studios Limited is a private limited company (company number 10225028). The applicant also has a dormant Community Interest Company (CIC) and are considering whether they transition to a CIC structure for the long-term. Globe Studios previously operated as two separate entities: 'Globe Studios Limited' (looking after the workshop space) and 'Benk + Bo Bakery' (looking after the bakery and kitchen activities). Since early 2020, all activity for both companies has been transferred to 'Globe Studios Limited' and the forecast and budget figures below reflect this revised structure.

The applicant was first incorporated in 2016 and began trading in the latter half of 2018. The applicant had two years of gradual growth prior to the pandemic. The business strategy and operations of Benk + Bo were overhauled at the start of 2020 when a new Financial Director joined the team to streamline staff costs and evaluate all administrative and overhead expenditure.

The end of year forecast for 2021 should very much be considered in the context of the pandemic: the impact of lockdown restrictions has been particularly painful for the applicant, given that its business model is predicated on the face-to-face provision of services in a fixed location with specific equipment. The applicant moved quickly to reduce its costs by taking advantage of the furlough scheme and other available grants to ensure that the business would survive and be able to return to normal trading when possible. The applicant expects to be able to resume normal trading in the last two quarters of 2021 and the budget for 2022 reflects this (the figure excludes any potential income from this grant, should it be approved).

Globe Studios Limited's accounts show a large net liability which is attributed to a significant sum of money injected into the business as a Director's Loan from one of the founders of the business. Given the steps that have been taken to reduce expenditure during the pandemic and the long-term plans which have seen the applicant shed the loss-making elements of its programming to make the business sustainable: the business remains viable as a going concern. If this grant were to be approved, with the exception of the capital costs, the rest of the financial risk to the CILNF can be managed through quarterly retrospective payments to the applicant.

Globe Studios Limited has several fixed costs such as rent for their premises and the salaries of a small staff team. Beyond that, their primary expenditure is on sessional teaching staff for classes, alongside the materials for those classes. Should the grant be approved, the applicant has the necessary financial understanding and procedures to manage the proper administration and reporting of the grant funds. The applicant has a long history of timely filing and compliance with the requirements of Companies House.

Year End 31/05	2020 Signed Accounts £	2021 Forecast £	2022 Budget £
<b>Income &amp; expenditure:</b>			
Income	317,158	41,000	210,000
Expenditure	430,709	48,000	205,000
Total surplus/(deficit)	(113,551)	(7,000)	5,000
<b>Reserves</b>			
Share capital	100.0	100.0	100.0
Profit and loss account	-278,981	-285,981.0	-280,981.0

### Recommendation

Benk + Bo is an important part of the City's cultural offering. If this application is successful, it will create a unique resource within the Square Mile. The community appetite for this work has been thoroughly researched by the applicant and the positive impact on the City's cultural offering is clear.

Whilst this will be the applicant's first grant of this size, with careful management on the part of both the applicant and the City of London, there is no undue cause for concern regarding this. The applicant has provided a strong monitoring and evaluation framework as part of their application and this provides confidence that the grant will be spent effectively and responsibly. The recommendation is for this application to be fully funded.

**£198,633 over two years (£131,816; £66,817) to develop a creative studio and architecture/design library alongside a regular schedule of public, private and corporate creative classes.**

## COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND

**Barbican Centre Trust Limited**  
**(ref.18557)**

**Amount requested: £737,807**

**Amount recommended: £737,807**

**Purpose of grant request: To deliver a Creative Communities programme, collaborating with partners across the City to strengthen connections with and between neighbours and the culture on their doorstep.**

**Type of cost: Revenue**

**Ward(s) benefitting: All Wards**

### **The Applicant**

Barbican Centre Trust Limited (BCTL) is an entity registered under charity number: 294282 and company number: 01962950. First established as a charitable company limited by guarantee in November 1985 and subsequently registered as a charity in May 1986. The Barbican Centre Trust Limited exists to promote arts and culture, an objective it fulfils primarily through the financial support it provides in the form of grants to The Barbican, one of Europe's largest multi-arts venues, based in London. Whilst BCTL and The Barbican are closely linked, they exist as separate entities.

This application is led by BCTL but has been created and will be delivered in partnership with all of the Culture Mile stakeholders. Culture Mile: established by the City of London Corporation in partnership with the Barbican Centre, the Guildhall School, the LSO and the Museum of London to bring culture and commerce together in the north-west part of the City, has become an internationally recognised part of the City of London's cultural life. It has played a valued part in sustaining cultural and community activity during the recent months of the pandemic.

### **Background and detail of proposal**

This is an application for funding that builds on work that has been initiated by the Culture Mile partnership. The CILNF is being asked for funding to support the 'Creative Communities' programme being delivered by Culture Mile. The funding required consists of activity costs (£341,747 over three years), development and delivery costs (£226,040 over three years) a contribution towards management costs (£85,799 over three years) and marketing & evaluation costs (£84,221 over three years). It is anticipated that this programme will deliver nearly 150,000 engagements with culture in the City and beyond over the course of three years.

This application aims to provide three main outcomes:

- Creative Participation: Living near Culture Mile unlocks opportunities for residents to enrich their lives by participating in creative activities. Sharing stories, experiences, hopes and fears with others in imaginative and playful ways, strengthens connections with and between neighbours, nurturing

emotional resilience, belonging and mental well-being and supporting a flourishing society.

- Creative Citizenship: Representation, visibility and civic engagement of the City's diverse communities is increased. People from all communities have the agency to play an active role. There are clear ways for people to meet and share ideas, resources and skills with each other and the organisations on their doorsteps.
- Cross-sector Collaboration: To achieve the outcomes above, partners work, learn, and innovate together. A cohort of supported peers from the Culture, Community and Public Sectors collaborate to shift thinking, evidence impact and influence change. The Culture Mile partnership is recognised for the value it brings to its local communities.

To achieve these outcomes, 'Creative Communities' will deliver three main strands of activity:

- Play & Imagine Programmes: Delivery of an annual programme of creative activities, events and resources, co-produced with local people and the City's cultural organisations. Projects will be accessible to all, inviting people to get creative at home and in their neighbourhoods as well as at live events in Culture Mile.
- Creative Citizens Lab: An ambitious new initiative, testing ways for residents to come together, share and contribute actively to local change. Building on the pilot of our first resident-led community grants programme, the "Imagine Fund", we will deepen the exploration of participatory decision-making models and develop spaces for peer-to-peer exchange.
- Community Collaborators: Each year 10 professionals from the culture, health, community sectors will come together to form a peer cohort. The cohort will meet regularly, focusing on strengthening evaluation approaches, developing shared measures of value and building a stronger evidence-led case for the impact of community led work.

Each activity strand is composed of a number of elements that are detailed below.

The Play & Imagine Programmes build on Culture Mile's existing activities which engage lower-income families and isolated older people. These activities are delivered at home and in the community. The activity costs the CILNF is being asked to fund for this strand of work will total £88,407. Overall, it is anticipated that this strand of activity will have 31,200 engagements per year.

This strand of work consists of a number of activities that reach people at home, on the streets of their neighbourhoods and across the City.

Radio Local provides a platform for local businesses, residents, guest artists and young people to tell their stories about the City. Radio Local has been a valuable form of connection for its 10,000 listeners, featuring the voices of 120 local

participants, 11 local businesses, several guest artists and involved two groups of local young people as presenters.

Play Packs were created with local cultural institutions and artists to provide families at home with materials and resources that they would not have otherwise been able to access during lockdown. So far, 12,000 Play Packs have been distributed via foodbanks, community centres, schools, refugee services, housing associations, charities, playgrounds and more. Feedback on this provision has noted how valuable they have been to low-income families that would have otherwise struggled to entertain their children during lockdown. The Play Packs are a great example of how Culture Mile activities responded to the pressures of the pandemic and are also a way of engaging people in digital poverty by providing a range of offline cultural resources.

Imagination Packs are aimed at the City's older population and provided creative inspiration and connection through poetry, music & visual art activities and materials to support creativity and well-being. The Imagination Packs also encouraged participants to share their creative responses and write encouraging messages to other local residents. Nearly 2,000 Imagination Packs have been distributed and the feedback from recipients has been positive, noting the way in which they have helped combat social isolation.

In addition to these at-home activities, Play Packs In The Streets and Play Streets provided accessible and inclusive play activities and opportunities for families to connect with their local area. Taking place prior to the pandemic, the first two Play Streets sessions attracted 1,000 visitors, an estimated 60% of whom were children and young people.

The Play & Imagine Programmes the CILNF is being asked to fund will build on the existing work that has been well received by participants, residents and local businesses in the Square Mile. The applicant has provided many examples of positive feedback for this work: it is clear that a range of communities value and appreciate the activities and resources offered through this work.

The Creative Citizens Lab strand of activities provides spaces to test ways for residents to come together, share and contribute to their neighbourhoods. There is a strong streak of co-production with local communities that runs through all of the proposed activities in this strand. The activity costs the CILNF is being asked to fund for this strand of work will total £223,160. Overall, it is anticipated that this strand of activity will have 18,280 engagements per year.

Within the Creative Citizens Lab, The Imagine Fund will support the creative ideas of local people by providing small amounts of seed funding. The design and delivery of this activity reflects some of the best practice in participatory grant making. The Imagine Fund will bring together a panel of local people to design the process and then make decisions on the distribution of small amounts of funding to support community-led projects. This is a really strong element of the proposed work that the CILNF is being asked to fund as it places members of the community right at the heart of the decision-making process. Feedback on the existing work of the Imagine Fund has noted the valuable community spirit that it fosters, and the learning gained

from this process can be hugely valuable to other funds: it has been agreed that should this application be successful, the Central Grants Unit will be part of the process to provide support and learn from this place based participatory grant programme.

The Creative Citizens Lab also provides a Peer to Peer support network for local creative freelancers. Initially started as a way to include freelancers in the wider conversation about culture, commerce and recovery – the work has since evolved to respond to the needs of the freelance community that it supports by providing spaces and opportunities to work and learn together.

The final element of the Creative Citizens Lab will be the Community Commissions programme, which works with cultural and community partners to deliver co-designed projects to meet local needs identified by the partners involved. Previous commissions have included work with Age UK to reduce social isolation, creative workshops with children in playgrounds and online creative workshops with Women for Refugee Women.

The third strand of activity that the CILNF is being asked to support is called Community Collaborators. The activity costs the CILNF is being asked to fund for this strand of work will total £30,180. Whilst this strand provides a smaller number of engagements per year (110) the work has the potential to impact on thousands of lives through its intention to create a peer learning cohort of community engagement leads who work in the City. Providing the space and encouragement to share resources and good practice amongst practitioners working in any given sector is widely recognised as a valuable thing. Whilst this strand of work will have the lowest number of engagements, it is arguably one of the most meaningful ways in which the City and CILNF can support communities in the Square Mile.

Underpinning all of the work that will be delivered is a robust monitoring and evaluation framework that the applicant has supplied with their application. Using a mixture of methodologies to capture and share information, the applicant will analyse qualitative and quantitative data about the impact of the proposed programmes and the people they will reach. The indicators of success are linked to the outcomes articulated and there is an emphasis on monitoring the impact of this work on the most disadvantaged and under-represented groups. Alongside more established methods, the applicant also proposes what they have described as a 'storytelling methodology' as part of the monitoring framework. The intention behind this approach is to reflect the values that underpin how the applicant wishes to work: with a commitment to creative participation, collaboration, sharing power and learning. The methodology involves recruiting and training a team of 'story-collectors' who then have structured conversations with people involved in the various programmes (the 'storytellers') about what has changed for them as a result of participating; how that change has occurred and why that change is important to them. These conversations are then written up into stories, retaining the teller's voice, and discussed in a facilitated meeting by a group of people involved in the work to draw out and understand the themes and learning they reveal and what that means for the ongoing development of the work.



## Financial Information

The applicant has a relatively stable level of income that has ranged from £1.19m to £1.59m over the last five years. BCTL's latest accounts show a small reduction to income that is attributed to lost income and donations from visitors to the Barbican Centre as a result of the pandemic.

BCTL holds no liabilities beyond money that it has committed in the form of grants. BCTL is governed by 11 trustees but has no staff as support services for the day to day running of BCTL are provided by the City of London Corporation. The cost of providing support services to the Trust amounted to £253,879 in 2020 (2019: £309,228) and is based on a portion of the salary costs of fourteen City of London Corporation employees. Support services are recognised as 'donated services' and are cited in BCTL's annual accounts as donations within Incoming Resources and Charitable Activities within Resources Expended.

As a consequence of how the operations of BCTL are managed and its low operational costs thanks to support from the City of London Corporation, the Trustees consider it necessary only to retain a relatively low level of unrestricted reserves. Whilst the reserves of BCTL are inconsequential, it is the policy of the Trustees at all times to maintain sufficient reserves within the Trust to meet all future commitments in full. The Trustees have a policy of only committing to grants once income has been received into the Trust and has low net expenditure on running costs.

BCTL appears to be on a stable financial footing and the financial controls outlined in their governance documents follow recognised good practice. However, whilst the governance documents outline financial processes that follow recognised good practice, it is worth noting that in their 2020 signed annual report, BCTL did not produce fully Charities SORP-compliant accounts. As part of our recommendation we will advise that the charity must produce SORP-compliant accounts in 2021 and correct the issues we identified in the 2020 report.

Year end as at 31 March	2020 Signed Accounts £	2021 Forecast £	2022 Budget £
<b>Income &amp; expenditure:</b>			
Income	1,264,686	1,119,410	1,206,591
- % of Income confirmed as at	N/A	100%	0%
Expenditure	(1,171,608)	(1,079,979)	(1,206,591)
Total surplus/(deficit)	<b>93,078</b>	<b>39,431</b>	<b>0</b>
Split between:			
- Restricted surplus/(deficit)	34,473	40,564	0
- Unrestricted surplus/(deficit)	58,605	(1,133)	0
	<b>93,078</b>	<b>39,431</b>	<b>0</b>
Cost of Raising Funds	235,199	258,065	244,701
% Income	19%	23%	20%
<b>Free unrestricted reserves:</b>			
Free unrestricted reserves held at year end	123,074	121,941	121,941

## **Recommendation**

This is a large application for an ambitious, multi-year programme of activities that are grounded in the Square Mile but with an impact that reaches far beyond the borders of the City.

The applicant has demonstrated its ability to deliver these activities at the proposed scale, with feedback from participants and other stakeholders that has been positive and points to the value of this work. The impact of the pandemic on Culture Mile has shown the adaptability at the heart of this work, which is led by the needs of the communities it wants to reach. The emphasis on co-production and working with communities is a particularly strong element of this application. The recommendation is for this application to be fully funded. The CILNF will be advising the applicant to take feedback on the 2020 accounts and produce fully SORP-compliant accounts in 2021.

**£737,807 over three years (£191,067; £273,370; £273,370) to deliver a Creative Communities programme, collaborating with partners across the City to strengthen connections with and between neighbours and the culture on their doorstep.**

# **City of London**

## **Community Infrastructure Levy**

### **Neighbourhood Fund**



# City of London Community Infrastructure Levy

## Neighbourhood Fund

### Introduction and legislative background

1. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a charge levied on new development, introduced by the Planning Act 2008. It is intended to help local authorities deliver the infrastructure needed to support development. The power to set a charge came into effect from April 2010, through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which have subsequently been amended.
2. The City of London Corporation implemented a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the City of London from 1 July 2014.
3. Further information on the City CIL is available on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>

### CIL Neighbourhood Fund Requirements

4. Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts should be reserved to enable the delivery of neighbourhood priorities. These receipts should be passed directly to existing parish and town councils where development has taken place. Where a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made 25% of CIL receipts from development in the plan area is reserved for the delivery of neighbourhood priorities.
5. Where there is no existing parish, town or community council, neighbourhood plan or development order, then the local authority will retain neighbourhood CIL funds, but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood CIL.
6. Within the City of London, there are no existing parish, town or community councils and no adopted neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood development orders. The City Corporation therefore retains the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and should seek community views on how this Fund should be used. In exercising this role, the City Corporation has considered whether specific communities or

neighbourhoods should be identified. However, given that the City is little over one square mile in area, the City Corporation considers that it should be regarded as a single neighbourhood for the purposes of collection and spending of CIL Neighbourhood Funds.

## **What can CIL Neighbourhood Funds be used for?**

7. CIL Regulation 59(F) requires that the Neighbourhood Fund be used to support the development of the neighbourhood. The scope of projects that can be funded by the Neighbourhood Fund is wider than that for general CIL funds and comprises:
  - a. The provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
  - b. Anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
8. This definition is deliberately wide and allows the City Corporation to work collaboratively with local communities to determine priorities and how the Fund should be used.

## **Scale of the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund**

9. The City of London CIL was implemented from 1 July 2014.
10. At March 2019, the total amount of CIL monies received and allocated to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund was £4.5 million.

## **Community Priorities**

11. The City Corporation has adopted a Regulation 123 List which identifies the types of infrastructure that it will consider funding using the Community Infrastructure Levy. This Regulation 123 List is kept under review and any proposals for change will be subject to public consultation. The current Regulation 123 List is available on the City Corporation's website at:  
<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx> . The Regulation 123 List is used principally to guide the use of CIL monies outside of the Neighbourhood Fund.
12. In considering how to use the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, Planning Practice Guidance states that where there is no parish, town or community

council, charging authorities should engage with communities where development has taken place on their priorities for funding.

13. The City Corporation consulted on priorities for the use of the City's CIL Neighbourhood Fund during December 2018 and January 2019. This consultation revealed support for the Fund to be used primarily to deliver infrastructure which meets local community identified needs.

14. The City's Neighbourhood Fund has been established to be applied to funding applications from local communities and community groups and to deliver improvements in infrastructure which have the potential to deliver benefit to City residents, workers and visitors. The Fund could be used for:

- Smaller scale projects, deliverable for under £50,000, in response to locally identified needs.
- Larger projects of over £50,000 and normally less than 15% of the total available Neighbourhood Fund.

## **Community Definition**

15. The City of London has a resident population of approximately 8,000 and a daily working population of over 500,000 occupying nearly 9 million square metres of office floorspace. The City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement already recognises that it is not appropriate to regard the 'local community' as just the resident community. For the purposes of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, 'community' is defined as local residents, City workers and the owners and occupiers of City buildings.

## **Governance Process**

16. The City CIL Neighbourhood Fund will be allocated following consideration of valid applications (i.e. those that meet the adopted assessment criteria for the Neighbourhood Fund) from communities within the City of London or close to the City of London where projects support the development of the City. The determination of these applications will rest with the City Corporation. The City Corporation will publish details of funding applications and its determination of those applications on the City Corporation's website.
17. The City Corporation will prepare an annual report for the CIL Neighbourhood Fund as a separate item within the wider annual CIL

and s106 monitoring report. The Neighbourhood Fund monitoring will include details of:

- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund receipts for the reporting year;
- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year;
- Details of CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year, including the amount spent on each individual project;
- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund monies remaining.

18. City Communities will be consulted on an annual basis on community priorities for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund. A full review of the Neighbourhood Fund, including priorities and governance, will be undertaken at least every 5 years.

## **Neighbourhood Fund Application Process**

19. The application process will be managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit. Information about the Neighbourhood Fund and how to apply will be posted on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>
20. Fund applications can be made at any time and should be submitted via an online application form which will be posted on the City Corporation's website.

## **Organisations eligible to bid for funding**

21. Neighbourhood Fund applications will be accepted from the following types of organisation:
- Constituted voluntary organisations and resident associations
  - Constituted business organisations and associations
  - Registered charities
  - Registered community interest companies
  - Charitable companies (incorporated as not for profit)
  - Registered charitable incorporated organisations
  - Exempt or excepted charities

- Registered charitable industrial and provident society or charitable cooperative.
22. Applications should be from City-based organisations or should demonstrate City-based support. Applications cannot be accepted from individuals. Individuals who wish to apply for funding should do so through a City-based constituted organisation or group falling into the above definition. Applications will not be accepted from political parties or organisations involved in political lobbying.
23. Applications from City Corporation service departments will be accepted where they:
- Have the support of a City-based community group, or
  - Can demonstrate that delivery will meet community priorities, either through consultation with communities, or through an adopted City Corporation strategy which can demonstrate community support.
24. Applications for infrastructure funding to mitigate the direct impacts of development will not be accepted. Such mitigation should be delivered as part of the development process and funded through s106 Planning Obligations.

## **Assistance with Applications**

25. The Central Grants Unit can provide assistance to applicants with the completion of application forms. Contact details are available on the City Corporation's website. The Central Grants Unit cannot provide assistance with project management or delivery of schemes funded through the Neighbourhood Fund.

## **Assessment Criteria**

26. Applications should demonstrate that funding will be used to meet the Regulatory requirements for CIL funding set out in Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, namely to support the development of the area by:
- a. the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
  - b. anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.



27. Infrastructure improvements funded through the Neighbourhood Fund should deliver improvements necessary to support development of the City. Normally, such funding will deliver new infrastructure, but funding will also be available to meet reasonable on-going maintenance costs. Applications should, therefore, identify and include an allowance for future maintenance of any infrastructure to be provided.
28. CIL Regulations allow greater flexibility in the use of the Neighbourhood Fund compared with other CIL expenditure. Neighbourhood Funds may therefore be used to fund revenue expenditure. To avoid creating long term commitments on the Neighbourhood Fund, any requests for revenue funding should be clearly justified, showing demonstrable community benefit, and time limited to a maximum of 5 years. The City Corporation will not commit to providing CIL funding beyond the agreed time period and will need to be satisfied that alternative funding is in place if the proposed project is intended to continue beyond 5 years.
29. For larger projects of over £50,000 and up to 15% of the total value of the Neighbourhood Fund at the time of application, applications should also consider whether the project meets the priorities identified in the City Corporation's Regulation 123 List and projects identified in City Corporation strategies that have been subject to public consultation. Funding decisions will not be made solely on the basis of compliance, or otherwise, with the Regulation 123 List.
30. Applications should include evidence of the feasibility, deliverability and sustainability of the project.
31. Where possible, the application should be supported by a delivery plan or business plan, which sets out the timescales for delivery, that any necessary consents have been obtained and the mechanisms in place to ensure that the funds are used appropriately.
32. Projects should be delivered within a 12 month period from the grant of funding unless an alternative timescale has been agreed. If delivery over a longer timescale is anticipated, this should be set out clearly in the application and a justification provided for the extended timescale. The City Corporation will monitor delivery of projects, including taking action to ensure that projects are delivered on time, or seek to recover funds if projects do not proceed within agreed parameters.
33. Applications for funding in excess of £50,000 should demonstrate how the project will deliver value for money, including through the identification of any contributory or match funding. This can include contributions in time or expertise, for example, where a local community

delivers infrastructure improvements themselves, but is not necessary for a successful bid.

34. Applications to fund projects which are already in receipt of other City CIL funding, or s106, s278 funding for site specific mitigation will not normally be accepted.
35. Developers may wish to support an application from a constituted City-based organisation or group, as set out above, where the proposed infrastructure cannot be delivered through other means.

### **Value of Bids**

36. The minimum value for applications for infrastructure funding is £1,000.
37. Individual applications should normally not exceed 15% of the total value of the available CIL Neighbourhood Fund at the time of application. Information on the available funds will be published on the City Corporation's website on a quarterly basis to inform applications.
38. Applications in excess of 15% will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, where there is demonstrable benefit to more than one of the City's communities and where the proposal aligns with other City Corporation ambitions, set out in published strategies.

### **Awards Process**

39. The determination of applications will be made through a combination of officer delegation and Committee approval, depending on the financial value of the application. The adopted thresholds accord with those used by the City Bridge Trust in its consideration of grant applications.
40. Funding applications for under £25,000 will be determined by City Corporation officers under delegated authority. Decisions should normally be made within 12 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.
41. Applications for between £25,000 and £50,000 will be determined by a City Corporation officers under delegated authority and in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. Decisions should normally be made within 16 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.
42. Decisions taken under delegated authority will be reported to the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee.

43. Applications for over £50,000 will be considered by the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, normally on a quarterly basis. Applications will be considered as items in the public part of the meeting agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank