



Chipping Barnet Area Committee

9 July 2018

Title	Members Items – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Funding
Report of	Head of Governance
Wards	Oakleigh, Brunswick Park, East Barnet
Status	Public
Urgent	No
Key	No
Enclosures	Appendix 1 – Photos provided by Councillor Stephen Sowerby Appendix 2 – Photos provided by Councillor Thomas Smith Appendix 3 – Photos provided by Councillor Wendy Prentice Appendix 4 – Photos provided by Councillor Weeden-Sanz Appendix 5 – Photos provided by Councillor Felix Byers Appendix 6 – Photos provided by Councillor Julian Teare
Officer Contact Details	maria.lugangira@barnet.gov.uk 020 8359 2761

Summary

This report informs the Area Committee of requests for CIL funding submitted by Members of the Committee. The Committee are requested to consider the information highlighted within this report and decide on its desired course of action in accordance with its powers.

Recommendations

1. That the Area Committee consider the requests as highlighted in section 1 of the report.
2. That, in respect of each request submitted, the Area Committee decide whether it wishes to:
 - (a) agree the request (subject to due diligence checks) and supporting officer's recommendation, and note the implications to the Committee's CIL funding

budget;
(b) defer the decision for funding for further information; or
(c) reject the application, giving reasons.

1. WHY THIS REPORT IS NEEDED

1.1 Requests for funding from the Committee's allocated CIL budget have been raised. The requests are as follows:

Title	Raised by (Councillor)	Ward	Member Request	Funding required (£)
Extend the double yellow lines outside the access road to Barrydene, Oakleigh Road North N20 9HG	Councillor Stephen Sowerby	Oakleigh	I would like to request funding to extend the double yellow lines outside the access road to Barrydene, Oakleigh Road North, N20 9HG. Cars parking beyond the double yellow lines going north significantly effect sightlines making exiting Barrdene a dangerous exercise. I suggest that an extension of approximately 10 meters (around two standard car lengths) will be sufficient length. The attached photo shows exactly where the extension needs to be placed.	TBC
Implementation of double yellow lines on the carriageway running south on Netherlands Road	Councillor Thomas Smith	Oakleigh	I request funding to implement double yellow lines on the carriageway running south on Netherlands Road in the run-up to the width restriction. This is to prevent people from parking their vehicles close to the width restriction, thereby obstructing access south to north. Whilst Highways Officers will need to recommend the optimal length necessary I would suggest that 12 meters from the kerbside post would be around the optimal length. Please refer to the attached photo for the exact proposed location for the double yellow lines	TBC
Implantation of double yellow lines on the northern side of the carriageway opposite Onslow Parade	Councillor Wendy Prentice	Brunswick Park	I request funding to implement double yellow lines on the northern side of the carriageway opposite Onslow Parade and where it becomes Osidge Lane. This is to prevent people from parking their vehicles on a busy stretch of road rather than in the parking spaces that already exist. There is currently a problem with cars parking on this part of the carriageway, even blocking driveways, which causes congestion on this road which is regularly used by double decker buses. Whilst Highways Officers will need to recommend the optimal length necessary I would suggest that around 30 metres, from the end of the parking bay	TBC

Implementation of double yellow lines on the north side of the carriageway on Russell Lane where the road	Councillor Roberto Weeden-Sanz	Brunswick Park	I request funding to implement double yellow lines on the north side of the carriageway on Russell Lane where the road narrows approaching Church Hill Road. This is to prevent people from parking their vehicles in front of private driveways and causing congestion on a road which regularly has double decker buses driving down it. It will also prevent visibility problems for residents exiting Fitzwilliam Close who currently struggle to see traffic when turning onto Russell Lane and creates a high risk of an accident occurring. Whilst Highways Officers will need to recommend the optimal length necessary I would suggest that 90 metres from the between the corner of Haslemere Avenue and the tree in front of 155 Russell Lane would be around the optimal length. Please refer to the attached photos for the exact proposed location for the double yellow lines.	TBC
installation of a pedestrian "zebra" crossing with belisha beacons on Cat Hill, EN4 beside the junction with Brookside ('the site' – see Picture B and Picture E).	Councillor Felix Byers	East Barnet	<p>For provision to be made for the installation of a pedestrian "zebra" crossing with belisha beacons on Cat Hill, EN4 beside the junction with Brookside ('the site' – see Picture B and Picture E).</p> <p>The existing island crossing at the site is heavily used: its situation is a primary walking route to and from local schools including East Barnet School and Danegrove Primary School; it is the most direct walking route into East Barnet Village for residents in the CBC polling district; it is a popular access route for Oak Hill Park via Brookside; and there is a bus stop immediately beside the site (see Picture A).</p> <p>The existing island arrangement is hazardous for both motorists and pedestrians to navigate. There is no instruction to drivers to yield to pedestrians. Traffic approaches at speed from north-east of the site, accelerating down the steep incline from the junction of Cat Hill, Brookhill Road and Park Road. Traffic from the south-west poses a separate danger as vehicles approach the crossing accelerating downhill around a</p>	TBC

			<p>blind corner (see Picture D), and visibility on the west side of the crossing is often obstructed by parked cars (see Picture C). The proximity of parked cars to the central bollards also requires vehicles – including buses, and many moving at considerable speed – to swerve sharply to manoeuvre around the island.</p> <p>There is a strong precedent for assisted crossings in East Barnet Village. There are two existing zebra crossings at either end of the section of East Barnet Road passing through East Barnet Village, and another zebra crossing on Church Hill Road near the junction with Jackson Road, all within c.100 metres of the site. The existing crossings facilitate safe passage for pedestrians travelling into and out of East Barnet Village from the west and south, but there is no equivalent safe route of entry and exit for pedestrians approaching from roads immediately east.</p> <p>Local residents and local traders are concerned about the risk to public safety posed by the existing island crossing at the site. Some traders suspect that the absence of a safe crossing is damaging business. Residents feel nervous to cross the road at this point, but many also admit to taking the risk because there is no logical alternative walking route to access the north side of East Barnet Village if approaching from the east.</p> <p>Having spoken with residents and traders, there is considerable support for this proposal.</p>	
Extend the double yellow lines on the carriageway on Hampden Way at the corner of Arlington Road, N14	Councillor Julian Teare	Brunswick Park	<p>I request funding to extend the double yellow lines on the carriageway on Hampden Way at the corner of Arlington Road, N14, on the north side, the right hand side as one comes down Arlington Road. Currently the double yellow lines on this side are much shorter than on the south side of this turning and visibility is badly obstructed. Whilst Highways Officers will need to recommend the optimal length necessary I would suggest another 5</p>	TBC

			metres from where it currently ends. Please refer to the attached photos for the exact proposed location for the double yellow lines.	
--	--	--	---	--

2. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 As identified above Members of the Council have requested that the Committee consider requests for CIL funding. In line with guidance for Members' route to support applications for CIL funding, the Committee is asked to determine the desired course of action.
- 2.2 CIL funding can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure [section 216\(2\) of the Planning Act 2008](#), and [regulation 59](#), as amended) to support the development of a local area. The Act specifically names roads and transport, flood defences, schools and education facilities, medical facilities and recreational facilities; but is not restrictive. Therefore, the definition can extend to allow the levy to fund a very broad range of facilities provided they are 'infrastructure'.
- 2.3 Further examples are: play areas, parks and green spaces, cultural and sports facilities, district heating schemes, police stations and community safety facilities. The flexibility in how the funds can be applied is designed to give local areas the opportunity to choose the infrastructure they need to deliver their Local Plan.
- 2.4 Guidance states that the levy is intended to focus on the provision of new infrastructure and should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision, unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development. Therefore, if funds are intended to be used to address existing deficiencies, it is recommended that funds are used to either increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure, where it is recognised as necessary to support development in the area.
- 2.5 Guidance states that local authorities must allocate at least 15% of levy receipts to spend on priorities that should be agreed with the local community in areas where development is taking place. Therefore, a decision was made to honour the provision of a 15% contribution to each of the Council's Area Committee.
- 2.6 Applications relating to requests should be made to this Area Committee via Members' Items as outlined in the Council's Constitution. In line with guidance, applications submitted by Members should receive an initial assessment by an appropriate Officer, and should be accompanied by a recommendation (i.e. that the Committee should support or refuse the application).
- 2.7 At its meeting on 8 March 2017 the Community Leadership Committee received a report in relation to Area Committee Funding – Savings from non-Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) budgets

2.8 Therefore, this Committee is informed that it no longer has non-CIL funding Area Committee budget funding decision making powers.

2.9 Members are further informed that it has retained the power to discharge CIL-related environmental infrastructure projects and therefore has joint budget responsibility across the Area Committees which can be spent in 2017/18. Furthermore, it is noted that any request can be considered only by this Committee if it is in line with its terms of reference as contained in the Council's Constitution.

3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND NOT RECOMMENDED

3.1 Not applicable; Members of the Council are able to submit applications for non-CIL funding to the Area Committee Budgets via Members' Items. As a result, the Committee are requested to consider the Ward Members request and determine. Therefore, no other recommendation is provided from Officers.

4. POST DECISION IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Post decision implementation depends on the decision taken by the Committee, and the assessing officer's recommendation.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF DECISION

5.1 Resources (Finance & Value for Money, Procurement, Staffing, IT, Property, Sustainability)

5.1.1 The Committee has an allocated budget from which it can award funds to Area Committee grant applications. Any allocation of funds will be assessed by Officers as outlined on page 2 of this report.

5.1.2 The Committee is able to award funding of up to £25,000 for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Funding. Requests for funding must be in line with the Council's priorities which are outlined in the Corporate Plan 2015 – 2020.

5.2 Social Value

5.2.1 Requests for Area Committee budget funding provide an avenue for Members to give consideration to funding requests which may have added social value.

5.3 Legal and Constitutional References

5.3.1 Council Constitution, states that any Member, within the Area Constituency, will be permitted to have one matter only (with no sub-items) on the agenda for an Area Committee where the Member is sponsoring an application to an Area Committee Budget. Members' Items sponsoring an application to the Area Committee Budget must be submitted 10 clear working days before the meeting. Items received after that time will only be dealt with at the meeting if the Chairman agrees they are urgent.

5.4 Risk Management

5.4.1 None in the context of this report.

5.5 Equalities and Diversity

5.5.1 Requests for Funding allow Members of a Committee to bring a wide range of issues to the attention of a Committee in accordance with the Council's Constitution. All of these issues must be considered for their equalities and diversity implications.

5.6 Consultation and Engagement

5.6.1 None in the context of this report.

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

6.1 Meeting of the Community Leadership Committee 8 March 2016 Area Committee Funding – Savings from non- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) budgets:

<http://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s38413/Area%20Committee%20Funding%20Savings%20from%20non-%20Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy%20CIL%20budgets.pdf>

6.2 Review of Area Committees – operations and delegated budgets (24/06/2015):
<https://barnet.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s24009/Area%20Committees%20%20Community%20Leadership%20Committee%2025%20June%202015%20-%20FINAL.pdf>