

# Appendix A

---

## **Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) consultation 2022**

**03 August 2022 – 07 October 2022**

**Consultation Team, Strategy**

# NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the consultation findings from the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) consultation 2022 which will be presented at Policy and Resources on 22 February 2023.

### 1.1 Response to the consultation

- a total of 47 questionnaires were completed
- the majority of responses were from residents

### 1.2 Summary of consultation approach

- the consultation ran from 03 August 2022 to 07 October 2022
- the consultation consisted of an online questionnaire and summary consultation document which was published on [engage.barnet.gov.uk](https://engage.barnet.gov.uk)
- paper copies and an easy-read version of the consultation were also made available on request

the consultation was widely promoted via the council's residents e newsletter magazine, Barnet First; Together Newsletter, the council's website; Twitter; Facebook.

## 1.2 Summary of key findings

### 1.2.1 Views on the council's proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area

- over two-thirds of respondents (70%, 32 out of 47 respondents) support the council's proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within its Area
- just over ten percent of respondents oppose the proposal (2% tend to oppose, and 9% strongly oppose)
- the remainder were either neutral (17%, 8 out of 47 respondents) or said they did not know or were not sure (2%, 1 out of 47 respondents)

### 1.2.2 Views on the council's proposal for broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent

- over two-thirds of respondents (71%, 32 out of 45 respondents) support the council's proposal to broaden how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent, to include 'anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area'
- just over a fifth of respondents oppose the proposal (9%, 4 respondents tend to oppose, and 13%, 6 out of 45 respondents strongly oppose)

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

- the remainder were either neutral (4%, 2 out of 45 respondents) or said they were not sure (2%, 1 out of 45 respondents)

### 1.2.3 Views on council's proposed Neighbourhood CIL four spending priorities

- **Sustainability received the highest level of support**, with over four-fifths of respondents (83%, 35 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (14%, 6 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 2%, 1 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Community Safety received joint-second highest level of support**, with three-quarters of respondents (76%, 32 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (14%, 6 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 10%, 4 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Public Health also received joint-second highest level of support**, with three-quarters of respondents (76%, 32 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (19%, 8 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 5%, 2 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Community Engagement received fourth highest level of support**, with two-thirds of respondents (67%, 28 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (24%, 10 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 9%, 4 out of 42 respondents are neutral).

### 1.2.4 Views on council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level

- nearly two-thirds of respondents (64%, 27 out of 42 respondents) support the council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level
- 17% of respondents oppose the proposal (12%, 5 respondents tend to oppose, and 5%, 2 out of 42 respondents strongly oppose)
- the remainder were either neutral (15%, 6 out of 42 respondents) or said they were not sure (5%, 2 out of 42 respondents)

### 1.2.5 Views on Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities in addition to the council's four spending priorities

Respondents were also asked to indicate six additional Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities for the Area Committees.

The priorities are summarised in the following table in the order preference of the respondents. 42 respondents provided feedback:

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Neighbourhood CIL Funding Priority	%	No.
Improvement in parks & greenspaces	67%	28
Bringing community assets back into use	50%	21
Restoring town centres & public realm	45%	19
Enhancing youth services and provision	45%	19
Making public spaces and streets safer for everyone and working with partners to reduce crime	40%	17
Improving air quality	38%	16
Providing greater access to sports & leisure activities	31%	13
Contributing to the use of library services	31%	13
Addressing poverty & deprivation and alleviating social isolation/exclusion	29%	12
Providing more awareness and access to health support	19%	8
Promoting access to healthy and affordable food	17%	7
Opportunities to support and enhance play	14%	6
Opportunities to tackle inequalities	14%	6
Creating opportunities to deliver local employment or business skills	12%	5
Contributing to the provision of cultural facilities	12%	5
Supporting schools (excl. fee-paying) & educational facilities	10%	4
Opportunities to tackle violence against women and girls	10%	4
Creating new business or enterprise opportunities	10%	4
Other opportunities to support learning	5%	2
Building capacity in in community groups and their service provision	2%	1

# NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

## 2 DETAILED FINDINGS

### 2.1 Introduction

The proposed changes to Barnet's Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) arrangements have been subject to a formal public consultation.

This report sets out the full findings from the council's consultation on Barnet's Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure (NCIL) arrangements. The findings will be considered by Policy & Resources Committee on the 22 February 2023, where the final decision on proposed changes will be taken.

### 2.2 Summary of consultation approach

The Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure (NCIL) Consultation began on 3 August 2022 and concluded on 7 October 2022.

UK government CIL guidance (paragraph 146) outlines that the council 'should engage with the communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding' which should be obtained through consultation undertaken 'at the neighbourhood' level.

### 2.3 Technical details and method

#### 2.3.1 In summary, the consultation was administered as follows:

- the general consultation consisted of an online questionnaire published on <http://engage.barnet.gov.uk> together with a summary consultation document which provided background information about the council's budget setting process and the financial challenges the council faces. Paper copies and an easy-read version of the consultation were also made available on request
- the consultation was widely promoted via the council's residents e newsletter magazine, Barnet First; the council's website; Twitter; Facebook.
- super-users, i.e. users of non-universal services, were also invited to take part in the consultation through Community Barnet, Communities Together Network, Youth Board, Service area newsletters/circulars and super-user mailing lists.

#### 2.3.2 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire was developed to ascertain residents' views on the proposed changes to Barnet's Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy (NCIL) arrangements. In particular the consultation invited views on the following proposals:

- Allocation of Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area
- Broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent
- Focusing on four priorities for each Area Committee to consider for Neighbourhood CIL spending
- To continue to manage the Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level

# NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Throughout the questionnaire and where applicable, hyperlinks were provided to the relevant sections of the consultation document. Links to further information of the Policy & Resources Committee paper with the proposals was also provided.

Those respondents who elected to receive a paper copy were also sent the consultation document and a copy of the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy arrangements proposals.

## 2.4 Response to the consultation

A total of 47 questionnaires have been completed - all these were completed online.

### 2.4.1 Response profile

The tables below show the profile of those who responded to the questionnaire.

**Table 1: Profile of those who responded to the Consultation**

Stakeholder	%	Base
Barnet resident	88%	37
Working within the London Borough of Barnet area	0%	0
Barnet business & resident	2%	1
Representing a voluntary/community organisation	7%	3
Representing a public-sector organisation	2%	1
Representing a school	0%	0
Other	0%	0
Prefer not to say	0%	0
<b>Total who answered this question</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>
Not Answered		5
<b>Total response to the consultation</b>		<b>47</b>

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

**Table 2: Profile of those who responded to the Consultation (by ward/committee)**

Ward / Area Committee	%	No.
Barnet Vale (North Area Committee)	0.00%	0
Brunswick Park (East Area Committee)	6.38%	3
Burnt Oak (West Area Committee)	8.51%	4
Childs Hill (West East Area Committee)	6.38%	3
Colindale North (West Area Committee)	2.13%	1
Colindale South (West Area Committee)	0.00%	0
Cricklewood (West Area Committee)	4.26%	2
East Barnet (North Area Committee)	2.13%	1
East Finchley (East Area Committee)	6.38%	3
Edgware (West Area Committee)	0.00%	0
Edgwarebury (North Area Committee)	0.00%	0
Finchley Church End (East Area Committee)	4.26%	2
Friern Barnet (East Area Committee)	2.13%	1
Garden Suburb (East Area Committee)	4.26%	2
Golders Green (East Area Committee)	4.26%	2
Hendon (West Area Committee)	2.13%	1
High Barnet (North Area Committee)	8.51%	4
Mill Hill (North Area Committee)	10.64%	5
Totteridge Woodside (North Area Committee)	2.13%	1
Underhill (North Area Committee)	0.00%	0
West Finchley (East Area Committee)	8.51%	4
West Hendon (West Area Committee)	0.00%	0
Whetstone (North Area Committee)	4.26%	2
Woodhouse (East Area Committee)	10.64%	5
Other (please specify)	2.13%	1
<b>Total who answered this question</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47</b>
Not Answered		0
<b>Total response to the consultation</b>		<b>47</b>

# NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

## 2.4.2 Profile of protected characteristics

The council is required by law (the Equality Act 2010) to pay due regard to equalities in eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations between people from different groups.

The protected characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010 are age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy, maternity, religion or belief and sexual orientation.

To assist us in complying with the duty under the Equality Act 2010 we asked the respondents to provide equalities monitoring data and explained that collecting this information will help us understand the needs of our different communities and that all the information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be stored securely in accordance with our responsibilities under data protection legislation (such as the General Data Protection Regulation or the Data Protection Act 2018).

Table 3 below shows the profile of those who answered these questions. However, due to the low response it has not been possible to do any demographic analysis on the consultation findings.

**Table 3: Protected Characteristic, profile of those that completed the questionnaire**

Protected Characteristic	Response	
	Number	%
Age		
16-17	1	2%
18-24	0	0%
25-34	3	6%
35-44	7	15%
45-54	5	11%
55-64	9	19%
65-74	8	27%
75+	3	6%
Prefer not to say	2	4%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>
Gender		
Female	20	43%
Male	14	30%
If you prefer your own term	1	2%
Prefer not to say	3	6%



## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Protected Characteristic	Response	
	Number	%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?		
Yes, it's the same	33	70%
No, it's different	1	2%
Prefer not to say	4	9%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Disability		
Yes	7	15%
No	24	51%
Prefer not to say	7	15%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Ethnicity		
Black	2	4%
Asian	3	6%
White	24	51%
Mixed	0	0%
Other	2	4%
Prefer not to say	7	15%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Faith		
Baha'i	0	0%
Buddhist	1	2%
Christian	11	23%
Hindu	0	0%
Humanist	0	0%
Jain	0	0%
Jewish	7	15%
Muslim	2	4%

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Protected Characteristic	Response	
	Number	%
Sikh	0	0%
No religion	10	13%
Other Faith	0	0%
Prefer not to say	8	17%
Not answered	8	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Pregnancy		
Pregnant	0	0%
On maternity leave	0	0%
Neither	21	45%
Prefer not to say	3	6%
Not answered	23	49%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Sexuality		
Bisexual	2	4%
Gay or Lesbian	3	6%
Straight or heterosexual	26	55%
Other sexual orientation	1	2%
Prefer not to say	6	13%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

Marital Status		
Never married and never registered a civil partnership	7	15%
Married	20	43%
In a registered civil partnership	0	0%
Separated, but still legally married	0	0%
Separated, but still legally in a civil partnership	1	2%
Divorced	1	2%
Widowed	3	6%
Prefer not to say	6	13%
Not answered	9	19%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

# NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

## 2.5 Calculating and reporting on results

- The results for each question are based on “valid responses”, i.e. all those providing an answer (this may or may not be the same as the total sample) unless otherwise specified. The base size may therefore vary from question to question.
- Where percentages do not add up to 100, this may be due to rounding, or the question is multi-coded - i.e. respondents could give more than one answer. The open-ended questions are multi-coded, as respondents could write in more than one comment, and therefore the tables on verbatim comments add up to more than 100%.
- All open-ended responses have been classified based on the main themes arising from the comments, so that they can be summarised. It should also be noted that the responses were very varied, however there were a number of common themes that were evident, and the most common themes have been summarised in this report.

## 3. Results in detail:

### 3.1 Views on the council’s proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area

Respondents were asked to what extent do they support or oppose the proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within its Area.

Table 4 below shows that:

- over two-thirds of respondents (70%, 32 out of 47 respondents) support the council’s proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within its Area
- just over ten percent of respondents oppose the proposal (2% tend to oppose, and 9% strongly oppose)
- the remainder were either neutral (17%, 8 out of 47 respondents) or said they did not know or were not sure (2%, 1 out of 47 respondents)

**Table 4: Respondents level of support for the proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area**

To what extent do you support or oppose the proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within its Area?	%	Base
Strongly support	26%	12
Tend to support	43%	20
Neither support nor oppose	17%	8
Tend to oppose	2%	4
Strongly oppose	9%	4

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Don't know / not sure	2%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>46</b>

### 3.2 Views on the council's proposal for broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent

Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent do they support or oppose the proposal to broaden how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent, to include 'anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area:

Table 5 below shows that:

- over two-thirds of respondents (71%, 32 out of 45 respondents) support the council's proposal to broaden how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent, to include 'anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area'
- just over a fifth of respondents oppose the proposal (9%, 4 respondents tend to oppose, and 13%, 6 out of 45 respondents strongly oppose)
- the remainder were either neutral (4%, 2 out of 45 respondents) or said they were not sure (2%, 1 out of 45 respondents)

**Table 5: Respondents level of support for broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent**

To what extent do you support or oppose the proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within its Area?	%	Base
Strongly support	17%	8
Tend to support	53%	24
Neither support nor oppose	4%	2
Tend to oppose	9%	4
Strongly oppose	13%	6
Don't know / not sure	2%	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>46</b>

### 3.3 Views on the council's proposed Neighbourhood CIL four spending priorities

Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent do they to what extent do they agree or disagree with each of the proposed Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities.

Table 6 below shows that:

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

- **Sustainability received the highest level of support**, with over four-fifths of respondents (83%, 35 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (14%, 6 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 2%, 1 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Community Safety received joint-second highest level of support**, with three-quarters of respondents (76%, 32 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (14%, 6 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 10%, 4 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Public Health also received joint-second highest level of support**, with three-quarters of respondents (76%, 32 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (19%, 8 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 5%, 2 out of 42 respondents are neutral).
- **Community Engagement received fourth highest level of support**, with two-thirds of respondents (67%, 28 out of 42 respondents) indicating they agree with this as a spending priority (24%, 10 out of 42 respondents oppose, and 9%, 4 out of 42 respondents are neutral).

**Table 6: Respondents level of support for council's proposed Neighbourhood CIL four spending priorities**

Priority	Strongly Agree		Tend to agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Tend to disagree		Strongly disagree		Total
	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	%	Base	Base
Community Engagement	40%	17	26%	11	10%	4	19%	8	5%	2	42
Sustainability	50%	21	33%	14	2%	1	7%	3	7%	3	42
Community Safety	50%	21	26%	11	10%	4	2%	1	12%	5	42
Public Health	43%	18	33%	14	5%	2	2%	1	17%	7	42

### 3.4 Views on council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level

Respondents were asked to what extent they support or oppose the proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety and Parking Fund at a borough level.

Table 7 shows that:

- nearly two-thirds of respondents (64%, 27 out of 42 respondents) support the council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

- 17% of respondents oppose the proposal (12%, 5 respondents tend to oppose, and 5%, 2 out of 42 respondents strongly oppose)
- the remainder were either neutral (15%, 6 out of 42 respondents) or said they were not sure (5%, 2 out of 42 respondents)

**Table 7: Respondents level of support for council’s proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level**

To what extent you support or oppose the proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety and Parking Fund at a borough level?	%	Base
Strongly support	36%	15
Tend to support	29%	12
Neither support nor oppose	14%	6
Tend to oppose	12%	5
Strongly oppose	5%	2
Don’t know / not sure	5%	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>42</b>

### 3.5 Views on Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities in addition to the council’s four spending priorities

Respondents were asked to consider additional examples for CIL spending priorities and indicate six areas in which they wished CIL funding to be invested in by their Area Committee.

Table 8 below shows how the respondents ranked the additional priorities:

**Table 8: Respondents views on Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities in addition to the council’s four spending priorities**

Please consider each of these and indicate six areas in which you wish for the CIL funding to be invested in by your Area Committee	%	Base
Improvement in parks & greenspaces	67%	28
Bringing community assets back into use	50%	21
Restoring town centres & public realm	45%	19
Enhancing youth services and provision	45%	19
Making public spaces and streets safer for everyone and working with partners to reduce crime	40%	17
Improving air quality	38%	16
Providing greater access to sports & leisure activities	31%	13

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

Contributing to the use of library services	31%	13
Addressing poverty & deprivation and alleviating social isolation/exclusion	29%	12
Providing more awareness and access to health support	19%	8
Promoting access to healthy and affordable food	17%	7
Opportunities to support and enhance play	14%	6
Opportunities to tackle inequalities	14%	6
Creating opportunities to deliver local employment or business skills	12%	5
Contributing to the provision of cultural facilities	12%	5
Supporting schools (excl. fee-paying) & educational facilities	10%	4
Opportunities to tackle violence against women and girls	10%	4
Creating new business or enterprise opportunities	10%	4
Other opportunities to support learning	5%	2
Building capacity in in community groups and their service provision	2%	1

### 3.4 Further comments on the council's proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area

Respondents were also asked if they had any comments to make on the council's proposal to allocate Neighbourhood CIL to Area Committees based on the population within the Area. Of those who responded to the consultation, 6 out of 47 gave a response to this question.

The responses to this question were varied and there was one common theme, based on three comments. This is summarised below as:

➤ **Neighbourhood CIL should be allocated according to the development an area is bearing:**

*Area Committees are too broad in geographic focus. CIL funds should be allocated within a point-to-point distance of CIL-liable developments / It doesn't look like it would make much difference, based on current population levels. That could change with the intensive building in the West of the borough, however / The neighbourhood CIL should be allocated according to the quantum of development an area is bearing. With especial focus on Wards with a significant scale of development.*

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

### 3.5 Further comments on the council's proposal for broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent

Respondents were also asked if they had any further comments on the council's proposal for broadening how Neighbourhood CIL may be spent. Of those who responded to the consultation, 10 out of 47 gave a response to this question.

Again, the responses to this question had one common theme, with a response of eight comments summarised below.

➤ **Neighbourhood CIL spending should focus on infrastructure only:**

*Infrastructure items only / Prefer the current scheme of capital item funding / Too broad. Could lead to too many applications and too much competition with no clear guidance on how to choose between projects. / Should not cover areas that the council should be funding. What was wrong with the previous system? / There are many other funds for projects for community groups, but little that can support capital items for groups that are run by volunteers / infrastructure/physical improvements should always be prioritised. All social infrastructure scheme should be run by the council itself no private involvement. / The link to development will need to be carefully policed if this is not to give way to effectively any idea for any project in any area. Given that the geographical spreading of the CIL funding is taking place across a whole committee area, the articulation of how the activity relates to development and its impacts will therefore be crucial to ensure legitimacy. Let's not forget that residents directly adjacent to the large new developments are supposed to be seeing the benefits. So far nothing has been spent in Mill Hill East and we've taken over 2000 new homes.*

### 3.6 Further comments on the council's proposed Neighbourhood CIL four spending priorities

Respondents were also asked if they had any comments to make on the council's proposed Neighbourhood CIL four spending priorities. Of those who responded to the consultation, 10 out of 47 gave a response to this question.

The responses to this question were varied and there two common themes. The summarised themes and comments are as follows:

➤ **The priorities presented should be funded through other sources:**

*Community safety is funded by gov and police. Public health is funded by NHS. Community assets can support community groups for environment, places and spaces / These areas should be funded by the council NOT community funds! / Community safety and public health are statutory and so should be funded by the council. Community groups do not get the same level of funding / London Borough of Barnet should demand that The North Central London Integrated Care System provides and pays for all Mental Health provision for the borough. Why should they push the provision in the community and abandon the people of Barnet?*



## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

*If the London Borough of Barnet do provide public health provision, it must be owned and operated by The London Borough of Barnet. The London Borough of Barnet should set up its own healthcare service that will provide services funded by the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy.*

➤ **The priorities presented are too broad and should be more specific:**

*I don't disagree with sustainability, but this covers a multitude of things. It needs clarification. Is this really about green infrastructure? In which case say so. Sustainability is too broad a concept. / Community engagement sounds very woolly*

### 3.6 Further comments by respondents when asked for views on Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities in addition to the council's four spending priorities

Respondents were also asked if they had any comments on Neighbourhood CIL spending priorities in addition to the council's four spending priorities. Of those who responded to the consultation, 13 out of 47 gave a response to this question.

The responses to this question were varied and there five common themes. The summarised themes and comments are as follows:

➤ **Comments in support of Community Safety & Enforcement:**

*You need to have better monitoring facilities for public places - streets and parks to enforce what you are planning to do with your Borough wide Public Space Protection Order consultation. I will not be stopping dog walkers or people who cannot control their dogs of people riding bikes/scooters on pavements and causing injury. So how do you get to find these people? / Parking, Antisocial Behaviour in open small spaces (ex-football games)*

➤ **Comments in support of Community Groups:**

*Stop wasting community money for council run projects: libraries, schools, making streets safer. Support community assets especially those that are being bought by developers and turning into housing / Provide community groups with the physical space to allow them to do their projects /*

➤ **Comments in support of improving Public Realm:**

*Improving pedestrian pavements and walkways, e.g. some pavements are very narrow and very close to traffic such areas of Grahame Park Way towards Mill Hill, or the tunnel on Bunns Lane. / This falls under "public realm" but it is becoming increasingly difficult to walk down our filthy street without shoes sticking to the pavement. Come up with some ways this can be remedied, using local businesses and community engagement. And clean them please. / Addressing the abysmal mess of the public realm in Mill Hill East, with a lack of tree planting and biodiversity planting across monoculture Barnet Homes estate and highways land, gigantic pointless roundabouts, poor crossing facilities, no cycle lanes, a lack of tree planting, areas of stupidly narrow pavements (e.g. station forecourt - what happened to the £150k for improvements there...), and the*

## NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) CONSULTATION 2022

*need for a review of parking controls as the spill over of cars from the new build development is an increasing problem (and we're only half way occupied), tackling the dust from construction that pervades the streets.*

➤ **Comments in support of Public Health:**

*Integrated community hubs, Medical and dental care, Social prescription, Wrap around childcare through maintained nurseries with extended hours and age eligibility, Wrap around childcare through after school care, Public transport, Cycle infrastructure. / Support for the provision of more gp's and dentists.*

➤ **Comments in support of Greenspaces:**

*Improving local green spaces such as parks.*

### 3.6 Further comments on the council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level

Respondents were also asked if they had any comments on the council's proposal to continue to manage the Barnet Road Safety & Parking Fund at the borough level. Of those who responded to the consultation, 16 out of 47 gave a response to this question.

The responses to this question were varied and there three common themes. The summarised themes and comments are as follows:

➤ **The Road Safety & Parking budget should not be part of NCIL. It should be funded separately:**

*I am not convinced that this should be part of the NCIL - this should entirely sit within the core Highways Budget / Keep this budget separate - it's the council's job to ensure road safety is funding from parking tickets!*

➤ **Concerns about road safety in the borough:**

*I am very concerned about road safety. At present speeding drivers, and those looking at phones appear to be getting away with it. There are inadequate pedestrian crossings and very poor bike infrastructure / It doesn't seem that much is done in my ward to deal with issues like speeding and parking in unsafe ways which block pavements. Giving the option to a Committee Area may encourage local residents to do more on the issues which affect us directly.*

➤ **Concerns about the coordination of responses across the council:**

*So far this has been totally ineffective in our area, despite many meetings. The departments don't seem to communicate to each other / As previously noted, the neighbourhood CIL contribution arises from development according to scale, and therefore the scale of investment must reflect areas with a greater volume of development (and therefore higher exposure from changes and increased dependence on delivering a shift to active travel). Living in Mill Hill East there has been no proper investment in the public realm, especially given that the council secured a significant capital return from the redevelopment of its depot. The lack of joined up investment in improving the public realm within this area is shocking.*