

On behalf of the Battle Civil Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group who met last night and agreed that we need to bring the particular matter of **CIL payments** to the attention of Battle Town Council.

We are asking that the matter is put onto the next appropriate BTC agendas. Our reason for raising this now is that we have noticed Agenda Item 11 covers the **F&GP Action Plan 2020/2021** draft additions, which we understand are new mentions of CIL funds, namely:

[Objective 1.5: Identify additional sources of funding for projects and routine activities Grants, CIL, donations etc.](#)

[Objective 2.2: Update Council's Business Plan - To be finalised by Council - Include priorities for CIL funds, possible grant funding. Reviewed and updated every four years - Sep 2023](#)

However our real concern was highlighted at the very end of RDC's recent Blackfriars development presentation (now on YouTube, Oct-20), when doubt was expressed about the **percentage of payments to be made** to BTC. We therefore hope that BTC will place the highest priority on the issue of the overall CIL payments made by developers to RDC and what proportion of the funds will be forwarded to Battle.

As a result of what was said at the presentation, Planning Officers have been asked by RDC's Cllr Vine-Hall to report back on the key question of **how and when** the up-lift from 15 % to 25% applies to Planning Applications within the Civil Parish of Battle; in particular with respect to:

a) preceding outline Planning Permission being granted

b) Neighbourhood Plan referendum timing after which a plan becomes a "made Plan". There appears now to be a significant potential for BTC to **not** receive the up-lifted payment in respect of three or more **large scale** developments, namely Tollgates, Lillybank Farm and Blackfriars.

To put our concern into context, I obtained for the Steering Group some confidential information from RDC in 2019-December, which for 2 sites within Battle CP showed that if the 15% portion is only agreed on the basis of *when* Planning Permission was granted, then BTC would potentially *lose out* on the **10% up-lift**, amounting to **£174k** for potential expenditure, by BTC within the CP. The Blackfriars site is significantly larger than those two examples and the loss to BTC for **direct local expenditure** would be huge, approaching £500,000.

It should be noted that the RDC CIL Regulation 123 list mentions, generic items such as: access improvements to stations, cycle network improvements, public realm improvements safety infrastructure outside schools and rights of way improvements; whereas Battle is only mentioned specifically once, thus: "Management of cross-town traffic congestion in Battle". It is clear the list is not yet populated with fully thought through aspirations; RDC have very little currently on their radar for expenditure within Battle CP; we clearly have an opportunity to build on the NP work.

Given this analysis the NP Steering Group are now asking BTC, to analyse the CIL implications and to engage with RDC very strongly about the moral case for CIL funds to be used *within* the CP. This might just be the opportunity to activate the now flagged-up 'Implementation, Monitoring and Review sub-committee', to progress Battle CIL funding cases that are laid out in the **Neighbourhood Plan Reg 15 Submission, Section 7: Community Aspirations**; this already contains eleven "Ambitions" paragraphs, which the Council have recently adopted and have delivered to RDC for further public consultation, inspection and local referendum.