

CIL Governance and Administration

Final Decision-Maker	Full Council
Lead Head of Service/Lead Director	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning and Development
Lead Officer and Report Author	Tay Arnold, Planning Projects Delivery Manager. Isabel Elder, Principal Planning Officer
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All

Executive Summary

Since the last Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) report to Full Council on 25 October 2017, SPST have successfully overseen the administrative and governance arrangements required for the CIL implementation date of 1 October 2018.

SPST have received reports on 13 March 2018, 11 September 2018 and 8 January 2019 regarding the administration and governance arrangements for CIL. This report will update Council on progress to date and seek the appropriate delegations for SPST.

The current constitutional wording states that the function of SPST (amongst other functions) is to oversee the development, review and implementation of The Community Infrastructure Levy (subject to approval by Council). This report is in line with the constitution for Council to note progress and also recommends amending the wording of the constitution for appropriate delegations to be made to SPST.

This report makes the following recommendations to Full Council that:

1. Progress on the implementation and delivery of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) be noted.
2. Delegated responsibility be given to the Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee to be the final decision maker for spending CIL funds.
3. The following additional/revised wording be agreed for incorporation into Part 2.2 of the Constitution (Responsibility for Functions):

2.1 FUNCTIONS OF FULL COUNCIL**COUNCIL**

- ~~(22) Any other function which must, by law, be reserved to the full Council.~~
 (22) *Approving the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule.*
 (23) *Any other function which must, by law, be reserved to the full Council.*

2.2.3 STRATEGIC PLANNING, SUSTAINABILITY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

FUNCTIONS	DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS
<p>Strategic Planning and Performance Management – to oversee the development, review and implementation of the Council’s:</p> <p>Development Plan, including the Maidstone Borough Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans (subject to approval by Council); Spatial planning documents such as supplementary planning documents and planning policy advice notes; Master Plans and development briefs; The Infrastructure Delivery Plan; <i>and</i> The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (subject to approval by Council) <i>including being the final decision maker for spending strategic CIL funds. (Note: the CIL Charging Schedule must be approved by a meeting of full Council).</i></p>	<p>Head of Planning and Development</p>

Timetable	
Meeting	Date
Full Council	27 February 2019
SPST	8 January 2019

CIL Governance and Administration

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Following consideration of the CIL Examiner's Report and the modified Charging Schedule at the 12 September 2017 Strategic Planning, Sustainability & Transportation Committee (SPST) meeting, Full Council resolved to approve the Maidstone Borough CIL Charging Schedule at its meeting on 25 October 2017. It was agreed the Charging Schedule would come into effect on 1 October 2018.
- 1.2 On 7 November 2017, SPST received a report outlining the key issues which would need to be addressed as the Council established its administrative and governance arrangements for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in Maidstone borough. On 13th March 2018, officers presented further details on the proposals for the administrative arrangements as these needed to be in place by the implementation date of 1st October 2018. The report also informed members as to how Parishes could spend the neighbourhood (non strategic) portion of CIL as set out in the CIL Regulations.
- 1.3 SPST subsequently received a report on 11th September 2018, updating them on the progress that had been achieved for the administration and engagement arrangements and set out the parameters of what the strategic CIL portion could be spent on. By 1st October 2018, the administrative requirements necessary for the Council to be able to collect were in place.
- 1.4 On 8th January 2019, SPST received the latest report which focused on the governance arrangements for CIL and made recommendations on how decisions regarding the strategic portion of CIL would be made. CIL must be spent on infrastructure to support the development needs of the borough. Strategic CIL is the larger portion of CIL. It will be either 70% or 80% of the total CIL receipt depending on how much is taken for the neighbourhood area who either have a plan or do not. This is set out in legislation.
- 1.5 SPST resolved at the January meeting that they should be the final decision maker and be responsible for assessing the recommendations brought to them by an officer steering group in respect of the allocation of the strategic CIL. It was agreed, as per the constitution that the appropriate delegations should be sought from Full Council.
- 1.6 Strategic CIL can only be spent on infrastructure as identified in the 2008 Planning Act. It must be spent on infrastructure which is needed to support the delivery of the adopted Maidstone Borough Local Plan and schemes identified on the Regulation 123 list.
- 1.7 The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is a key supporting document for both the Local Plan and the CIL. It identifies the individual infrastructure schemes required to sustainably deliver the plans

objectives. The IDP is a 'living' document and will be reviewed on an annual basis, alongside the Regulation 123 list, as new projects come forward to support the current plan and those projects identified in the document are delivered. It acts as a tool for identifying the appropriate funding mechanism for each project. It states what CIL will be expected to contribute towards and what other funding sources, such as S106, will pay for.

- 1.8 It is critical therefore, that the Council makes effective decisions on the allocation of CIL monies, to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure in a timely manner to support planned growth, and to ensure that infrastructure delivery does not become a constraint to planned development, or adversely affect the Council's five year housing land supply position.

Update on administrative and governance issues from 7th November 2017

- 1.9 The initial report on administration and governance in November 2017 outlined the key issues that needed to be addressed for the two areas of administration and governance. These have provided a framework for subsequent report updates to SPST. They are illustrated in the table below and an outline of the actions taken and progress made, provided in the accompanying text.

- 1.10 Table:

Key administration issues
A1: How responsibility for the day-to-day operational tasks of CIL implementation is distributed within the Planning Department: whether to a single bespoke section, or whether some elements are allocated more widely for instance across validation, development management, enforcement or building control.
A2: Whether or not the CIL Additional Information Form should be added to Part1 of the Local Validation List and whether the Assumption of Liability Form should be added to Part 2 of the List.
A3: How the Council should approach applications submitted during the transitional period, in the weeks and months leading up to 1 October 2018.
A4: How the Council should engage with infrastructure providers ahead of and during the transition, to ensure that requests for developer contributions are compliant with the CIL Regulations and the Council's Regulation 123 List.
A5: How the Council administers the neighbourhood portion within parish council areas.
Key governance issues
G1: Who will be the final decision making body, with responsibility for

the allocation of CIL monies and the regularity of their decision making.
G2: The process by which recommendations on the allocation of CIL monies are reached, and the involvement of infrastructure providers, corporate leadership, members, officers and other stakeholders in this process.
G3: The extent to which the overall CIL “pot” is sub-divided in some predetermined manner, either between infrastructure types/projects, between geographical areas or between large/long term infrastructure and smaller/short term infrastructure.
G4: The nature of the delivery agreement with an infrastructure provider, on allocation, and the extent to which conditions and clawback mechanisms are imposed.
G5: How the Council works with Parish Councils to develop local infrastructure priorities for neighbourhood portion spend.
G6: How the Council works with local communities in non-parished areas to develop local infrastructure priorities for neighbourhood portion spend

Update on progress on key administration issues:

- 1.11 **KEY ISSUE A1: How responsibility for the day-to-day operational tasks of CIL implementation is distributed within the Planning Department/Council: whether to a single bespoke section, or whether some elements are allocated more widely for instance across validation, development management, enforcement or building control.**
- 1.12 **Response to A1:** The prescriptive nature of CIL requires co-ordination of responsibilities and services in order to oversee the day to day operation of the CIL. To facilitate this, two specific CIL administrative officers were recruited in the summer of 2018 to create a CIL team reporting to the Principal Projects and Delivery Manager within the Strategic Planning team. In the short term, these posts are funded from existing revenue budgets. As CIL income is generated, the costs will be offset from the 5% administrative fee, which can be taken from the CIL collected.
- 1.13 A process map to identify the individual stages of the CIL collection process was produced which aided inter departmental discussions and assisted with identifying symmetry with other Council functions in order to allocate tasks in the most efficient way. The map has been subsequently updated to include all the internal processes required for the CIL team to deliver the CIL administrative requirements. Officers have requested that internal audit reviews these processes to ensure all opportunities for efficiencies have been taken.

- 1.14 **KEY ISSUE A2: Whether or not the CIL Additional Information Form should be added to Part 1 of the Local Validation List and whether the Assumption of Liability Form should be added to Part 2 of the List.**
- 1.15 **Response to A2:** Following the introduction of CIL, all applications for full planning permission (including householder), reserved matters (following an outline application) and applications for lawful development certificates are required to complete and submit an Additional Information Form (Form 0). This form identifies whether the development is CIL liable and is a necessary part of the CIL process. Following a 6 week notice period, Form 0 was added to Part 1 of the local validation list. MBC started asking for Form 0 from 11 June 2018. This allowed a generous lead in time to ensure all potential liable applications had a Form 0 submitted with the application. Until a Form 0 is received, the planning application is not validated.
- 1.16 Submission of an Assumption of Liability (Form 1) has been added to Part 2 of the local validation list which will encourage the form to be submitted with the planning application but will still allow an application to be validated without it. The CIL monitoring officer sends out a request during the planning application assessment process to encourage an early submission but Form 1 can be sent to the Council at any point up until the day of commencement.
- 1.17 **KEY ISSUE A3: How the Council should approach applications submitted during the transitional period, in the weeks and months leading up to 1 October 2018.**
- 1.18 **Response to A3:** From 1 October 2018, any planning permission for development meeting the CIL charging schedule eligibility criteria are CIL liable. Prior to this date a review of the number of undetermined major applications identified those that need to be approved before 1 October 2018. All applicants with outstanding S106's were contacted regarding the cut off date of 1st October. Planning and Legal Officers worked closely with applicants to get those in the system approved before 1st October.
- 1.19 CIL Officers worked closely with others to raise awareness with key stakeholders, such as developers, of the CIL implementation date. The date was widely publicised as were key details of the CIL eligibility criteria and the Council's processes. These were published on the Council's website to make clear the statutory determination dates. Due to there being a potential spike in the number of applications received before the CIL was implemented, applicants were encouraged to make their submission earlier so that it could be assessed within the statutory time frame.
- 1.20 When applications were submitted and validated by the Council, in the lead up to CIL, applicants were informed by the validation team, in their receipt acknowledgement that their application could become CIL liable if it wasn't determined prior to 1 October 2018.

- 1.21 **KEY ISSUE A4: How the Council should engage with infrastructure providers ahead of and during the transition, to ensure that requests for developer contributions are compliant with the CIL Regulations and the Council's Regulation 123 List.**
- 1.22 **Response to A4:** Prior to CIL implementation there was engagement with key infrastructure providers to inform them of the introduction of CIL. The one year lead in time allowed a length of time for providers to be aware of the date and to adapt accordingly. Specific training took place for development management to assist them in being able to offer advice both to infrastructure providers and developers of the CIL implementation date. Liaison with legal ensured that the correct CIL interpretation was being followed. Training has also been provided for Councillors (September 2018) to be aware of the change to the process of securing developer contributions, this was open to all but specifically members from planning and SPST committees were encouraged to attend.
- 1.23 Pursuant to the 8 January 2019 report to SPST, infrastructure providers will be able to access CIL funds through an annual bidding process. Projects must be included in the IDP and on the Regulation 123 list to be eligible and must meet the specified criteria:
- Does the project align with an infrastructure type or project included in the adopted Regulation 123 list?
 - Is the infrastructure identified in the current IDP?
- 1.24 Officers engaged with infrastructure providers earlier this year to request project updates and new additions to the IDP. This ongoing dialogue will ensure that infrastructure providers will be engaged with and they will understand the CIL allocation process.
- 1.25 **KEY ISSUE A5: How the Council administers the neighbourhood portion within Parish Council areas.**
- 1.26 **Response to A5:** The non strategic portion of CIL is also known as the neighbourhood portion. The specific process of allocating the neighbourhood portion is set out in legislation and was brought to SPST on 13 March 2018. Parishes will be allocated 15% or 25% of the CIL collected from development within their area, depending on whether there is a 'made' neighbourhood plan in place or not. Those with a plan receive 25%. The legislation is clear on how the money is to be passed to parish councils, what it must be spent on and how it must be accounted for.
- 1.27 A meeting for all Parish Councils (to which members were also invited to attend) was held in June 2018 to inform them of how they could access CIL and what it could be spent on. A further meeting will be held on 20 February 2019 for Parish Council representatives (members have also been invited). The meeting has been scheduled to take place before the first possible payment date to them on 28 April 2019 to support them through this process.

Update on progress on key governance issues

- 1.28 **KEY ISSUE G1: The final decision making body, with responsibility for the allocation of CIL monies and the regularity of their decision making.**
- 1.29 **Response to G1:** The 8 January 2019 report to SPST recommended that SPST be the final decision making body for allocating the strategic CIL money and that there should be an annual bidding and decision making process. Infrastructure providers will be invited to complete a proforma outlining their project proposal. This will be assessed by officers against specified criteria, who will then make recommendations to SPST for them to make the final decision.
- 1.30 **KEY ISSUE G2: The process by which recommendations on the allocation of CIL monies are reached, and the involvement of infrastructure providers, corporate leadership, members, officers and other stakeholders in this process.**
- 1.31 **Response to G2:** SPST agreed at its meeting on 8 January 2019 that a CIL steering group of officers will be established. This steering group will be chaired by the Director of Regeneration and Place. This steering group will meet initially to assess the bid proposals and then make recommendations to SPST as the final decision maker. The reasons for each recommendation will be included in the report to ensure full transparency in the decision making process. Officers will use their technical expertise and make an initial assessment of whether the bid meets the criteria for funding. There will be no new delegation of authority to officers.
- 1.32 Details of all the submissions which meet the minimum criteria will be included in the report to SPST which will, in the ordinary course of events, be publically available prior to the committee meeting. All meetings are webcast, so stakeholders will have the opportunity to view the meeting and see how decisions have been made and their outcome. All those who submitted bids will be informed after the committee meeting of the outcome.
- 1.33 Stakeholders, infrastructure providers, other non-SPST members, officers and members of the general public will be kept informed by information published in the CIL annual report. This report will be for the previous financial year and will be published on the Councils website no later than 31 December each year.
- 1.34 **KEY ISSUE G3: The extent to which the overall CIL "pot" is subdivided in some predetermined manner, either between infrastructure types/projects, between geographical areas or between large/long term infrastructure and smaller/short term infrastructure.**

- 1.35 **Response to G3:** It is not proposed that there will be a predetermined split of the CIL into different categories. The evidence for MBC's CIL charging schedule was based on projects identified in the IDP, which is directly related to the delivery of the adopted Local Plan. CIL receipts should therefore be spent on projects which are in the IDP and on the Regulation 123 list. The amount of CIL received will influence the precise allocation process. Schemes that are the most critical will be prioritised as well as the impact they will have on the borough
- 1.36 SPST, as final decision maker, could choose not to allocate CIL to any schemes in that year either because of
- a lack of funds or
 - wanting to choose a different scheme in the future and it wanted to wait until a larger reserve of CIL had been received or
 - being unsatisfied that the schemes were the best use of CIL receipts or
 - no bids having been received.
- 1.37 **KEY ISSUE G4: The nature of the delivery agreement with an infrastructure provider, on allocation and the extent to which conditions and clawback are imposed.**
- 1.38 **Response to G4:** An agreement will be put in place stipulating the terms and conditions of the release of the strategic CIL funds. Officers have met with legal to start drafting this agreement. A copy of the agreement will be issued with the bid proforma application pack so that infrastructure providers will know what will be expected from them in return for the CIL funds. The agreement will include clauses on such issues as clawback, milestones with agreed dates and CIL fund release dates. Funds can only be used for the purposes agreed. Any amendments will need the Councils approval.
- 1.39 **KEY ISSUE G5: How the Council works with Parish Councils to develop local infrastructure priorities for the neighbourhood portion spend.**
- 1.40 **Response to G5:** This was reported in the 13 March 2018 report, whereby officers recommended (for good practice) that Parishes develop a detailed Infrastructure Spend Plan (ISP) for their area. Officers have made a commitment to work closely with Parishes to support them and have devised specific pages on the Councils CIL webpages to assist Parishes. An initial workshop was held in June 2018 and a further workshop is scheduled for 20 February 2019. Members are also invited to attend this workshop, which is designed to ensure Parish Councils have all the information they require before the first possible payment date of 28 April 2019.
- 1.41 Parishes will have the choice not to receive CIL and may ask the Council to spend it on their behalf. Should the Parish choose this option; the Council will spend the CIL in consultation with the community. The level of consultation will be proportionate to the amount of CIL to be spent as agreed by SPST in the report on 11 September

- 1.42 **KEY ISSUE G6: How the Council works with local communities in non parished areas to develop local infrastructure priorities for neighbourhood portion spend.**
- 1.43 **Response to G6:** The report to SPST on 11 September 2018 outlined how the Council will work within the non-parished areas. Legislation states that CIL can only be passed to Parish Councils. For all other areas, such as parish meeting areas, town centre wards and neighbourhood forums, CIL will be administered by the Council in consultation with that community.
- 1.44 CIL money will be collected by ward. Each ward will then be dealt with on an individual basis and, where appropriate and reflecting the community needs, CIL funds could be combined should it felt that this constitutes the best use of CIL to achieve the delivery of relevant infrastructure. If a ward/wards chooses to become a Forum or Parish/Town Council and develop their own plan then this will be supported by the Council.
- 1.45 When planning the relevant schemes for the year, officers will have regard to priorities and smaller non strategic schemes identified in the IDP and any other locally consulted upon and publically supported schemes.
- 1.46 The CIL Regulations require consultation to be proportionate with the amount of CIL received and the scale of the development to which the neighbourhood funding relates. Maidstone will achieve this by using existing consultation mechanisms already used by the Council, such as the Councils website, libraries, press etc. and liaising with neighbourhood groups and other interested parties. Ideas could, for example also be submitted via the Council's website. The Council will have a dialogue with Ward members before consulting the community on any projects over £5,000. Ward members will have an important role to play in assisting the Council with the consultation process by using their usual forms of engagement with their constituents to inform a wider audience.
- 1.47 Maidstone borough currently has only one non-parished area with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, the North Loose Residents Association. The Council has met with the Forum separately and will continue to engage with them to ensure that the neighbourhood portion of CIL is spent in accordance with their Neighbourhood Plan and reflects the community's priorities.

Delegation required from Full Council

- 1.48 SPST resolved at its meeting on 8 January 2019 that:
1. The SPST Committee agrees the governance proposals for managing the strategic portion of CIL as follows:
 - A. That a CIL steering group be established comprising the Director of Regeneration and Place (as Chair) and other appropriate Council officers;

- B. That the SPST Committee should be the final decision making body for the strategic portion of CIL.
2. The SPST Committee agrees that the processes, as set out in the report, for the allocation of the strategic portion of CIL be agreed.
 3. The governance arrangements to be reviewed at an appropriate time.
 4. These recommendations are referred to Full Council for approval, so that the appropriate delegations can be made to the SPST Committee.
- 1.49 MBC's constitution sets out that SPST is responsible for overseeing the development, review and the implementation of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (subject to approval by Council). This report updates Full Council on progress to date and seeks the appropriate delegation for SPST Committee to oversee the CIL (with the exception of approving the charging schedule) This will also include being the final decision maker for the strategic CIL spend.
- 1.50 SPST will also be responsible for reviewing the governance arrangements, specifically those for the strategic spend, at the most appropriate time. The earliest date this first review could take place would be after the first round of the bidding and allocation process.
- 1.51 To achieve this delegation of responsibility to SPST, it is proposed that the Council's Constitution is amended to reflect the following:
- Strategic Planning and Performance Management – to oversee the development, review and implementation of the Council's:
- Development Plan, including the Maidstone Borough Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans (subject to approval by Council); Spatial planning documents such as supplementary planning documents and planning policy advice notes; Master Plans and development briefs; The Infrastructure Delivery Plan; *and* The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) ~~(subject to approval by Council)~~ *including being the final decision maker for spending strategic CIL funds. (Note: the CIL Charging Schedule must be approved by a meeting of full Council).*
-

2. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 2.1 **Option 1:** Full Council notes progress to date and agrees to make the appropriate delegation to SPST and reflect the associated changes in the Councils Constitution. SPST committee has responsibility for CIL and the delivery of the Local Plan and the production of the IDP. All of which are inter related. A consistent approach will be achieved by having the same committee responsible for all aspects of each of these as they will be aware of other projects and schemes that are taking place. This will ensure the best use of resources and, where available, matched funding.

SPST committee also receives specialist training in CIL and other planning matters which will assist their decision making.

- 2.2 **Option 2:** Full Council chooses to note progress to date but does not agree to amend the Council's Constitution and continues to have decisions brought to them for approval. This could have significant resource implications for members of Full Council. Additional training would be required in CIL and planning related issues. There could also be a risk that the context of other planning decisions and projects would be missed as this detail would have been discussed in SPST meetings such as progress on the Local Plan and the IDP.
- 2.1 **Option 3:** Full Council chooses to note progress to date and resolves to reconsider this request at some point in the future when the CIL has been in operation for longer. This could lead to uncertainty and a lack of ownership by a specific committee. Although there is nothing set out in the legislation about which committee should be responsible, the Government will be expecting the Council to follow what has been laid out in law regarding the process.

3 PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The preferred option is **Option 1**, that SPST are granted delegation from Full Council to deliver the Community Infrastructure Levy including being the final decision making body to spend the strategic CIL. Full Council will retain the function of approving the CIL Charging Schedule. Working with officers, SPST would have over arching responsibility for the Community Infrastructure Levy. Having all the appropriate measures in place will give confidence to the public, developers, Parish Councils, local ward members and other stakeholders such as statutory infrastructure providers.

4 RISK

- 4.1 The risks associated with this proposal, including the risks if the Council does not act as recommended, have been considered in line with the Council's Risk Management Framework. We are satisfied that the risks associated are within the Council's risk appetite and will be managed as per the Policy. If the Council chooses options 2 or 3 then there could be delays in approving strategic CIL fund expenditure. This could affect delivery of infrastructure in the borough.

5 CONSULTATION RESULTS AND PREVIOUS COMMITTEE FEEDBACK

- 5.1 No formal consultation has taken place on the implementation however extensive consultation took place regarding the Charging Schedule.
-

6 NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

6.1 If Option 1 is selected, this will be published on the Council's website under the Community Infrastructure Levy pages.

7 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	Accepting the recommendations will materially improve the Council's ability to achieve corporate priorities. We set out the reasons other choices will be less effective in section 2.	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development
Risk Management	Already covered in the risk section	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development
Financial	<p>This report proposes governance arrangements for CIL. Given the potential amounts to be collected via CIL, it is important that robust Financial decision making processes are put in place. Administrative costs associated with CIL can be recouped through a top-slice of CIL income.</p> <p>The proposals to note in the report are all within already approved budgetary headings and so need no new funding for implementation.</p>	Paul Holland, Senior Finance Manager
Staffing	We will deliver the recommendations with our current staffing.	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development
Legal	Accepting the recommendations will fulfil the Council's duties	Susan Mauger

	under The Planning Act 2008. Failure to accept the recommendations without agreeing suitable alternatives may place the Council in breach of the Planning Act 2008.	Senior Planning Lawyer (Locum)
Privacy and Data Protection	Accepting the recommendations will increase the volume of data held by the Council. We will hold that data in line with the Councils privacy policy on GDPR.	Susan Mauger Senior Planning Lawyer (Locum)
Equalities	Equalities will be a key consideration of communication and engagement plans. Particularly in relation to engaging the wider community as part of key issue G6.	Equalities and Corporate Policy Officer
Public Health	Health inequalities will be a key consideration particularly in relation to key issue G5 and G6 when working with Parish Councils and communities in non parished areas	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development
Crime and Disorder	N/A	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development
Procurement	On accepting the recommendations, the Council will then follow procurement exercises. We will complete those exercises in line with financial procedure rules.	Rob Jarman Head of Planning and Development

9 BACKGROUND PAPERS

8 January 2019

<https://meetings.maidstone.gov.uk/documents/s64101/CIL%20Governance%20Report.pdf>

11 September 2018

<https://meetings.maidstone.gov.uk/documents/s62411/Maidstone%20Community%20Infrastructure%20Levy%20Administration%20and%20Governance.pdf>

13 March 2018

<https://meetings.maidstone.gov.uk/documents/s59715/CIL%20administration%20and%20engagement.pdf>

7 Nov 2017 SPST report

<https://meetings.maidstone.gov.uk/documents/s57649/CIL%20Administrative%20and%20Governance%20Arrangements.pdf>
