

Appendix D – Summary of Ward Assembly NCIL Meetings

NCIL: Bellingham ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Rachel Onikosi
Attendance	14
No. of Recommended Projects	8
Date of meeting	30 January 2025

Summary: A positive meeting with no objections. The attendees were happy to recommend the projects to Mayor and Cabinet

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: There were questions from the audience about the cost of the street trees, these seemed very high, what were the costs for exactly.

Response: Cllrs clarified that the costs included the background work including scoping work and surveys etc, as well as including three years maintenance to ensure the trees survive and flourish. Cllrs stated that they would have oversight of locations ensuring the trees were put into the areas of most need.

Comment: There were comments from the audience around the Kitchen for the Youth Club and cooking courses. Residents hoped that young people would benefit from a form of accreditation or professional certification to benefit from the kitchen works in the longer term. This was agreed to be discussed at mobilisation.

Comment: Clarification was sought on the costs for the St Dunstan's organ recitals project. It was confirmed that the costs included paying musicians, marketing and promotion, organ maintenance and supporting young people to play the organ. It was agreed this was a reasonable cost for this project.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Blackheath ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr De Ryk
Attendance	17
No. of Recommended Projects	7
Date of meeting	15 January 2025

Summary: No objections to any of the proposals or issues regarding the recommendations going to Mayor and Cabinet.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: The first question related to the open call projects and to confirm that there was just the one application to Blackheath ward.

Response: This was confirmed by the officer who also stated that this was not the case in other wards where there have been plenty of open call applications.

Question: More detail was requested regarding the Hare and Billet Pond Trees project:

Response: The officer referred to the application and information provided by the Tree Officer that some of the trees are over-mature and will likely fall in the short to medium term. Information about the type of tree selected and the reasoning was provided.

Question: More information was requested as to where the street trees will be planted and if the money is allocated to Street Trees for Living, will the trees be planted within the ward.

Response: It was confirmed that the location for the trees is still to be decided, however, all of the trees will be planted in Blackheath ward.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Brockley ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Ayesha Lahai-Taylor
Attendance	21
No. of Recommended Projects	7
Date of meeting	1 February 2025

Summary: Attendees were satisfied with the recommendations, though had some questions about the project selection and about the consultation process.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Comment: Street Trees have the potential to be impactful in the long term, could you confirm that those being funded via S106 (not NCIL) will be in addition to those funded by Sustainable Streets?

Response: Officer confirmed that these would be in addition to those funded via the Sustainable Streets programme.

Question: What was the percentage of the responses from Brockley ward?

Response: The specific details weren't available at the meeting, but officers stated they have details of the breakdown that can be shared. Officers also flagged the support given to those unable to go online to respond through visits to community groups.

Comment: The fact that capital projects had been identified by the Council and residents were not asked to feed in felt dispiriting.

Comment: More information was requested about the Lewisham Way Youth Club Reunion application (which was not recommend in this round), as this is something Brockley Society are keen to see developed.

Response: Details of individual applications could not be discussed at the meeting, but officers undertook to revisit this project with interested parties to see which elements needed funding and try to identify a way forward.

Officers also spoke about the follow-up plans for support for unsuccessful applicants through individual feedback to organisation, but also through workshops and advice with the Funding Development Managers.

Comment: The capital projects on the list could be considered to be projects that the council should be funding anyway and are therefore not truly community projects.

Response: Officers undertook to reflect these comments and explained that in relation to the Parks projects, they have been identified in consultation with Friends groups.

Question: Would this mean that the Council's preferred contractors would be used to deliver the projects?

Response: Officers undertook to confirm this, but explained that the parks team would work with residents on this.

Comment: There is a gap in terms of consultation in relation to parks works as detailed specifications aren't always shared to enable groups to give informed feedback.

Response: Officers agreed to feed this back to colleagues in the relevant team.

Comment: Development funding could be made available prior to the programme to develop ideas

Comment: Work has been undertaken with the Friends of Friendly Gardens to identify potential works, and Thames Water need to deliver some elements they have committed to. To ensure no funding is wasted or efforts duplicated have officers considered sequencing and how this work will be being taken forward.

Response: Officers confirmed that they have been liaising with the parks team already in contact with the Friends group, and no elements would be put in place that may be undone by future works.

Further action taken by officers:

Officers will feed back to relevant teams where they have undertaken to do so.

NCIL: Catford South ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Royston
Attendance	90
No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	6 February 2025

Summary: The meeting attendees were happy with the recommendations made to Mayor and cabinet, although had some questions and comments around the cost of street trees however this was clarified by a representative from Street Trees for Living and Cllr Royston. There is also a notable emphasis on the need for more activities and projects aimed at young people.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: How many trees will the funding for street trees cover?

Response: The funding will cover between 2 to 3 trees. The cost includes the maintenance over three years.

Comment: There was confusion about the cost, with one resident calculating that the same amount could fund six trees. The costs were clarified that they included scoping work and maintenance and that street trees for living is subsidised for community planting making it cheaper for the resident than for the council.

Tree Size and Selection

Question: How big are the trees?

Answer: When planted are taller than an average person and variety selected to avoid affecting house foundations.

Disappearance of Bins

Question: Why have bins disappeared along Bromley Rd? Worry about funding more if they are going to be removed.

Response: The reason was unknown, but it was noted that it is a TfL road, and the issue would be looked into – ACTION for Cllr Royston

Diamond Club Project

Question: How many people attend the Diamond Club?

Response: Between 40 and 60 older people attend weekly.

Comment: There was a discussion about the validity of funding the Diamond Club, with some preferring to fund other projects like railings.

Comment: Some felt that the Diamond Club should be more visible promoting their project.

Question: Why are there not enough bike hangers, and why was the decision made to decline funding for more?

Response: The decision was based on the popularity of different projects, and bike hangers were not among the most popular.

Comment: Cycle hangers lack reflective lights, making them hard to see in the dark.

Projects for Young People

Question: Were there any projects for people under the age of 18?

Answer: Other than the basketball courts, there were no specific projects aimed at young people.

Comment: There was a call for more projects aimed at teenagers and young people, noting a lack of activities for this age group. Cllr Royston referenced Youth First, the youth service provider coming back in house soon.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Crofton Park ward assembly summary	
Chairs	Cllr Tauseef Anwar, Cllr Chris Barnham and Cllr Carol Webley-Brown
Attendance	24
No. of Recommended Projects	3
Date of meeting	11 February 2025

Summary: Overall the proposed projects were well received.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: Clarification on site of the rain garden, is it on A205 as this is a TFL Road?

Response: It is on a side road off the A205 which is a fly-tipping hot-spot and an area of anti-social behaviour.

Comment: The Deputy Chair of the Friends of the library expressed gratitude for the part funding and asked for more information on the Community Fundraisers service

Comment: Chair of the Ackroyd Centre thanked the team for their recommendation for funding which will ensure service can resume safely once the new floor is fitted.

Question: As Brockley Max did not get funding for Crofton Park. Does that mean that the ward will not get any benefit from the proposals for the festival?

Response: Moira put in three bids to three wards, each for something slightly different; she did not rely on getting all three and she will be fundraising from other sources to try to obtain funding. The project is also scalable according to the funding that is agreed.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Deptford ward assembly summary	
Chairs	Cllr Dawn Atkinson, Cllr Rosie Parry and Cllr David Walker
Attendance	11
No. of Recommended Projects	12
Date of meeting	1 February 2025

Summary: Positive reception to the proposed projects

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Comment: Officers and Cllrs stated that there were lots of very good projects (the ward fund was over-subscribed by more than 10x the amount allocated to the ward fund). They added that they would continue working with unsuccessful projects to identify funding.

Comment: The application process was much easier this time, it feels fairer and more balanced, so I wanted to thank you for that and for the contribution to the New X and Deptford Free Film Festival this year.

Comment: The Bear Church building is not quite finished yet, but we are hoping to be able to host two films this year.

Comment: Cllrs formally thanked Sarah, Sakthi and the rest of the team for all their work on delivering the NCIL project.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Downham ward assembly summary

Chair	Cllr Andre Bourne
Attendance	14
No. of Recommended Projects	7
Date of meeting	4 February 2025

Summary: It was felt that more details should have been provided regarding the main capital project, which was the improvements to Downham Fields, but overall, there was a positive reaction to the recommended projects and no issue with them going to Mayor and Cabinet.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: Further details were requested regarding the Downham Fields improvements proposal and what are the improvements being made.

Response: Officers referred to the original Capital Project proposal from Greenscene and provided more detail.

Comment: An attendee welcomed the Downham Fields recommendation, however it was commented that there should have been more liaison regarding the proposal.

Comment: It was mentioned that two of the projects not recommended for funding are youth projects and that we need to ensure that there are activities for young people.

Response: It was explained that it is very difficult with so little money available, however, two of the recommended projects are aimed at young people and in addition the parks project and the creative project will both have young people as beneficiaries.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Evelyn ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Rudi Schmidt
Attendance	27
No. of Recommended Projects	12
Date of meeting	25 January 2025

Summary: Recommendations were supported, but there was feedback both on individual projects and on the overarching process.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Comment: Ensure that the Foreshore project has community consultation on how money should be spent, and that consideration is given to use of green spaces, dog walkers, cycling and parking spaces.

Response: Councillors agreed that this was an important part of delivering this project. Officers undertook to ensure this was reflected in the report to Mayor & Cabinet.

Comment: The Bear Church is based outside of the ward.

Response: Officers acknowledged that this was the case, but also acknowledged that a number of the programmes delivered by the church (such as EAL schemes, lunch clubs and play sessions for children) also benefitted Evelyn ward residents.

Question: Clarification was sought on the two projects in Deptford Park – replacement play equipment and a renovated football pitch [for a total of £115k].

Response: Officers explained that the cost for the pitch renovation was currently an estimate of no more than £80k, but once confirmed, any remaining funds would go towards replacement play equipment.

Comment: Support should be given to non-recommended projects such as the After School Club, as they are important for the community.

Response: Officers shared the follow-up plans for support for unsuccessful applicants through individual feedback to organisation, but also through workshops and advice with the Funding Development Managers.

Comment: Some groups seem to be ‘missing’ from the list of recommended projects including elderly and disabled people, carers, those facing gender-based abuse and domestic violence (including men), collaborative working with the Muslim community and smaller community projects.

Response: Some of these groups will be served by these projects as only summaries of the projects have been presented today.

Comment: Communities should be asked to help identify capital projects.

Comment: There should be opportunities created for joint working between funded and non-funded projects, and a more collaborative approach should be developed between groups to reduce competition for the funds, as the process can divide groups. Also, some organisations submitting multiple applications may impact funds available to a wider range of groups.

Comment: Having earlier sight of recommendations would have been helpful, as would regular feedback from funded projects. Perhaps the new Community Forum could be a part of this process.

Response: Councillors agreed it would be helpful to use the Forum for this type of work.

Comment: Support could be given in the following ways:

- Lists of funders
- Pooling resources across groups
- Sharing ideas on what makes a good application

Comment: The mailing list is not comprehensive

Comment: Developers are making huge sums locally, and residents are only seeing a fraction of this.

Further action taken by officers:

Officers will feed back to relevant teams where they have undertaken to do so.

NCIL: Forest Hill ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Peter Bernards
Attendance	11
No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	23 January 2025

Summary: The assembly accepted the recommendations overall and welcomed funding for Horniman Triangle Playground.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: Participants asked why the library is not recommended for funding.

Response: Cllrs explained that the funding amount requested would have taken up the entire funding pot for Forest Hill ward and it was felt more appropriate to share the resources more widely. The Library has received funding on a number of occasions in the past from Forest Hill Assembly.

Question The cost of the Christmas trees was queried along with siting (was Kirkdale within the ward?) and provision of a permanent tree.

Response: Officers and Cllrs clarified that the costs of the trees include preparing the site, decorating with lights and switching on, and aftercare (if sustainable tree) or dismantling (if one year only tree) – in addition to the cost of the trees themselves. It was clarified that the site of the ‘Kirkdale’ Christmas tree is within the ward.

Question: The café at Horniman Triangle was also looking dilapidated and closed. Participants asked whether the community could take over running this?

Response: Officers responded that Lewisham Local were able to support groups that want to run a community project of this sort.

Comment There were various suggestions for community fundraising for projects from the participants. Officers stated that they would be happy to set up a workshop on community fundraising including use of sites such as GoFundMe. It was also noted that Lewisham Local operates a community lottery which enables people to nominate their favourite local charity and channel regular funds towards them.

Comment: There was a suggestion that community fundraising could be carried out to cover the costs of the Forest Hill Station Christmas Tree. The view was expressed that, should this fundraising be successful, funds could be released to support Forest Hill Library.

Comment Participants welcomed the funding for Horniman Triangle Playground. It was well recognised that the play equipment was in need of replacement.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Grove Park ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Hilary Moore
Attendance	37
No. of Recommended Projects	4
Date of meeting	25 January 2025

Summary: Attendees were positive about the recommended projects, but were keen to ensure that the unsuccessful projects receive feedback. There was also some concern about how well NCIL was communicated.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: There was a question as to why the street tree application was unsuccessful.

Response: It was explained that the last round of NCIL funded 20 street trees for the ward.

Comment: It was felt that street bins should not be funded by NCIL (this application was unsuccessful) and should come from the main council budget.

Response: It was re-iterated that this was an unsuccessful application, however, it is an example of the budgetary pressures that the council is now under where money has to be found to finance improvements that previously could be funded through existing budgets.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Hither Green ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Yemisi Anifowse
Attendance	48
No. of Recommended Projects	8
Date of meeting	30 January 2025

Summary: Positive comments on the NCIL process and overall satisfaction with the recommended projects, however, concern as to why Hither Green receives so little NCIL funding compared to some other wards.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: It was felt that the cost of the street trees was very high

Response: It was explained that this is a complicated process and that we need to look at the feasibility and impact as well as where there are less trees and more trees etc. In addition, this cost will involve the cost of looking after the tree.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Ladywell ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Laura Cunningham
Attendance	23
No. of Recommended Projects	3
Date of meeting	30 January 2025

Summary: Attendees were satisfied with the recommendations, with only a few queries raised (as below).

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Comment: It would have been good to see some projects funded that related to health and wellbeing to reduce strain on GPs.

Response: Cllrs stated that there are other sources of funding that can be accessed. Officers shared that the council funds Community Connections, which undertake social prescribing and offered to pass on contact details.

Comment: The Christmas tree could be used to celebrate other culturally significant festivals such as Diwali.

Question: What is the difference between Section 106 (S106) and NCIL?

Response: Officers explained that NCIL has replaced S106 as a levy charged to developers with schemes over a certain size. Whereas S106 can only be spent on capital projects, NCIL can also fund revenue projects.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Lee Green ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Eva Kestner
Attendance	62
No. of Recommended Projects	5
Date of meeting	6 February 2025

Summary: Overall, the Assembly accepted the recommendations proposed.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: There was a question from the audience as to why Edith Nesbit Gardens was not amongst the recommended projects.

Response: Cllr James Rathbone explained that the park needs considerable investment, which is why a large sum from S106 funding from the Leegate development is largely assigned to improving Edith Nesbit Gardens. It was thought that with the NCIL allocation for Lee Green being so small, it didn't make sense to spend £20k on the park now only to spend a lot more money undoing the works that has been undertaken in a year's time.

Question: When the Assembly had funds attached to it, residents were trusted to be sensible enough to debate and decide amongst themselves what to spend the funds available on. It is an act of absolutely condescending that the council has this time decided that the assembly cannot be trusted to make a decision on the projects that have applied to the NCIL funds. What were the reasons for not recommending the Lee Green Consortium proposal?

Response: Cllr Rathbone responding explained that it has always been the case in the past that recommendations are being made on projects proposed by Cllrs and officers before asking the Assembly for their comments. The NCIL fund is different from the Assembly fund, projects proposals are assessed by officers and recommendations made along with Councillors to decide the best use of the money. Lee Green has a very small allocation and Cllrs tried to prioritise the community proposals. The Lee Green consortium in the last round of NCIL was funded because there were not enough bids to use up all the money allocated. Rather than have some of the NCIL go back into the central pot, the decision was taken to award the rest of the money to the consortium to keep it in the ward and distribute to groups later on. This time around, there were strong community bids for the totality of the money. Rather than give it to the consortium who could then distribute it in small pots going forward, it was felt that those community bids were worthy of being recommended and that is the reason why Cllrs recommended the ones presented to the meeting.

Comment: A comment from the floor that while NCIL is now a very different funding source it is regrettable that while this Assembly is still alive (albeit only just) it feels a considerable shame that it was not considered sufficiently experienced or

sophisticated in making informed decisions about the needs of the area. We have to wonder how any other panel could have superior skills in this respect.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Lewisham Central ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Aliya Sheikh
Attendance	32
No. of Recommended Projects	4
Date of meeting	23 January 2025

Summary: Assembly members were satisfied with the projects being recommended for ward NCIL funding with no objections.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: There was a question from the audience about what will happen when the NCIL funding period comes to an end in 2027 in relation to projects requiring ongoing maintenance costs such as in the case of Cornmill Garden Water Play feature.

Response: Cllr Edison Huyhn responded that the council has built in the future maintenance cost of the water play features into the Parks Maintenance Contract. In the case of other individual projects, the council has been upfront with projects leads, advising them that the funding award will only provide support over the term of their project and that other source of funding will need to be found where there are ongoing costs.

Comment: No further comments received.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: New Cross Gate ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Aisha Malik-Smith
Attendance	18
No. of Recommended Projects	10
Date of meeting	16 January 2025

Summary: Assembly accepted the recommendations.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: There is a large Barratt Homes development next door to us, which is causing a lot of disruption. Will we see any mitigation funding for this?

Response: The Barratt Homes development is in the London Borough of Southwark, therefore there is no Lewisham NCIL funding targeted to this area in relation to it. However, Cllr Malik-Smith agreed to speak with Southwark councillors regarding measures to address the disruption to New Cross Gate ward residents.

Question: Can Lewisham Housing Newsletter include promotion of next round of NCIL funding

Response: We will look at doing this.

Question: Can developers be made to plant trees around the ward?

Response: We ask for biodiversity measures with all developments. The planning rules do not allow us to stipulate planting in other areas not directly associated with the development.

Question: There were several queries with regard to street bins, including the number of bins originally requested in the council-led proposal; the rationale for using NCIL to pay for them; and whether they will be regularly emptied.

Response: The bid was for 34 street bins. There is insufficient council budget to cover installation of the numbers and types of bins required to maintain clean streets. The council is aware of the need to replace and upgrade bins and also to install bins in areas not well served and which suffer from littering. The council confirms that new/upgraded bins will be regularly emptied.

Question: As residents, can we approach developers and ask them to sponsor infrastructure such as bins?

Response: We are happy for residents to do this.

Question: Have Millwall been asked to contribute funding?

Response: Yes – at the moment their funds do not allow for this. They are also working on other projects with the council. Milwall are aware of the pressure on local areas and are keen to give back to the community.

Comment: Online applications are challenging for working people to complete.

Response: We took on board a lot of feedback from the last round of NCIL and improved our application process as a result. We will listen to feedback on this round as well and will aim to incorporate suggestions into the next round.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Perry Vale ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Susan Wise
Attendance	25 tbc
No. of Recommended Projects	2
Date of meeting	14 January 2025

Summary: The assembly welcomed the recommendations particularly funding of the Bellingham Play Park. There were no objections.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: Who will be responsible for maintenance of the playground (Bellingham Play Park)

Response: Lewisham Council

Question: What was the rationale for funding Sydenham Garden?

Response: The recommendation is based on assessment by officers following strict criteria and local knowledge of councillors. Sydenham Garden provides a range of benefits to the community over and over the funded project.

Question: How can we link up with others to address the obstacle of the railway bridge over the River Poole, which makes access to this playground difficult for local families in Bellingham?

Response: Officers and councillors would be happy to speak to people about this. Friends of the River Poole also stated they would be keen to link up with the Cycle Path project and cycling groups that use the Waterlink Way.

Comments: NCIL funding should go to community projects.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Rushey Green ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr John Muldoon
Attendance	22
No. of Recommended Projects	7
Date of meeting	13 February 2025

Summary: The meeting went well and overall the attendees were happy to recommend the Rushey Green NCIL Projects to Mayor and cabinet. Various concerns and suggestions were raised by residents. Key issues include the need for better recycling education, the importance of community projects like the Catford Football Project, and the desire for more youth-focused initiatives.

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Bins and Recycling

Question: Why is the upgrading of bins being funded by NCIL instead of the Council's core budget?

Response: Due to austerity and budget cuts, NCIL funds are being used for capital investments like bins.

Comment: There is a need for strong education on recycling to ensure proper use of the bins.

Cycle Hangers

Question: Why were cycle hangers not funded, and what is the process for their installation?

Response: Cycle hangers were not among the highest-scoring projects. The installation process is based on resident requests and consultations.

Comment: Some residents noted that cycle hangers are not well-used and suggested better consultation.

Tree Replacements

Question: Will dead trees be replaced?

Response: Yes, residents should report dead trees to the Council for replacement.

Comment: The Council is committed to maintaining and replacing trees as needed.

Comment: Concerns about the type of trees planted to avoid trip hazards and ensure longevity.

Response: The council is working with specialists to select appropriate trees and ensure proper maintenance.

Question: Were there any projects specifically for young people?

Response: The Catford Football Project is aimed at young people, but there is a need for more youth-focused projects.

Comment: The Council should seek more projects for teenagers and young people in future rounds.

Comment: Residents appreciated the efforts to improve the community but expressed a desire for more diverse projects, including those targeting different age groups and needs.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Sydenham ward assembly summary	
Chair	Cllr Chris Best
Attendance	43
No. of Recommended Projects	6
Date of meeting	1 February 2025

Summary: Overall assembly members were satisfied with the projects being recommended for ward NCIL funding

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: Clarification was sought on whether funding for the library would be spent on maintenance of the building.

Response: Sidra Hill-Reid was present and explained that the NCIL funding would be spent on a standalone infrastructure project to increase community space by creating a new entrance onto the park. Maintenance of the building was also being carried out by the council and V22, with funds being sought from other sources.

Comment: A representative of the Sydenham Wells Park Improvement Group expressed disappointment that the park was not recommended for any funding.

Response: Councillors explained that the funding available in Sydenham ward is not sufficient to cover the full costs of the necessary improvement works, particularly to address the current flooding issues. It was also explained that thanks to the work of the friends group and councillors the issue has now been incorporated into the Council's infrastructure development plan which means it can attract further funding from other sources. Councillors assured assembly members that they would continue to push for this issue to be addressed.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.

NCIL: Telegraph Hill ward assembly summary	
Chairs	Cllr Paul Bell, Cllr Joan Millbank and Cllr Luke Sorba
Attendance	11
No. of Recommended Projects	4
Date of meeting	3 February 2025

Summary: Overall attendees were happy with the proposed programme

Key questions and issues raised about recommendations:

Question: How is NCIL allocated?

Response: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is collected from developers and a portion is allocated to community projects based on local needs and council priorities.

Note: this was asked at the introduction of the NCIL agenda item so the answer above was explained in more detail in the section of the presentation which outlined the process.

Question: How is community feedback incorporated into the decision-making process?

Response: There was portal for residents to like up to three Council-led projects in their ward which we promoted in the community and at outreach sessions. This feedback will be used to inform the final recommendations to the Mayor and Cabinet.

Comment: Positive comments on the efforts to involve the community in the decision-making process.

Further action taken by officers:

No further actions were identified to be taken forward by officers.