Neighbourhood CIL Scoring Criteria

Applicant:						
Project location:						
Project description:						
Amount of CIL						
funding requested:						
Total project cost:						
Mandatory Poquiron	nonte					
Mandatory Requirements						
For a project to be scored against the scoring criteria all mandatory requirements must be satisfied:						
☐ The application form must be completed satisfactorily.						
☐ The organisation must be capable of carrying out the proposed project*. *If landowner consent is required to deliver the project, this must be gained and evidenced as part of the bid application.						
 The project must meet the terms of the CIL Regulations 2010, as amended: The project must be clearly defined as 'infrastructure'; as per the Planning Act 2008 						
					ment, operation or	
			upport the devel	•	in its area. cture and should not	
be used to	remedy	pre-existing de	eficiencies in infr	astructu	ure provision, unless	
those defic	iencies	will be made m	ore severe by ne	ew deve	elopment.	
0 0						
Scoring Criteria If a project fulfils the n	nandato	ry requirements	officers will ass	sess it a	against the following	
scoring criteria: Delivering Growth (4)	5)					
		niect contribute	to the growth an	nd susta	ninable development of	
Hertsmere?	, tillo pi		to the growth ar	ia odote	anable development of	
Strong link (15)	Some link (10)		Very little (5)		No contribution (0)	
2) Evidence of public benefits?						
Evidence of local and public benefit (10			f local public fit (5)	No/lim	ited evidence of public benefit (0)	
3) Local community 8	& stakel	nolders support	?			
			e of community ort (10)	No/limited evidence of community support (0)		

Project Cost (20)							
4) Is the project value for money (VfM)? (considering: comparison of quotes provided, costs against benchmark costs, potential benefits and outcomes for the Borough, alternative funding sources available and the need for CIL, the added value which CIL could bring to the scheme)							
Excellent evidence that all aspects of the project are VfM (10)	Good evidence that most aspects of the project are VfM (7)	Some evidence that aspects of the project are VfM (5)	Limited evidence that the project is VfM (3)	Evidence does not demonstrate project is VfM/Unknown (0)			

5) Does the project have or unlock additional funding from other sources (e.g. grants or match-funding)?

Over 75%
funding from
other sources
(10)

50-74% funding from other sources (7) 25-49% funding from other sources (5) Up to 25% funding from other sources (3)

No funding from other sources / Unknown (0)

maintenance (0)

Deliverability (35)

6) What evidence is there to suggest the project is deliverable? (considering: feasibility; if planning permission would be required; what type of bid is the project, e.g. feasibility, preliminary works or project; is there a project plan which includes timetabling and resources; what measures have been explored to minimise the risk of the project not being delivered)

a construction of					
Strong evidence supporting deliverability of the project (15)	Good evidence supporting deliverability of the project (10)	Some evidence supporting deliverability of th project (5)	supporting		
7) What is the delivery timescale for the project?					
Immediate (10)	1-2 years (6)	3 years (3)	More than 3 years / Unknown (0)		
8) Have details been given as to how on-going maintenance will be provided for and the identification of the responsible party for the maintenance?					
Evidence of provider and cost for			No/limited evidence of provider or cost for		

provider but cost for maintenance (5)

Project Score

maintenance (10)

Officers Recommendation

Justification & Comments:
Officers Recommendation: