

Strategic CIL Scoring Criteria

Applicant:	
Project location:	
Project description:	
Amount of CIL funding requested:	
Total project cost:	

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
 - Funding must be for the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development in its area.
 - CIL is intended to focus on the provision of new infrastructure and should not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision, unless those deficiencies will be made more severe by new development.

Scoring Criteria

If a project fulfils the mandatory requirements Officers will assess it against the following scoring criteria:

Delivering Growth (45)

1) In what ways does this project contribute to the strategic growth and sustainable development of Hertsmere?

Strong support (15)	Some support (10)	Very little support (5)	No contribution (0)
---------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

2) Does your organisation possess the requisite capacity, expertise, and resources to successfully deliver this project?

Critical (20)	Essential (15)	Desirable (10)	Other (5)	No contribution (0)
---------------	----------------	----------------	-----------	---------------------

3) Will the proposed project support the objectives and priorities outlined in the emerging Hertsmere Borough Council Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan?

Strong link to Council priorities (10)	Some link to Council priorities (5)	No link to Council priorities (0)
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Community Support (30)

4) Is there evidence of a public benefit of the project?

Evidence of local and wider public benefit (10)	Evidence of local public benefit (5)	No/limited evidence of public benefit (0)
---	--------------------------------------	---

5) Is there evidence that the local community support the project?

Significant evidence of community support (20)	Some evidence of community support benefit (10)	No/limited evidence of community support (0)
--	---	--

Project Cost (25)

6) 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)
---	--	---	--	--

7) 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)
--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---

8) If the project has or unlocks funding from other sources, what is the status of this funding?

Subject to CIL, funding secured/approved (5)	Alternative funding not currently applied for/secured/approved (3)	No funding from other sources/ Unknown (0)
--	--	--

Deliverability (35)

9) 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)

Strong evidence supporting deliverability of the project (15)	Good evidence supporting deliverability of the project (10)	Some evidence supporting deliverability of the project (5)	No/limited evidence supporting deliverability of the project (0)
10) What is the delivery timescale for the project?			
Immediate (10)	Up to 6 months (6)	6m - 1 year (3)	More than 1 years (0)
11) 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 maintenance (10)	Evidence of provider but no cost for maintenance; <i>or</i> no evidence of provider but cost for maintenance (5)		No/limited evidence of provider or cost for maintenance (0)

Project Score	/145
----------------------	-------------

Officers Recommendation

Justification & Comments:

Officers Recommendation: