

Form B – Factors considered when determining whether schemes should be funded by CIL

Criteria number	Criteria description	Detail	Scoring (on a scale of 1-4) 4 being the highest score (with some exceptions noted) Examples for guidance
1	Is the scheme proposed for infrastructure?	Schemes should propose works that relate to infrastructure as defined by the CIL regulations. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy#spending-the-levy . Part A of the application form seeks information about the scheme which will be used to determine this.	1 = The scheme relates to infrastructure as defined by the regulations. 0 = The scheme does not relate to infrastructure as defined by the regulations, and cannot be funded. The application will not succeed despite any further scoring. (No scoring in-between 0 and 1, the scheme is either award 0 or 1. Schemes that receive 0 will not be successful).
2	Working in partnership	If possible, the applicant should provide evidence of partnership working with one or more organisation. Consideration will be given to the type of partners involved, the formality of the partnership and the amount of involvement from all partners. Applications from infrastructure/statutory providers that do not need to work in partnership will still be considered.	4 = The scheme is supported by detailed and thorough evidence regarding partnership working. That evidence demonstrates an appropriate and adequate partnership or, partnership working is not applicable to the scheme or required for the scheme to be delivered. 1= The scheme is not supported by information to assess the partnership. The suggested partnership is deemed inappropriate or inadequate. (Scoring on a scale of 1-4)
3	The need for the scheme	In Part B of the application form, the applicant is expected to explain the need for the scheme, and demonstrate how it supports growth in the Local Authority area. Those identified on the Council’s Infrastructure Plan or any infrastructure funding statement will receive a higher score.	4 = There is clear, detailed and robust evidence demonstrating the need for the scheme and that it clearly supports growth in the district. 1= There is not enough evidence provided or the scheme is deemed to be of limited benefit. (Scoring on a scale of 1-4)

4	Is the scheme part of an existing strategy/plan?	<p>In Part B of the application form, the applicant is expected to explain the need for the scheme.</p> <p>We would expect the scheme be part of an existing strategy or plan. This could include Neighbourhood Plans. It could also be strategies, work programmes by statutory bodies or if it has been identified as a project.</p>	<p>4 = The scheme aligns with the priorities with existing strategies and/or plans. There is an audit trail linking the scheme to a plan or strategy. 1= There is not enough evidence provided to demonstrate the scheme is part of an existing strategy or plan.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>
5	The benefits of the scheme	<p>In Part C of the application form, the applicant is expected to explain the public benefits of the scheme. The benefits of the scheme should be clearly set out, specifically relating to the economic, social and environmental needs of the district and its residents. Applicants are encouraged to consider the local and wider aspects of the economy, community and environment.</p> <p>Schemes likely to have greatest benefit are those for health and well-being, education, transport and flood mitigation. These will receive higher scores.</p> <p>Points will be awarded under each section, making a total of 12 points possible for this section.</p>	<p>4 = The scheme can demonstrate and evidence significant benefits. 1 = The scheme is of limited benefit. The scheme has not been identified as required and there is little evidence provided with the proposal to justify the scheme.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>
6	Public benefit	<p>In Part C of the application form, the applicant is expected to explain the overall public benefits of the scheme and the timescales those benefits will materialise. It is likely that schemes that are looking to provide the greatest public benefit within a reasonable timescale will be looked upon more favourably than those that do not bring a greater benefit to the wider community or take a long time to materialise. Definition: Schemes should provide something that is advantageous or good; that will relate to or affecting a population or a community.</p>	<p>4 = Clear public benefit that is greater or proportionate in scale to funding sought and can be delivered within a reasonable timescale.</p> <p>2-3 = Public benefits, may take a while to materialise.</p> <p>1 = Inadequate information provided and/or minimal public benefit.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>

7	Funding	<p>In Part D of the application form, the applicant is expected to provide information about funding. CIL is clearly meant as a 'top up' and should not be used to fund entire projects. Schemes that rely totally on CIL will not be considered. Schemes that already have a large amount/majority of funding in place will receive a higher score.</p>	<p>4 = Proportion of CIL funding compared to cost of the scheme is less than 25% 3= Proportion of CIL funding compared to cost of the scheme is between 25% - 50% 2 = Proportion of CIL funding compared to cost of the scheme is between 51% - 75% 1 = Proportion of CIL funding compared to cost of the scheme is greater than 75%</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>
8	Clear project management	<p>In Part E of the application form, the applicant is expected to provide information about delivering the scheme, which includes clear project planning.</p> <p>The applicant should evidence that the project is well managed. The following should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear dates for start and finish of the project • Details of the management of the project and timescales • Details of when they will provide updates to EHDC • Is other consent required/granted? 	<p>4 = The scheme is supported by a clear and detailed project plan or appropriate detail setting out all required information.</p> <p>1 = The scheme is not supported by a project plan or inadequate detail is provided.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>
9	Project delivery and timescales	<p>In Part E of the application form, the applicant is expected to provide information about delivering the scheme.</p> <p>Schemes that can be commenced in the next 12 months if partly funded by CIL will be scored highly, alongside with those that are advanced.</p> <p>In Part A of the application form, the applicant is expected to clarify whether planning permission is required and has been sought/obtained for the scheme, and whether any other consents are needed. This is to ensure the applicant has</p>	<p>4 = The scheme can be commenced in the short term (in the next 12 months).</p> <p>1 = The scheme cannot demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>

		checked this consideration, and to inform timescales of delivery.	
10	Does the application have local support covering different areas of the district or a range of stakeholders?	In Part E of the application form, the applicant is expected to provide information about delivering the scheme, including the existence of widespread local support. Reference to local support applies only to applications from organisations that are not Councils or Strategic Infrastructure Providers.	4 = The scheme has widespread local support, and this is demonstrated by the appropriate evidence, or the applicant is a Council or Strategic Infrastructure Provider and support can be demonstrated by relevant plans or strategies. 1 = The scheme does not have local support and/or no information has been submitted (Scoring on a scale of 1-4)
11	Has the project already received CIL funding?	A lower score will be given for those projects which have already received CIL funding, unless a strong justification can be provided as to why further funding is required.	4 = CIL funding has not previously been given to this scheme. 3 = CIL funding has previously been given to this scheme and there is strong justification why further funding to meet a specific evidenced funding gap is required, and that with the funding the project can be delivered. 2= CIL funding has previously been given to this scheme, and there is evidence supplied to support further funding of the scheme. 1= CIL funding has previously been given to this scheme, and sufficient evidence is not supplied to support further funding of the scheme. (Scoring on a scale of 1-4)

12	Cost benefit	Higher scores will be given to those projects which require the smallest % of the overall project cost or provide evidence of a clear public benefit or need. Projects where the CIL money would complete the scheme will also be scored highly.	<p>4 = The scheme requires a small contribution from the CIL pot proportionate to the overall cost and demonstrates clear public benefit or need. CIL funding would enable deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>1 = The scheme requires a large contribution from the CIL pot and/or cannot demonstrate a clear public benefit or need, proportionate to the CIL monies requested. CIL funding may not complete the scheme.</p> <p>(Scoring on a scale of 1-4)</p>
----	--------------	--	--