

Notice of Meeting

Cabinet

Date: Wednesday 18 August 2021

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: The Annexe, Crosfield Hall, Broadwater Road, Romsey, Hampshire
SO51 8GL

For further information or enquiries please contact:

Caroline Lovelock- 01264 368014
clovelock@testvalley.gov.uk

Legal and Democratic Service

Test Valley Borough Council,
Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road,
Andover, Hampshire,
SP10 3AJ

www.testvalley.gov.uk

This is formal notice under The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 that part of this meeting may be held in private because the agenda and reports for the meeting may contain exempt information under Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEME

If members of the public wish to address the meeting they should notify the Legal and Democratic Service at the Council's Beech Hurst office by noon on the working day before the meeting.

Membership of Cabinet

MEMBER

WARD

Councillor P North (Chairman)

Bourne Valley

Councillor N Adams-King (Vice-Chairman)

Blackwater

Councillor P Bundy

Chilworth, Nursling & Rownhams

Councillor D Drew

Harewood

Councillor M Flood

Anna

Councillor I Jeffrey

Mid Test

Councillor A Johnston

Mid Test

Councillor T Tasker

Andover Romans

Cabinet

Wednesday 18 August 2021

AGENDA

**The order of these items may change as a result of members
of the public wishing to speak**

- 1 Apologies**
- 2 Public Participation**
- 3 Declarations of Interest**
- 4 Urgent Items**
- 5 Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2021**
- 6 Recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny
Committee: None**
- 7 Government Covid Grant Funding Scheme – Welcome
Back Fund 4 - 9**

Community and Leisure
To consider allocating the £112,403 Welcome Back
Funding allocated to Test Valley.
- 8 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - Allocation of
CIL funds 10 - 24**

Planning
To consider approval to fund 6 projects within the borough
from the Council's CIL receipts.

ITEM 7 Government Covid Grant Funding Scheme – Welcome Back Fund

Report of the Community and Leisure Portfolio Holder

Recommended:

That the Head of Community and Leisure, in consultation with the Head of Finance and Revenues, be authorised to allocate Test Valley Borough Council’s allocation of the “Welcome Back Fund” as described in paragraph 6.2 of the report.

SUMMARY:

In recent months, the government has introduced the Welcome Back Fund to enable local authorities in England to put in place additional measures to create and promote a safe environment for local trade and tourism, particularly in High Streets, as their economies reopen and recover from the pandemic.

This report seeks authority to allocate the £112,403 funding available for Test Valley.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Throughout the pandemic the government has made funding available to local authorities to help fight the impacts it has had on our communities.
- 1.2 Some of this funding is ring-fenced, and must be spent on specific activities. Some comes directly to Test Valley Borough Council, whereas some is allocated via Hampshire County Council.
- 1.3 Where funding is provided for specific purposes, there is government guidance attached as to what it can (and cannot) be used for, along with a requirement to submit returns to government confirming how the funding has been allocated and spent (on allowable expenditure).
- 1.4 This report provides an update on one of the government’s more recent funding streams, the Welcome Back Fund, and proposals as to how it will be used.

2 Background

- 2.1 The council has received an allocation of £112,403 of Welcome Back Funding. The fund is intended to allow and enable local authorities in England to put in place additional measures to create and promote a safe environment for local trade, tourism, particularly in the High Streets, as their economies reopen.

- 2.2 Grant conditions include details of what this allocation can (and cannot) be used for;
- 2.2.1 Funding can be used by local authorities to;
- (a) Boost the look and feel of an area (eg parks, green spaces– to make High Streets welcoming)
 - (b) Publicity campaigns to encourage visitors
 - (c) Preparing / holding events that will boost footfall and encourage people back into their High Streets (thereby supporting local businesses)
 - (d) Installing / refreshing signage or markings to encourage safety / social distancing
 - (e) Improving green spaces on High Streets
- 2.2.2 The supporting guidance notes state funding can be used for ‘support to promote a safe public environment for a local area’s visitor economy.’ This includes, but is not limited to;
- (a) Place-based marketing (for example, supporting safe celebration events on High Streets and local towns)
 - (b) Marshals
 - (c) Public space maintenance
 - (d) Maintenance of public conveniences including new temporary facilities
 - (e) Beautification activities (inc graffiti removal)
 - (f) Non-permanent public realm adaptations
 - (g) Activities that future proof the High Street
 - (h) Improvement of green spaces and provision of outdoor seating areas.
- 2.2.3 The guidance also stipulates what the funding cannot be used for, such as;
- (a) Activities that provide no additionality
 - (b) Capital expenditure
 - (c) Grants to businesses
 - (d) To replace funding already committed in other projects
- 2.3 The guidance notes includes reference to working with key stakeholders in scoping and agreeing what the funding allocation is to be used for, and seeks assurance that it is committed within the 2021/22 financial year.
- 2.4 There is a High Street in each of Test Valley’s towns of Andover, Stockbridge and Romsey, and so it is recommended to allocate a proportion of funding to each.
- 2.4.1 The proposals contained within this report have been put forward with the support and endorsement of both Romsey Future and Andover Vision boards.

- 2.4.2 Temporary infrastructure enhancements in Stockbridge have been led by both the Parish Council and Hampshire County Council, and so any proposed allocation of funding for continuation or enhancement in Stockbridge, would be made with their full agreement.

3 Corporate Objectives and Priorities

- 3.1 All options contribute to prime corporate objectives to enhance our town centres.

3.2 Growing the potential of town centres to adapt and be attractive, vibrant and prosperous places.

- (a) future proofing our town centres to be accessible places where people live, shop, work and spend their leisure time.
- (b) Enhancing public realm and improving the appearance and environment of our town centres.
- (c) Making our town centres attractive places for inward investment to attract more jobs and increase footfall.
- (d) Working with Andover Vision and Romsey Future to ensure that growth within our town centres benefits all of our communities.

4 Consultations/Communications

- 4.1 The proposals contained within this report have been put forward with the support and endorsement of both Romsey Future and Andover Vision boards. Both Andover Vision and Romsey Future partnerships are made up of a broad mix of statutory, local and charitable stakeholders for their respective towns.
- 4.2 Proposals for Stockbridge will be agreed in partnership with the Parish Council and Hampshire County Council, both of whom have led on projects for the High St during the pandemic.

5 Options

- 5.1 Do nothing.
- 5.2 Propose to allocate the funding as follows:
- 5.2.1 Andover - £62,403 towards an extended programme of diverse cultural events and activities, in keeping with the direction of travel for regeneration, and aspirations set for the town centre masterplan.
 - 5.2.2 Stockbridge – up to £20,000 towards extending interim measures to manage safe / social distancing.
 - 5.2.3 Romsey - £30,000 towards urban realm improvement projects between Dukes Mill, fishlake stream and Stirling Walk.
- 5.3 Consider some other scheme for funding.

6 Option Appraisal

6.1 Do nothing.

6.1.1 The Council could chose not to draw down Welcome Back Funding and return the allocation, but on the basis there are a number of positive and potentially viable options for use of the funding, this is not the recommended option.

6.2 Propose to allocate the funding as follows:

6.2.1 Andover - £62,403 towards an extended programme of diverse cultural events and activities in keeping with the direction of travel for regeneration, and aspirations set for the town centre masterplan.

- (a) The Council, BID, Chantry Centre and the Lights are already working together on a programme of events for the town throughout the summer of 2021.
- (b) In line with the direction of the town centre masterplan, Welcome Back Funding provides an ideal opportunity to extensively enhance our cultural events and activities programme (as a catalyst for change and regeneration).
- (c) In doing so it is intended to set out a plan for a more diverse programme of cultural events, activities and 'meanwhile uses', for and across the town centre.
- (d) This will require a dedicated curatorial and event coordination resource, as well as scoping the events, initiatives and activities themselves.
- (e) The detail and resource plan for this work is still being prepared, and it will be the subject of a future and more detailed report to Council.

6.2.2 Stockbridge – up to £20,000 towards extending interim measures to manage safe / social distancing.

- (a) Stockbridge Parish Council and Hampshire County Council have led on the development of temporary measures to enable safe and socially responsible use of their High Street. It would therefore only seem appropriate for any extension / enhancement of this scheme to be determined in consultation with these partners.
- (b) Discussions as to the specific detail are ongoing but a provisional allocation of up to £20,000 is recommended (with any underspend being reallocated to Andover and/or Romsey).

6.2.3 Romsey - £30,000 towards urban realm improvement projects between Dukes Mill, fishlake stream and Stirling Walk.

- (a) Ambition to enhance this section of the town is already articulated as part of the South of Town Centre Masterplan.
- (b) It is proposed that a £30,000 allocation is made toward this project (subject to eligibility and funds being spent this financial year).

- (c) If this is ultimately not possible, and in consultation with Romsey Future and its stakeholders, it is proposed that the funding allocation instead be directed to an alternate Romsey Future scheme – such as the ‘virtual High Street / Smart Town’ project (currently also being scoped), or to promote events and activities that support or promote recovery (with any underspend being reallocated).

6.2.4 This is the recommended option, and it is proposed that details of each project would be reported to Members as they progress.

6.3 Consider some other scheme for funding

6.3.1 A number of good ideas have been put forward and discussed with partners. It would be possible to consider other schemes, but it would seem prudent to pursue those agreed above before considering others. There is a risk that no further viable scheme or options would emerge, and / or time would run out for its use whilst further options are explored (and the funding could be lost). For this reason, this is not the recommended option.

7 Risk Management

7.1 An evaluation of the risks indicate that the existing controls in place mean that no significant risks have been identified at this time.

8 Resource Implications

8.1 This report seeks authority for the allocation of the Welcome Back Funding, as set out in section 6.2 of this report. This is a government grant allocation and there are no net budgetary implications.

8.2 A further report will be prepared for a future Cabinet meeting to present a more detailed proposal for an extended programme of cultural events, activities and ‘meanwhile uses’ for Andover town centre.

9 Legal Implications

9.1 The funds must be spend in accordance with the specified criteria – a link to which is provided in ‘background papers’ section below.

10 Equality Issues

10.1 All / any schemes will be required to complete individual EQIAs as appropriate as proposal crystallise.

11 Other Issues

11.1 **Community Safety** – for all / any projects and activities on our High Streets and/or in public places, a ‘covid-safe’ risk assessment will be carried out in addition to existing and statutory risk assessments and risk management measures.

11.2 **Property Issues** – land owners, statutory consultees and stakeholders will be consulted as appropriate.

11.3 **Wards/Communities Affected** – all town centre wards though all wards likely to be impacted.

12 Conclusion and reasons for recommendation

12.1 To enable local authorities in England to put in place additional measures to create and promote a safe environment for local trade, tourism – particularly in High Streets, as their economies reopen – it is proposed that Welcome Back Funding be allocated as set out in section 6.2 of this report.

Background Papers (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/993397/Welcome_Back_Fund_Guidance_v2.pdf

Confidentiality

It is considered that this report does not contain exempt information within the meaning of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and can be made public.

No of Annexes:	0	File Ref:	N/A
(Community and Leisure Portfolio) Councillor I Jeffrey			
Officer:	Dave Tasker	Ext:	8801
Report to:	Cabinet	Date:	18 August 2021

ITEM 8 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Allocation of CIL funds

Report of the Planning Portfolio Holder

Recommended:

That the applications for CIL funding set out in this report are determined in accordance with the recommendations contained in paragraph 3 and release of £1,202,808 be authorised.

Recommendation to Council

SUMMARY:

- This report sets out a summary of the bids received during September-November 2020, an evaluation of each project, and
- Funding recommendations made for each project.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report outlines 7 projects that were submitted during the September-November 2020 round of the CIL bidding process and the resultant funding recommendations.
- 1.2 The report includes a brief description of each project, a percentage score against the Spending Protocol scoring criteria and a funding recommendation.
- 1.3 There is currently £2,451,000 in the main infrastructure fund. This is after taking into account the Neighbourhood Portion passed to Parish and Town Councils as well as administrative expenses.

2 Background

- 2.1 The CIL Spending Protocol and scoring methodology was adopted by Council on the 8 November 2017.
- 2.2 This round of CIL bidding ran between 1 September and 30 November 2020.
- 2.3 The following paragraphs outline each project and provide a recommendation for funding based on the approved scoring methodology.
- 2.4 The approved Bid Assessment document is attached at Annex 1 to the report. This is made up of 10 questions with a maximum score of 120 points. Questions 1 and 2 are heavily weighted as they are linked to CIL's main purpose which is to enable or mitigate the impacts of development. An average percentage score is presented below alongside a funding recommendation.

- 2.5 All bids are assessed against the same criteria meaning that a scheme with a total cost of £15,000 will be scored in the same way as a scheme with a total cost of £15,000,000.
- 2.6 Smaller schemes are likely to score lower as the level of detail required for the project is not as significant as a large scheme. This means that the threshold for recommendation reduces along with total project cost.

3 Funding Recommendations

3.1 Project 1 – New Community Clubhouse at Trojans Sports Club

Lead Organisation – Trojans Sports Club

Description – Develop a 2 story clubhouse with changing rooms and social facilities.

Evaluation of project – A well evidenced need alongside a range of benefits from the proposed clubhouse. Supporting documentation showed teams representing a range of sports fully supported the proposals. The new clubhouse will provide a high class sports facility for residents in the South of the Borough.

Average Score – 74%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £350,000 towards a new community clubhouse at Trojans Sports Club.

3.2 Project 2 – Construction of a new Village Hall in Monxton

Lead Organisation – Monxton Parish Council

Description – Demolition of current village hall and construction of a new oak framed design maximising natural lighting and energy efficiency.

Evaluation of project – A detailed bid that made a strong case for a new community hub in Monxton. Detailed consultation has shown key issues from users of the existing village hall. This has allowed for a design that focuses on the requests of the intended user groups. The Parish have undertaken a good risk assessment and have addressed potential issues at the pre-development stage.

Average Score – 67%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £345,000 towards the construction of a new village hall in Monxton.

3.3 Project 3 – New Sports Pavilion at Broughton Playing Field

Lead Organisation – Broughton Parish Council

Description – Replacement sports pavilion to serve football and cricket teams in the locality in addition to use for non-sporting and community events.

Evaluation of project – Clearly evidenced submission with strong support from the clubs that utilise the formal recreation facilities. The project looks to address issues of compliance with sporting bodies from the current outdated pavilion. A strong project that will deliver clear benefits to the many regular users of the playing fields.

Average Score – 62%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £200,000 towards a new sports pavilion at Broughton Playing Field.

3.4 **Project 4 – Abbots Ann Sports Field and Community Clubhouse**

Lead Organisation – Abbots Ann Parish Council

Description – A new Clubhouse and Multi Use Games Area at Bulbery Sports Field.

Evaluation of project – A proposal to improve the formal recreation offer in Abbots Ann. Effective communication and consultation has shown that the project is a top priority for the local community. This project delivers on these local aspirations.

Average Score – 60%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £250,000 towards a community clubhouse and Multi Use Games Area at Bulbery Sports Field. Subject to £325,000 of additional funding being secured by 31 December 2023.

3.5 **Project 5 – North Baddesley Fitness Equipment**

Lead Organisation – Test Valley Borough Council

Description – To purchase and install three outdoor gym stations at Fleming Avenue, Lavington Gardens and North Baddesley Recreation Ground. An accessible 5km circular route will be formed as part of the installation.

Evaluation of project – The project addresses an identified need in the locality and provides additional informal recreation opportunities for residents. Consultation showed widespread support for the scheme.

Average Score – 60%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £40,000 towards the procurement and installation of three outdoor gym stations in North Baddesley and the creation of a 5km circular route.

3.6 **Project 6 – Traffic Calming in Kings Somborne**

Lead Organisation – Kings Somborne Parish Council

Description – A series of traffic calming measures including gateways, signage and posts on various roads in Kings Somborne.

Evaluation of project – The scheme is supported by the County Council and is already part funded through Section 106 contributions. Consultation showed support for the measures from residents, businesses and community groups.

Average Score – 53%

Recommendation – That Cabinet approve the release of £17,808 towards a series of traffic calming measures in Kings Somborne.

3.7 **Project 7 – Wellow Groundsman’s Hut**

Lead Organisation – Wellow Parish Council

Description – Replacement of cricket groundsman’s hut at West Wellow Recreation Ground.

Evaluation of project – A lack of supporting documentation and evidence of community consultation meant low scores. The project is not deemed to address an identified need in the community and would be best placed within a larger scheme to improve formal recreation opportunities in the parish.

Average Score – 20%

Recommendation – That Cabinet refuse the request for £10,000 for a replacement groundsman’s hut. Feedback will be provided to the Parish Council.

4 **Objectives and Priorities**

4.1 This report covers the following Corporate Priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2019 – 2023 as shown below.

4.2 Communities – Five of the successful bids are being led by Parish Councils. Three of which are large schemes that have had extensive community involvement. Trojans Sports Club’s project will result in a high quality community asset that will be used by many Test Valley residents.

5 **Consultations/Communications**

5.1 There has been no external consultation because the report reflects the outcomes of an approved methodology. Projects listed have gone through various forms of consultation prior to bids being submitted as is required by the assessment criteria.

6 **Options**

6.1 **Option 1** – To approve the recommendations and the release of £1,202,808.

6.2 **Option 2** – To refuse or approve any or all of the projects against the recommendations.

7 Option Appraisal

Option 1

- 7.1 Option 1 is the recommended Option. The recommendations contained in the report are a result of a transparent and fair assessment of each application using the criteria approved by Cabinet on the 18 October 2017.

Option 2

- 7.2 Any or all of the projects may be approved or refused against the recommendations. As set out at Option 1, the recommendations contained in this report are arrived at as a result of careful assessment using established and Council-approved criteria. Therefore Option 2 is not recommended.

8 Risk Management

- 8.1 An evaluation of the risks associated with the matters in this report indicate that further risk assessment is not needed because the changes/issues covered do not represent significant risks or have previously been considered by Councillors.

9 Resource Implications

- 9.1 The funding for these projects will come from the Council's CIL receipts. No other resources will be used.

10 Legal Implications

- 10.1 No legal implications for Option 1.

11 Equality Issues

- 11.1 An EQIA screening has been completed in accordance with the Council's EQIA methodology and no potential for unlawful discrimination and/or low level or minor negative impact have been identified, therefore a full EQIA has not been carried out.

12 Other Issues

- 12.1 Wards/Communities Affected – The projects listed affect the following communities: Chilworth, Monxton, Broughton, Abbots Ann, North Baddesley, Kings Somborne, Wellow.

13 Conclusion

- 13.1 Approval is sought to release CIL funds to the following projects:

- New Community Clubhouse at Trojans Sports Club – £350,000
- Construction of a new Village Hall in Monxton – £345,000
- New Sports Pavilion at Broughton Playing Field – £200,000

- Abbots Ann Sports Field and Community Clubhouse – £250,000
- North Baddesley Fitness Equipment – £40,000
- Traffic Calming in Kings Somborne – £17,808

<u>Background Papers (Local Government Act 1972 Section 100D)</u>			
Cabinet report from the 18 October 2017.			
<u>Confidentiality</u>			
It is considered that this report does not contain exempt information within the meaning of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, and can be made public.			
No of Annexes:	1	File Ref:	N/A
(Planning Portfolio) Councillor N Adams-King			
Officer:	Oliver McCarthy	Ext:	8176
Report to:	Cabinet	Date:	18 August 2021

Community Infrastructure Levy CIL Bid Assessment

Annex 1



CIL Bid Assessment

Project name:	Applicant :	Project cost:	Band:	Total score: /120
			1: £10 - £50K	
			2: £50 - £100K	Percentage:
			3: £100K+	

This forms purpose is to assess bids for CIL funds and follows on from the CIL Bid Form. The CIL Bid Form obtains initial information, such as whether planning permission is required, about the scheme to progress to the assessment of the CIL bids using the assessment criteria contained within this form.

The purpose of the assessment criteria below is to determine how well the proposed scheme delivers benefits to the residents and businesses of Test Valley.

Question 1 and 2 are designed to reflect the purpose of CIL which is to mitigate and enable development. The score for the first 2 questions are weighted more heavily that the remainder of the questions in the assessment, being scored out of 20. From question 3, each question is scored out of 10. The higher the score the better the proposal has performed against the criteria. Scoring guidance has been provided to assist with scoring each bid against each of the criteria below.

Applicants are asked to address each question under a separate heading to assist with scoring. The more information that is provided in addressing each criteria, the more likely it is that a higher score will be achieved.

Section 1: Development and Local Communities

Question 1 Evidence of need		What evidence is available to demonstrate that the project mitigates the impact of development in the area?								
0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
Scoring guidance		<p>2 - Anecdotal evidence that proposal is needed to mitigate growth from development in the area but no quantitative evidence to support proposed bid.</p> <p>10 – An audit or an assessment of need has been undertaken identifying quantitative deficits. Evidence or data has been gathered to suggest that the project is required to accommodate increased demand from development</p> <p>20 – The scheme has been identified and fully justified through both quantitative and qualitative assessments. Evidence or data has been gathered to demonstrate that infrastructure is reaching/has reached capacity and that the project is required increase capacity due to an increase in usage</p>								

Question 2 Enabling development		How does the proposal demonstrate that it helps bring forward development?								
0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
Scoring guidance		<p>0 – The project doesn't enable development</p> <p>10 – Evidence that the proposal would attract development. Some evidence that this would have secondary effects such as increasing foot fall to local shops or shortens journey times for pedestrians & cyclists to key destinations</p> <p>20 –Project unlocks sites to enable development or is a catalyst for further development by attracting more people and businesses. May be that the project is required to enable another project to come forward.</p>								

Question 3 Evidence gathering - Engagement with communities and stakeholders		How well does the proposal show that it has captured the ambitions of local and interested communities or organisations about the details of the project through a variety of engagement techniques?								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Limited consultation. No direct contact with stakeholders or end users seeking engagement or feedback (possibly 0 score). Consultation limited to informing local communities of proposal.</p> <p>5 – Some attempt to engage more meaningfully with local communities such as surveys or questionnaires and meetings capturing quantitative data. Analysis of feedback may include minor amendments of a proposal to address consultation responses from local communities (e.g. Parish Plan)</p> <p>10 – Range of consultation techniques used to engage local residents such as workshops, exhibitions, questionnaires. These techniques should be targeted to capture a wide range of stakeholders at different times over a period of time. The scheme should demonstrate how engagement attempted to build consensus amongst interested groups and local communities to meet the identified need and address the issue/deficit</p>								

Question 4 Benefits		What are the direct benefits and are there any potential indirect benefits?								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Limited to a small number of direct benefits (<u>e.g. road crossing – enables pedestrians to cross more safely</u>).</p> <p>5 – Greater number of direct benefits intended to address the issue/deficit identified (e.g. safer crossing, reduces vehicle speeds)</p> <p>10 – Multitude of direct and indirect benefits that fully addresses the issue/deficit that has been identified (e.g. increase the perception of safety, reduce risk of pedestrian injury, encourage walking, reduce obesity)</p>								

Question 5 Breadth of Impact		How many different communities is the proposal likely to benefit? What proportion of those communities will benefit (e.g. all ages or under 12's)? (Communities can be defined by geography or by a common issue/interest).								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Specific user group. The project generally serves only a specific community or a limited proportion of the community</p> <p>5 – Multiple user groups. Serves a number of communities equally. May only serve a small or limited proportion of these communities.</p> <p>10 – Serves all or a significant number of communities. May extend well beyond communities in the local vicinity (e.g. other villages or towns) and serve a high proportion of each of those communities</p>								

Question 6 Impact of benefits		How do the benefits of the proposal impact upon the intended users? (To address this criteria, see Annex 1 - CIL Bid Form 2 regarding equalities impact assessment.)								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Benefits with limited impact. E.g. the benefits of the proposal would provide an experience that users would enjoy or find desirable but are probably not essential to meet their needs. The proposal may have a negative impact on certain 'protected' groups that has not been minimised or eliminated. Users may be able to have their needs met elsewhere should the proposal not be provided</p> <p>5 – Benefits would have a positive effect on users lives. An attempt has been made to address any negative impact the proposal has on users with 'protected' characteristics. The needs of all users can be met through alternative means but the proposal is the preferred option to maximise opportunities to improve the quality of their lives.</p> <p>10 – The proposal would have a profound positive effect on users or particular groups of users. Their level of need may be high and the provision of the project may be crucial to better their quality of life. Negative impacts on all users, particularly those with protected characteristics have been full assessed and minimised or eliminated. Users needs cannot be met through an alternative scheme or elsewhere. If the proposal wasn't provided it may have a negative impact on their lives. Community may not function well without this piece of infrastructure</p>								

Question 7 Negative impacts and mitigation measures		Have any permanent/long term negative impacts of the proposal been considered and how are they proposed to be mitigated? (e.g. cycle link proposed but some loss of hedgerow, new crossing point but loss of a parking space).									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Impacts not considered (0 score). Minimal consideration of impacts but no mitigation proposed.</p> <p>5 – Impacts identified and assessed. Mitigation measures proposed but limited information about how and when they will be delivered.</p> <p>10 – All potential impacts identified and assessed. Full package of mitigation measures proposed which have been costed as part of the scheme. Advice from relevant expertise, where necessary, sought on impacts and mitigation. Programme of works provided setting out how and when mitigation will be integrated and delivered as part of proposed scheme.</p>									

Section 2: Financial viability

Question 8 Funding		What are the options for funding the proposal?									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Proposal is wholly reliant on CIL and no other funding options (e.g. CAF) have been explored (0 score). Securing other funding is reliant on CIL funding being granted (Possible score of 1 or more).</p> <p>5 – Proposal is partly reliant on CIL. Other funding options have been explored. Other funding may have been secured</p> <p>10 – Proposal is partly reliant on CIL and other funding has been secured. Greater weight can be given to well-prepared large scale projects that seek funding but where the amount of CIL reserves available is insufficient. Bid is accompanied by a project plan evidencing how much is needed and why CIL funds are required to be set aside over successive years.</p>									

Question 9 Delivery risks		What measures have been explored to minimise the risk of the project not being delivered?									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring guidance		<p>1 – Limited assessment of various risks undertaken. None or few measures to demonstrate that project will be carefully managed, the contractor/supplier is adequately insured, capable of undertaking the project, or able to provide guarantees.</p> <p>5 – Budget management measures explored. Contractor/supplier has delivered a project of this scale and type before and can demonstrate capability. Minimal guarantees offered.</p> <p>10 – Multiple budget management measures secured (e.g. fixed price contract tenders). All approvals and permissions have been secured. Contractor/supplier can provide guarantees and all insurances are in place. All risks against going over budget fully assessed and mitigated.</p>									

Question 10 Sustainability-		How have any ongoing costs been covered?									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring guidance		<p>0 – Future costs not considered</p> <p>5 – Some future costs covered or may be covered for a limited time (e.g. through guarantees/warranty/certification)</p> <p>10 – No ongoing costs. Ongoing costs covered by another organisation or project may be self-funding</p>									

Question	score	
1	/20	
2	/20	
3	/10	
4	/10	
5	/10	
6	/10	
7	/10	
8	/10	
9	/10	
10	/10	
Total	/120	%

Planning and Building Service

Council Offices

Beech Hurst

Weyhill Road

Andover

Hampshire

SP10 3AJ

Email: planning@testvalley.gov.uk

www.testvalley.gov.uk



TestValleyBC



@TestValleyBC