ANNEX 1

Community Infrastructure Levy CIL Bid Assessment





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					onstrate tha ent in the are		t			
0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
Scoring gu	uidance	quantitative 10 – An aud data has be developme 20 – The so Evidence o	e evidence to dit or an asse een gathereo nt cheme has b r data has bo	essment of n to suggest een identifie een gathered	l is needed posed bid. eed has bee that the proje d and fully ju to demonst capacity due	n undertaker oct is required stified throug rate that infra	n identifying o d to accomm gh both quan astructure is	quantitative c odate increa titative and c	deficits. Evide sed demand jualitative as	ence or I from sessments.

Question 2 Enabling developme		How does t	he proposa	l demonstra	ite that it he	lps bring fo	ward devel	opment?		
0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
Scoring gu	idance	10 – Eviden effects such destinations 20 –Project	n as increasi s unlocks site	roposal woung foot fall to	ld attract dev local shops development	velopment. S or shortens j or is a cataly s required to	ourney times	s for pedestri developmer	ans & cyclist	ts to key

Question 3 Evidence g - Engageme communitie stakeholde	athering ent with es and	communitie	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 gu	idance	 (possibly 0 5 – Some a and meeting to address 10 – Range questionnai times over a 	score). Cons attempt to en- gs capturing consultation of consultat ires. These to a period of ti	sultation limit gage more n quantitative responses fi ion technique echniques sl me. The sch	ted to inform neaningfully data. Analys rom local cor es used to e hould be targ eme should	takeholders of ing local com with local com sis of feedbac mmunities (en ngage local r geted to capto demonstrate es to meet the	munities of p mmunities su ck may includ .g. Parish Pla residents suc ure a wide ra how engage	oroposal. uch as survey de minor am an) ch as worksh ange of stake ement attemp	ys or questio endments of ops, exhibitio holders at di oted to build	nnaires a proposal ons, fferent consensus		

Question 4 Benefits		What are th	What are the direct benefits and are there any potential indirect benefits?								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring gu	idance	<u>safely).</u> 5 – Greater reduces vel 10 – Multitu	number of d nicle speeds de of direct a	lirect benefits) and indirect b	s intended to benefits that	e.g. road cros address the fully address pedestrian inj	issue/deficit es the issue/	identified (e deficit that h	.g. safer cros as been ider	ssing, htified (e.g.	

Question 5 Breadth of		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 geograph by a common issue/interest). 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 – Specific user group. The project generally serves only a specific community or a limited proportion of community								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring gu	idance	community 5 – Multiple proportion c 10 – Serves	Specific user group. The project generally serves only a specific community or a limited proportion of the				ł			

Question 6 Impact of b		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 gu	iidance	 would enjoy negative im to have the 5 – Benefits impact the alternative their lives. 10 – The pr of need ma impacts on or eliminate 	y or find desi ipact on cert ir needs met s would have proposal has means but th oposal would y be high an all users, pa ed. Users nee may have a	rable but are ain 'protecte e lesewhere s a positive e s on users w ne proposal i d have a pro d the provisi inticularly tho eds cannot b	e probably no d' groups that should the pr offect on user ith 'protected s the preferr found positive on of the pro- se with protected on en throug	of the proposition of essential to at has not been oposal not been res lives. An at of characterist ed option to r respect may be of pected charact gh an alternat lives. Commu	e meet their r en minimised e provided tempt has be ics. The nee naximise op sers or partic crucial to be eristics have tive scheme	een made to do r eliminate een made to ds of all user portunities to cular groups ter their qual been full as or elsewhere	roposal may ad. Users ma address any rs can be me improve the of users. The ity of life. Ne sessed and e. If the prop	have a y be able negative through quality of eir level egative minimised osal wasn't		

Question 7 Negative in and mitigat measures	npacts	proposed to	Have any permanent/long term negative impacts of the proposal been considered and how proposed to be mitigated? (e.g. cycle link proposed but some loss of hedgerow, new cross but loss of a parking space). 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 – Impacts not considered (0 score). Minimal consideration of impacts but no mitigation proposed								
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Scoring gu	idance	5 – Impacts when they 10 – All pote been coste mitigation.	s identified an will be delive ential impact d as part of t	nd assessed red. s identified a he scheme. of works pro	. Mitigation r and assessed Advice from	nsideration on neasures pro d. Full packag relevant expo out how and	posed but ling ge of mitigati ertise, where	mited information on measures e necessary, s	ation about h s proposed w sought on im	ow and which have pacts and	

Section 2: Financial viability

Question 8 Funding	3	What are th	e options fo	or funding t	he proposal	?				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring gu	idance	Securing of 5 – Propos been secur 10 – Propos to well-prep insufficient.	ther funding sal is partly re red sal is partly r pared large s	is reliant on eliant on CIL eliant on CIL cale projects npanied by a	CIL funding b . Other fundi . and other fu s that seek fu a project plar	r funding opti being granted ng options ha unding has be unding but wh n evidencing	I (Possible so ave been exp een secured. here the amo	core of 1 or r blored. Other Greater wei bunt of CIL re	nore). funding ma ght can be g serves avail	y have iven able is

Question 9 Delivery ris		What meas	What measures have been explored to minimise the risk of the project not being delivered? 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 – Limited assessment of various risks undertaken. None or few measures to demonstrate that project will carefully managed, the contractor/supplier is adequately insured, capable of undertaking the project, or able									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Scoring gu	lidance	carefully ma provide gua 5 – Budget before and 10 – Multipl permissions	anaged, the arantees. managemer can demons e budget ma s have been	contractor/su nt measures strate capabil anagement m secured. Co	upplier is add explored. Co lity. Minimal neasures seo ontractor/sup		red, capable plier has deli offered. ked price con vide guarante	of undertaki vered a proje tract tenders	ng the project ect of this sca s). All approve	ct, or able to ale and type als and		

Question 1 Sustainabil		How have a	iny ongoing	costs been	covered?					
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Scoring gu	idance	5 – Some fi certification)	overed or m		ed for a limite y another org				

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