



APPENDIX 9

HASLEMERE TOWN COUNCIL

Neighbourhood CIL Scoring Process Review

BACKGROUND

The Council's current arrangements for assessing Neighbourhood CIL applications have recently been reviewed by the Working Party (11 & 30 March). As a result of that review, a number of changes are now proposed in order to simplify the process, improve consistency in decision-making, and better align the scoring criteria with the Council's priorities and the intended purpose of Neighbourhood CIL.

The proposed revisions also reflect the Committee's existing role in determining and reviewing the method for evaluating Neighbourhood CIL applications, together with the established validation role of the Clerk and Chairman before applications are circulated to members.

PROPOSED CHANGES

It is proposed that the scoring matrix be revised to a simplified three-part model as follows:

- Benefits – up to 60 points
 - based on the scale of projected additional users and wider community benefit
 - no additional users – 0 points
 - small benefit: 20 points
 - medium benefit: 40 points
 - large benefit: 60 points
 - additional weighting may be given where a proposal clearly benefits disadvantaged groups
- Strategic need – 25 points
 - scored on a Yes/No basis
 - to assess alignment with the Council's adopted priorities, including relevant strategy documents, climate emergency objectives, CIL priorities and the Neighbourhood Plan
- Funding / Match Funding – 15 points
 - scored on a Yes/No basis
 - to recognise where alternative or complementary funding is in place

A minimum score of 50 points out of 100 is proposed as the threshold for an application to proceed for award consideration, consistent with the revised internal scoring matrix currently in development.

4. Other Amendments to the Process

It is further proposed that:

- the current public support criterion be removed from the scoring process;
- detailed project planning / deliverability no longer forms part of the scored assessment;

- deliverability instead be confirmed at the validation stage by the Clerk and Chair/Vice-Chair, in line with the Committee's existing validation process;
- greater emphasis be placed on projected additional users, rather than benefit to existing users alone;
- applicants be required to provide:
 - current user numbers;
 - projected future user numbers;
 - details of any ongoing revenue implications and how these will be met;
 - information on match funding;
- for building projects, applicants may confirm that a competitive tender process will be followed, rather than being required to submit three quotations at the outset.

5. Pilot Arrangements

In order to test the revised arrangements, it is proposed that the new scoring process be run alongside the existing matrix for the next round of applications as a pilot exercise.

This will allow members to compare outcomes, review whether the revised model operates as intended, and identify any further amendments before the new process is brought forward for adoption.

Recommendation:

Members are asked to:

1. Note the proposed revisions to the Neighbourhood CIL scoring process.
2. Approve the pilot use of the revised scoring matrix for the next round of Neighbourhood CIL applications.
3. Make a recommendation on formal adoption.
4. Clerk to make necessary changes to the guidance to applicants, the application form and terms of reference

CIL scoring matrix for internal use by Councillors

Name of organisation	
Purpose of CIL funding	
Amount requested	
Total amount of project cost	
Organisation's reserves (from accounts)	

	Score
Benefits of the project - Level of community benefit of the project, users, value for money	
None	
Existing	0
Limited	20%
Moderate	40%
High (significantly disadvantaged group)	60%
Identified strategic need Supports an identified priority, possibly with a partner authority	
None	0%
Yes	25%
Funding - Is there match funding in place (alternative sources of funding)	
No	0%
Yes	15%
Total score:	/100

Commented [LO1]: Applicant needs to evidence existing and projected future users, additional weighting for disadvantaged groups, % increases considered but small projects would outweigh larger projects

Commented [LO2]: The project either supports an identified priority or not - climate emergency alignment, Council strategy, CIL strategy, Neighbourhood plan opportunities etc

Commented [LO3]: There is either additional funding in place, or not - score accordingly

Over 50 goes to an award and the committee decides the funding level.