

<b>Criteria and considerations</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
<p><b>Supporting growth</b></p> <p>Consideration of the extent to which the project supports development in the borough, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How the project helps mitigate the impact of additional development</li> <li>- The fit with policies or objectives in the Local Plan</li> <li>- The fit with known infrastructure needs identified in existing plans and strategies</li> </ul>	<b>30%</b>
<p><b>Benefits to residents/community support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scale of benefit</li> <li>- Clear evidence of local support</li> <li>- Evidence that the project corresponds with known priorities for the local community</li> </ul>	<b>20%</b>
<p><b>Match funding</b></p> <p>Consideration of the proportional contribution of CIL to total project costs and the extent to which CIL funding would enable additional funding to be secured</p> <p>No funding from other sources – 0  1-20% funding from other sources – 1  21-40% funding from other sources – 2  41-60% funding from other sources – 3  61-80% funding from other sources – 4  81% + funding from other sources - 5</p>	<b>20%</b>
<p><b>Value for money</b></p> <p>Consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CIL sought in relation to benefits to the local area</li> <li>- Suitability to be considered for CIL funding</li> <li>- Alternative funding sources available and considered</li> </ul>	<b>20%</b>
<p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>Assessment of feasibility of scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stage of project development</li> <li>- Status of funding</li> <li>- Long term sustainability of project</li> </ul>	<b>10%</b>

### **Scoring assessment**

To inform decision making all applications submitted have been scored by officers against criteria to indicate the suitability of the project for CIL funding. This assessment is provided as a guide for Councillors and aims to give a value to the criteria that Councillors have always considered when deciding applications.

Scores have been weighted to place a higher value of total score on projects that most obviously address the impacts of development, in line with the purposes of CIL.

Each criteria is scored out of a total of 5 to provide a maximum total of 25 for each project. The overall score provided in the table is the weighted score, giving a higher priority to those that evidently address the impact of development.

## Applications

<b>Project One Description</b>	Improvements to footpath 27b linking Broadwater path to Walton Lane	
Lead organisation	Surrey County Council	
Amount CIL requested	£8,981	
Supporting growth	The project complements works already carried out on the Broadwater footpath, intended to assist in relieving pressure on the busy Thames path and also improving public access to the borough's countryside.	<b>4/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	The Broadwater path works already completed have been well received by local resident's groups and positive feedback has been received by both authorities. This project is prompted by community requests for improvements to the circular route back to Cowey Sale.	<b>4/5</b>
Match funding	Helps deliver works that falls outside of priorities for SCC but that has significant local support.	<b>0/5</b>
Value for money and added value	The Broadwater path was completed during 2017 and this project aims to build on the success of those works and respond to community feedback. It has been a very visible example to the community of the benefits CIL funding can bring to the local area.	<b>4/5</b>
Deliverability	The project is entirely reliant on CIL funding. Delivery would be managed by SCC and timescales for works are provided.	<b>3/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>15.5/25</b>

<b>Project Two Description</b>	Refurbishment of the lodge to create additional teaching space/community space	
Lead organisation	St James School	
Amount CIL requested	£60,000	
Supporting growth	The school has assisted in meeting increased demand for school places in the local area in recent years by providing bulge classes in 2012, 2013 and 2016.	<b>4/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	Support from the school community and wider community in relation to provision of community space. The Local Plan consultation in 2017 showed the importance the community place on the provision of additional school places along with supporting infrastructure in schools.	<b>4/5</b>
Match funding	CIL would assist in providing the final element of funding needed in order to	<b>4/5</b>

	deliver the project. 70% of project costs are being made available from other sources.	
Value for money and added value	The project would benefit not just the school but the wider community. A variety of sources of funding have been explored and CIL funding is being requested as a funding source of last resort. SCC are funding the elements of the project that relate to the aspects that have reached the end of their natural life.	<b>3/5</b>
Deliverability	A significant proportion of funding remains outstanding. SCC Property Services would project manage and timescales are provided.	<b>3/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>18.5/25</b>

<b>Project Three Description</b>	Improvement to lighting around the war memorial and restoration of the surroundings	
Lead organisation	Weybridge Society	
Amount CIL requested	£32,500	
Supporting growth	There is no direct impact on addressing the impacts of development. The works intend to improve the local environment and setting of this listed building.	<b>0/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	This project does not correspond with infrastructure priorities identified by the local community in relation to addressing pressures due to growth.	<b>1/5</b>
Match funding	No match funding provided	<b>0/5</b>
Value for money and added value	The project does not correspond with the main purposes of CIL funding.	<b>1/5</b>
Deliverability	There is no detail on what the bulk of the funding is being requested for as the initial part of the funding requested is for feasibility study. There is also no detail on the permissions required and what discussions have taken place with SCC as owners.	<b>1/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>2.5/25</b>

<b>Project Four Description</b>	Bollards to prevent parking on adopted highways land	
Lead organisation	PA Housing Ltd	
Amount CIL requested	£3,500	
Supporting growth	There is no direct impact on addressing the impacts of development. The works are intended to address problems of unauthorised parking.	<b>1/5</b>

Benefit to residents/community support	There is evidence of some local support for the works to improve aesthetics of the area.	<b>2/5</b>
Match funding	No funding is available from any other source	<b>0/5</b>
Value for money and added value	The project does not obviously correspond with the main purposes of CIL funding.	<b>2/5</b>
Deliverability	The permissions required are not clarified within the application. As adopted highway land, have permissions been sought from SCC?	<b>2/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>6.5/25</b>

<b>Project Five Description</b>	Roof replacement and addition of girl's changing facilities	
Lead organisation	Weybridge Cricket Club	
Amount CIL requested	£50,000	
Supporting growth	Part of the project is for maintenance work for a roof that has come to the end of its natural life. Whilst the project does not create additional capacity, the need for the addition of girl's changing facilities is due to growth within the club.	<b>2/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	Would benefit the growing membership of the club.	<b>2/5</b>
Match funding	15% of projects costs are to be provided from other sources. There is limited detail on the timings for decisions relating to other funds applied for.	<b>1/5</b>
Value for money and added value	Quotations have not been provided, meaning it is not possible to determine the cost of the various elements of the project.	<b>2/5</b>
Deliverability	The facility is leased from EBC and there is no reference to any discussions that have taken place with the Assets team around the project. Evidence of EBC support and permission for the scheme would be required. At present CIL would provide the bulk of the project costs, rather than providing a final element of match funding	<b>2/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>9/25</b>

<b>Project Six Description</b>	Accommodation pods	
Lead organisation	Walton Firs Foundation	
Amount CIL requested	£24,560	
Supporting growth	There is increased demand from growing school population and membership of youth organisations. However, the project is not an identified priority for addressing the impact of development	<b>3/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	There is clear evidence of support for the scheme from schools and youth organisations. However, no information is provided specifically on the current usage by Elmbridge organisations.	<b>2/5</b>
Match funding	Based on the current number of pods proposed, 80% of funds would be provided from other sources.	<b>4/5</b>
Value for money and added value	The centre does provide wider facilities required by schools to provide a broad education	<b>3/5</b>
Deliverability	The application includes evidence of discussions around the planning requirements. The bulk of project costs rely on additional funding applications being successful. There are therefore uncertainties around the scale of the project that will be achievable.	<b>3/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>15/25</b>

<b>Project Seven Description</b>	Creation of office space	
Lead organisation	St Marys Church	
Amount CIL requested	£20,000	
Supporting growth	No evidence of direct impact on addressing the impacts of development. The works are intended to improve office provision, rather than creating any additional hall space for community use.	<b>0/5</b>
Benefit to residents/community support	Works would appear to assist with internal management of bookings, rather than directly benefitting residents.	<b>1/5</b>
Match funding	26% of project costs would be provided from other sources.	<b>2/5</b>
Value for money and added value	The benefit to the community is not clear.	<b>1/5</b>
Deliverability	Quotations have not been provided and there is limited detail on permissions and timescales.	<b>2/5</b>
	<b>Weighted score</b>	<b>5/25</b>