



Reigate & Banstead
BOROUGH COUNCIL
Banstead | Horley | Redhill | Reigate

Signed off by	Andrew Benson, Head of Planning
Author	Ian Dunsford, Planning Policy Manager
Telephone	6889
Email	ian.dunsford@reigate-banstead.gov.uk
To	Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Date	Thursday, 16 March 2023
Executive Member	Cllr Richard Biggs

Key Decision Required	N
Wards Affected	(All Wards);

Subject	Community Infrastructure Levy - Strategic Infrastructure Programme Assessment Process
----------------	---

Recommendations
That Overview and Scrutiny Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Note the approach taken by officers in the assessment of funding bids for the Community Infrastructure Levy Strategic Infrastructure Programme 2023-2027; and(ii) Makes any observations for Executive on 23rd March 2023 when the proposed funding allocations for Strategic Infrastructure Programme 2023-2027 is scheduled to be presented for agreement.
Reasons for Recommendations
The Committee is requested to consider the project appraisal criteria to ensure that the process undertaken is robust and provide any observations to the Executive to assist with their consideration of the proposed Strategic Infrastructure Programme 2023-2027.
Executive Summary
Monies raised from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is designed to support the delivery of new infrastructure. 80% of the funding raised in the borough must be used to support Strategic Infrastructure Programme (SIP) the rest is spent on Local projects (15%) and Administration (5%). Currently there is approximately £10 million of Community

Infrastructure Levy monies available to support the delivery of strategic infrastructure projects. This fund continues to grow at approximately £2 million per annum as a result of new development in the Borough. The first SIP ran from 2017 – 2022. SIP2 will run from 2023 to 2027.

In summer 2022 a lessons learnt exercise was undertaken into the first SIP and infrastructure providers were invited to submit bids for strategic CIL monies.

75 bids have been received and assessed using an updated assessment methodology agreed with legal, finance and planning officers. Overview and Scrutiny have requested to review the SIP bid assessment methodology to provide assurances to Executive

Overview & Scrutiny Committee has authority to approve the recommendations.

Statutory Powers

1. Part 11 of Planning Act 2008 introduced the Community Infrastructure Levy to speed up the developer contributions process and support the delivery of infrastructure. In 2010 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations were introduced and have subsequently been amended eight times. Following independent examination, Reigate & Banstead became a CIL charging authority in 2016. Under the terms of the Act and Regulations 80% of the funding raised has to be spent on the provision, improvement, replacement, operation, or maintenance of public infrastructure needed to support development or growth. CIL can be used to provide new infrastructure or to repair or update existing infrastructure, to support development or growth.

Background

2. The Council has been collecting the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) since 2016. There are three elements to the way CIL can be spent – 80% is spent on strategic infrastructure projects, 15% on local projects and 5% on the administration of CIL. Any administration monies not spent in a year are returned to the CIL strategic infrastructure programme funding pot. This money is ringfenced by the CIL regulations.
3. From 2020 an Annual Infrastructure Funding Statements (AIFS) has been published annually (previously CIL and S106 were reported as part of the Annual Monitoring Report). These reports detail the amount of funding raised from developers and where it has been spent. These reports can be found at: https://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20088/planning_policy/1102/plan_monitoring/9
4. Aside from Salfords and Sidlow and Horley, where Local CIL is administered by the Parish and Town Councils, the prioritisation of projects to fund from Local CIL is undertaken following review by Members at four panels representing the remainder of the borough on a quarterly basis. Strategic CIL funding is allocated on the basis of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan, agreed by the Council's Executive every five years.
5. Strategic CIL projects for SIP2 were required to bid for at least £10,000, subject to available funding. According to the CIL regulations, CIL strategic funding has to be spent on infrastructure projects that will help support new development.

Key Information

Lessons Learnt Exercise from SIP1

6. The Strategic Infrastructure Programme 2017-2022 was the first occasion when there was a call for bids to be funded from CIL since the CIL was introduced to the Borough in 2016. Seven of the fifteen SIP(1) projects have subsequently been delivered in the SIP(1) funding period. Some projects were not delivered because of changes to the infrastructure providers' priorities or where match funding was not secured, or the project could not be delivered because of the restrictions of the Covid Pandemic. This has meant that the current Strategic CIL fund has approximately £10.4 million available to spend which is expected to rise to £18.2 million through to the end of 2027 as development projects are progressed.
7. To inform the SIP2 process, a lessons learnt exercise was undertaken on the 2017 bid assessment methodology (Contained in Annex 1). Of particular concern from the first SIP was the number of projects which were not delivered within the SIP period, in particular because the other funding required was not forthcoming. Consideration was therefore given to whether the bid assessment methodology could be updated to secure more SIP projects being delivered. The original assessment process had funding allocated to projects where delivery still had issues to address including organisational delivery priorities and resourcing. These matters were further accentuated by the effects of covid.
8. The original assessment process included weighting for match funding and value for money. Whilst these are important considerations in the assessment process, the updated bid assessment methodology has given more weight to project delivery certainty. One of the reasons for this is that at times of high inflation, it is more important that the CIL funding collected is quickly used or there is a risk that schemes will require additional funding to be delivered.
9. Consideration is given to the relative benefits for the Borough of a project with a large CIL request compared to the benefits of a number of smaller projects. The SIP(1) bid assessment criteria was amended for SIP(2) by agreement at Leaders and Group Leaders meetings in July 2022. An updated methodology was prepared in collaboration with Planning, Place, Finance and Legal. The agreed bid assessment approach is contained within Annex 2 of this report.

Bid Process

10. Following an email to potential bidders, and publicity on the Council's intranet, Members weekly bulletin and on the Council's website, and pre-bidding meetings with infrastructure providers, a call for bids was undertaken over 8 weeks in August and September 2022 which was accompanied by guidance on how to complete and submit a bid. Support was made available to answer any bidder's questions on completing the bid.
11. In 2017, 37 bids were received, and 15 projects approved for funding. In 2022 75 bids were received ranging in value from £10,000 to £4.9 million. This included Parish, Town, Borough Council and County Council bids.
12. In terms of geographic distribution of the bids Fig 1 below highlights the locations with most being around Redhill and Horley where most development has been taking place.

Figure 1 Bids received by area

Geographic Area	Number of bids received (and as a % of all bids received)
Borough-wide (multiple locations)	10 (13.3 %)
Banstead	2 (2.7%)
Burgh Heath	1 (1.3%)
Chipstead	1 (1.3%)
Earlswood	8 (10.7%)
Horley	14 (18.7%)
Merstham	3 (4%)
Merstham / Redhill	3 (4%)
Redhill	16 (21.3%)
Redhill / Reigate	1 (1.3%)
Reigate	9 (12%)
Salfords & Sidlow	3 (4%)
Tadworth	2 (2.7%)
Walton-on-the-Hill	1 (1.3%)
Smallfield, Tandridge (outside of borough)	1 (1.3%)
Total	75 (100%)

13. The assessment methodology has subsequently been applied and a list of projects recommended for funding is being reported to the 23 March Executive Committee for its approval. An overview of the draft results of the assessment is provided below in Figure 2 demonstrating how the approach has enabled a good proportion of projects to be funded, when considering the oversubscription of submitted projects compared to funds available.

Figure 2 Bid Assessment Process



14. In terms of the infrastructure types the bids related to, Figure 3 contains a list of the key infrastructure types of each project bid proposals.

Figure 3 Bids received by types of Infrastructure

Type of Infrastructure (where the project involves more than one type of infrastructure, the <u>key</u> type of infrastructure)	Number of bids received (and as a % of all bids received)
Active transport - pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure	4 (5.3%)
Biodiversity and tree planting	1 (1.3%) withdrawn by bidder
Cemeteries and crematoria	0
Community and cultural facilities	15 (20%)
Digital infrastructure	2 (2.7%)
Education facilities	9 (12%)
Electric car charging facilities	1 (1.3%)
Emergency Services	0
Flood risk reduction schemes	3 (4%)
Healthcare	6 (8.4%)
Highways - Strategic road network	2 (2.7%)
Highways - Local road network	0 Listed as an infrastructure type for 7 project bids, although not as the key infrastructure type

Leisure centres	2 (2.7%)
Off-street parking including public car parks	1 (1.3%)
Open space sports and recreation including pavilions	15 (20%)
Open space, green infrastructure and allotments	1 (1.3%)
Public realm improvements	3 (4%)
Public transport	3 (4%)
Security and anti-crime infrastructure	1 (1.3%)
Sustainability and Climate change	5 (6.7%)
Waste and recycling collection and management facilities	1 (1.3%)
Total	75 (100%)

15. Given the assessment of projects has been undertaken in accordance with a criteria based scoring system, it is not appropriate to consider the detail of each project individually, hence the focus of this report is on the assessment process. However in terms of projects being proposed for funding Figure 4 provides a summary breakdown.

Figure 4 Bid outcomes summary

RBBC bids to fund	RBBC bids NOT to fund	SCC bids to fund	SCC bids NOT to fund	Other organisations bids to fund	Other organisations bids NOT to fund
£7,524,652	£1,015,500	£4,984,000	£9,295,339	£3,,836,409	£25,346,358
Total CIL funding (£) that RBBC bid for = £8,514,501		Total CIL funding (£) that SCC bid for = £14,279,339		Total CIL funding (£) that other organisations bid for = £29,131,439	

<p>20 of the 24 bids submitted by RBBC are to be included in SIP(2) <i>(This includes the joint RBBC/SCC bid 22 for Horley subway, and two "either / or" option bids for refurbishment of the borough's tennis courts)</i></p> <p>Which is 83% of RBBC's bids and 88% of the funding bid for by RBBC</p>	<p>13 of the 15 bids submitted by SCC are to be included in SIP(2) <i>(plus also the joint RBBC / SCC bid)</i></p> <p>Which is 87% of SCC's bids and 35% of the funding bid for by SCC</p>	<p>18 of the 36 bids submitted by "other organisations" (including S&S Parish Council's 1 bid; and 3.5 of the four Horley TC bids)</p> <p>Which is 50% of "other organisations" bids and 13% of the funding bid for by "other organisations"</p>
--	--	---

Next Steps

16. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is being asked to consider the methodology, the process and framework for the decisions and provide any observations on the approach being used in the SIP2 Bid assessment process.

Legal Implications

17. The submission and assessment process has followed the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 as amended and there are no legal implications.

Financial Implications

18. The assessment criteria have been devised so as to be fair and equal to all bidders. The allocation of funding will be to the betterment of successful bidders but without detriment to unsuccessful bidders.

Equalities Implications

19. The SIP funding bid assessment process is designed to support development of the area, including planned development in the Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Development Management Plan 2019.

Communication Implications

20. The Council's Communications Team has been involved since the project commenced in July 2022, with spreading the message about the opportunity to bid for strategic CIL funding to RBBC's officers and councillors through the Council's intranet (the Knowledge), and the weekly Members Bulletins (ReMember), as well as directly to external infrastructure providers and organisations through our website and initial emails sent in in July 2022.
21. All bidders will be advised of the outcome by email following the Executive meeting. Following this, wider communications will be considered in light of the pre-election period.

22. Allocation and spending of strategic CIL funding, as well as other developer contributions, is publicised each year through the statutory publication of the Council's Annual Infrastructure Funding Statement on its website. [You can access the AIFS using this link](#) along with wider promotion via the Council's communications channels including a media release, website, Borough e-news and social media.
23. CIL award news, when officially published, generates significant engagement and reaction from residents on social media.

Environmental Sustainability Implications

24. The SIP funding bid assessment process is designed to support development of the borough, both planned development in the Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 and Development Management Plan 2019 and any windfall development. The bids were also assessed in relation to their contribution to the Council's Environmental Sustainability Strategy and Action Plan 2020, amongst other Council strategies. Several the proposed SIP projects would contribute directly to both borough carbon reduction targets, with others delivering other environmental sustainability and climate adaptation benefits.

Risk Management Considerations

25. There are two identified risks to consider. The first is the risk of complaint from a bidder whose scheme was not awarded funding. This has been addressed by transparent assessment and decision making process and communicating reasoning to unsuccessful applicants.
26. The second risk is associated with reputational harm where a scheme with SIP2 allocated funding is delayed or not delivered. This will be managed by regular engagement with successful bidders.

Other Implications

27. 31. Staffing/Human Resources
The transfer of funding will be recorded using the CIL administration budget. The Council projects that will benefit from SIP2 may have some resource issues, but it is anticipated that these will be covered by existing budgets.

Consultation

28. No public consultation is required for the SIP bid assessment methodology but the presentation of this report to Overview and Scrutiny ensures that the process is open.

Policy Framework

29. A number of key objectives set out in the corporate plan and the local plan have informed the assessment and selection of bids. These include supporting our communities, improving leisure and wellbeing, supporting our town centres and

economic prosperity, and reducing our environmental impacts. Policy INF1 Infrastructure in the Development Management Plan sets the local planning context.

Background Papers

1. Corporate Plan 2025 - [https://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20205/plans and policies/280/reigate and banstead 2025](https://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20205/plans_and_policies/280/reigate_and_banstead_2025)
2. [Local Plan Core Strategy 2012-2027 Reviewed 2019](#)
3. [Development Management Plan 2019](#)
4. [Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule 2016](#)
5. [Spending Community Infrastructure Levy Funds](#)
6. [Planning Act 2008](#)
7. [Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 \(As amended\)](#)

Annexes

1. Strategic Infrastructure Programme 1 Lessons Learnt
2. Strategic Infrastructure Programme 2 Assessment Criteria

ANNEX 1

SIP(2) Assessment Criteria - Lessons learnt from SIP(1) Assessment Criteria

The assessment criteria for SIP(2) are broadly the same assessment criteria as were agreed in Oct 2016 for the first SIP, although with the percentage weighting removed (to give more equal weight to value for money / match funding, supporting development, benefit to the borough, and deliverability, for reasons set out below).

Table 2 below, is the SIP(1) Appraisal Criteria used for evaluating bids, along with the following narrative, agreed in October 2016 :

“The Appraisal Criteria emphasises supporting areas experiencing significant development / growth (30 per cent) but also those projects which offer wider community benefits (20 per cent).

Consideration of value for money (20 per cent) will include the reasonableness of total project costs and the necessity for CIL funding (as opposed to other funding streams).

The inclusion of a match funding criteria (20 per cent) recognises the role of CIL as gap funding, and will maximise the benefit that CIL can achieve for the borough.”

Table 2 – Project Appraisal Criteria for SIP(1) 2017-2022 (agreed by SPAG)

Projects scored (1-5) against each of the criteria, with scores weighted as stated.

The rationale for the weighting is as follows:

Project appraisal criteria	Weighting
<p>Supporting growth: Assessment of the extent to which the project would support growth and/or development in the borough taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how the project relates to areas of significant growth/regeneration - whether the project would enable or unlock specific key development sites or growth opportunities - the fit of the project with specific policies or objectives in the Local Plan - the fit with existing infrastructure needs identified within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan or other infrastructure planning documents 	30%
<p>Benefit to our residents and businesses: Assessment of the overall benefit of the project to communities of the borough taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the likely scale/significance of benefit (e.g. borough-wide or specific groups) - fit with priorities in the Council's Five Year Plan - evidence of public or business support for the project 	20%
<p>Match funding: Assessment of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the extent to which other funding would be secured/leveraged in alongside CIL funding - the proportional contribution of CIL to total project costs 	20%
<p>Value for money: Consideration of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - project costs compared to benchmark costs - the costs of the project (in particular the amount of CIL funding sought) against potential benefits and outcomes for the borough. - alternative funding sources available and the need for CIL funding - the added value which CIL could bring to the scheme 	20%
<p>Deliverability: Assessment of the feasibility of the scheme and likelihood of timely delivery taking account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stage of project development - identified risks to project delivery - status of funding - the plan for sustaining the benefit /operation of the project in to the long-term 	10%

In drawing up the assessment criteria in late 2016 for the Council's first SIP, it was considered that "*whilst deliverability is important, the lesser emphasis on deliverability at the bidding stage (10 per cent) reflects the fact that further evidence to demonstrate deliverability will be sought from providers before money is released for a particular project.*"

Based on experience from the first SIP (including project delivery), and likely information available, the weighting of assessment criteria has been re-balanced to change its emphasis from “match funding” and “the extent to which other funding would be secured by allocation of CIL funding” and “the proportional contribution of CIL to total project costs”, towards greater emphasis on the project’s “deliverability” and “supporting the borough’s development” and the benefits to the borough through support of the Council’s priorities (through its Corporate Plan and accompanying Strategies).

One of the main issues that has been re-considered is the weighting given in assessment of third party match funding and value for money criteria, given lessons learnt from the first SIP.

The first SIP projects which were scored high for “value for money” and “match funding” relied on other (sometimes 3rd party) funding sources to be delivered, some of which has not been forthcoming and so the project has not been able to be delivered. The 40 per cent weighting which was given to each project bid for “match funding” and “value for money” (20 per cent each) in the first SIP assessment round weighs disproportionately against “deliverability” (given maximum of 10 per cent weighting). This is particularly important at a time when public funding is under great pressure relative to need.

In hindsight, particularly given the need for certainty of funding streams for the project delivery organisation and of infrastructure being provided to support develop for RBBC, it is considered ineffective to allocate strategic CIL funds to a project that brings with it lots of match funding (so scored high on “Value for Money”) if that match funding is not forthcoming in the SIP 5-year period (match funding and value for money was weighted 40 per cent in the first SIP).

On reflection, the emphasis in SIP(1) on “match funding” and some of the assessment criteria for “Value for Money” versus “Deliverability” played a part in resulting in less than half of the SIP(1) projects (6 of the 15) being delivered within the SIP timeframe 2017-22, mostly because of lack of the required match funding (with a few due to changes in the bidding organisations priorities). Particularly in the current economic climate, giving greater weighting to “match funding” and “value for money” (namely the assessment criteria of “project costs compared to benchmark costs”, and “alternative funding sources available and the need for CIL”) is no longer considered a suitable assessment criteria weighting.

For SIP2, evidence of the project delivery progress and dates will be required to be submitted by successful bidders by way of quarterly project delivery updates. A Spending Agreement will only be entered into, and CIL funding released at an appropriate time in the project’s delivery, and subject to sufficient strategic CIL funding being available.

There is a need to balance certainty of delivery against flexibility of the SIP, if annual review of the SIP shows that a project on the SIP cannot be delivered to anticipated timescales. Annual reviews of the SIP will include the potential to “re-allocate” funding from projects

whose delivery timescales change to after the current SIP period, to re-allocate to other projects that were shortlisted.

In interest of value for money, it is desirable to spend the strategic CIL funding collected but unspent and unallocated at the end of the first SIP period of 2022, which is **£9,406,388.14**. At a time of considerable inflation of construction materials and labour costs, it is suitable to allocate this funding to projects which could be delivered in the earlier years of SIP2. Further strategic CIL funding collected from developments from 2022 predicted at **approximately £2 million per annum** (planned and “windfall” developments, based on the Planning Policy Team’s monitoring) would be used to fund delivery of SIP project bids in the later years of the SIP.

In order to address these issues, the Assessment Criteria will be re-balanced, with greater importance attached to deliverability and committed funding than they were in SIP1. Bids received for the second SIP (SIP(2)) funding period will be assessed by CIL Team officers based on the agreed Assessment Criteria (set out in **Table 1**).

The 2017 SIP also factored in qualitative considerations:

1. Could the project provide a ‘quick win’ in terms of deliverability, the amount of CIL requested and potential impact?
2. Conversely, if a project’s CIL ‘ask’ is a large proportion of the total anticipated funding available, how does the potential impact of the project compare to the potential cumulative impact of other smaller projects?
3. Does a project complement (or could it be combined with) another proposal?
NOTE: the CIL Portfolio Holder has requested, on the basis of experience of the first SIP, that project bids are NOT combined in the second SIP, i.e. SIP(2).
4. Would other funding sources be available to support a project, in the absence of CIL?
5. Is a project’s CIL request too large for the amount of funding available?
If so, would an allocation up to the ‘ask’ prevent support being allocated to other good projects, which require less CIL support?
6. Does a project require feasibility work that could be funded from a non-CIL source?
NOTE: it has since been clarified that CIL ought not to be used to fund initial feasibility of infrastructure projects, as if found not to be feasible, no infrastructure will have been provided for the CIL spent.

A similar qualitative commentary will be made for each SIP(2) bid where relevant, and presented for consideration and finalising of SIP(2). This will help to provide a qualitative overview of the relative benefits of each project bid.

As a result of lessons learnt from the Council’s first SIP, project bids to be included in the Councils’ SIP 2023-28 will not be grouped, but each will be assessed and scored separately on their own merits, even when submitted by the same infrastructure provider or on the same site

Reigate & Banstead Borough Council's second Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Strategic Infrastructure Programme (SIP2) 2023 to 2027

Screening Qualification Criteria and Assessment Criteria for Project Applications for funding allocation in SIP(2)

Introduction

National legislation and guidance concerning CIL spending is very board-brush, giving CIL “charging authorities”, such as RBBC, considerable freedom to decide how to spend the “strategic” portion (at least 80% of the total CIL collected across the borough) of the CIL receipts that it collects.

CIL Regulations specify that charging authorities must apply the strategic CIL to funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure to support the development of its area. The strategic CIL can be used to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure or to repair failing existing infrastructure if needed to support development. We can also use the “strategic” CIL portion collected to fund infrastructure located outside of the borough, where to do so would support the borough’s development. Infrastructure is defined in the CIL Regulations as the “relevant infrastructure” types or projects listed on the Council’s “infrastructure list” in its “annual infrastructure funding statement” (*see list at the end of this report*).

This flexibility gives us the opportunity to choose what infrastructure we need to support both planned (in our Local Development Plan) and other “windfall” development across the borough.

As required, we publish a report annually on our website of CIL income received, allocated and spent, in our annual infrastructure funding statement. Whilst we have considerable flexibility in spending the “strategic” CIL portion, the process we use to decide how to allocate our CIL funding should be transparent to infrastructure providers who might benefit from the CIL, to developers who pay the CIL, and to the borough’s communities.

Process

Decision-making criteria will enable Council’s Principal Policy Development Officer and the Community Infrastructure Levy Officer to “screen” and to provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of project bids for strategic CIL funding.

This will ensure that the evaluation of proposals is robust, consistent and transparent, which is particularly important given the interest in SIP(2) at a time of considerable inflation of pressure on public funding. This quantitative scoring will be considered alongside qualitative

commentary in drawing up the SIP.

The Project Bid Evaluation Process will consist of the following 3 stages:

Stage 1 – Checking and inputting information

Once all bids have been read, and **the information provided** input into a single **screening & assessment spreadsheet**. If needed, telephone discussions will be held with project bidders to obtain clarification on any parts of the bids, including requesting any further evidence documentation needed to fully assess the bid.

Stage 2 - Screening of project proposals using Qualification Criteria (section 3 of the bidding form) to determine whether submitted projects are eligible for consideration under SIP(2).

Stage 3 - For bids meeting the Qualification Criteria, a full **Assessment** will be undertaken using “project assessment criteria” to ensure consistency and transparency.

The 2 officers assessing the bids will present the draft Assessment Scoring for each project along with any commentary for each bid assessed, to the Head of Planning and the Policy Manager with responsibility for CIL for any feedback before the Council’s second SIP (SIP(2) is drawn up.

NOTE: These 4 officers involved in the assessment of project bids all have responsibility for CIL and are not involved in any project bid submissions from other RBBC Services.

The Council’s second SIP (SIP(2) will then be recommended to the Executive for its agreement.

Stage 2 - Screening for meeting Qualification Criteria

Officers will determine whether submitted projects are eligible for CIL funding from strategic CIL, that is, that they meet statutory requirement for funding infrastructure, as well as the Council’s stated requirements from the Application Form for considering bids for strategic CIL funding.

Each SIP bid will be screened to ensure all parts of the application form have been completed, and for compliance with **Qualification Criteria (Section 3 of the SIP(2) bidding form)**

The following 4 criteria will be used to screen project bids:

- i) That the project would involve the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of a type (or types) of infrastructureⁱ on the Council’s Infrastructure List in its annual infrastructure funding statement (IFS)
- ii) That evidence has been provided that the project would support the development of the borough of Reigate & Banstead.
- iii) That the evidence provided confirms that the project can be delivered within the five year period 2023-27
- iv) That the project bid is for at least £10,000 of CIL funding (as lower value projects *needing less CIL funding are potentially more suitable for Local CIL funding*)

Project bids not meeting these Qualification Criteria and requirements will not be considered further.

All bidders will be advised of the outcome of their bids before the SIP2 is made public on the Council’s committee webpages.

Additionally, (from the SIP2 Application webpage) -

Religious organisations and groups can apply if the infrastructure to be provided or improved is open to all and the project clearly benefits the wider community.

The CIL should not be used to promote more followers to any religion.

and

Any funding bids made by schools should not be to support the core curriculum or anything concerned with meeting their statutory duties.

Stage 3 – Project Assessment of Qualifying bids

Project Assessment Criteria for SIP(2) 2023-2027

The criteria set out in **Table 1** below will be used as the Project Assessment criteria for SIP(2).

Projects will be scored (1-5) against each of the criteria, using specific questions from the Funding Application Form, as well as considering the response to all questions on the Form as a whole, along with any supporting documents submitted.

Table 1 - Project Assessment Criteria for SIP(2) 2023-2027

	Project Assessment Criteria SIP(2) 2023 - 2027	Score 0 - 5
1. Supporting development in the borough		Score out of 20 =

Assessment of the extent to which the project bid would support development in the borough taking account of:		
a	Relationship of the project bid to regeneration areas and other priority areas for development (Borough's Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 Policy CS6 "Allocation of land for development" ⁱⁱ)	
b	Degree to which the project bid would support specific allocated development sites	
c	Degree to which the project bid would support the infrastructure needs identified in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Strategy (DMP Annex 6)	
d	How well would the project bid fit with specific Local Plan policies (<i>list policies</i>)?	
2. Benefit to borough; its environment, economy and communities Assessment of the overall benefit of the project to communities of the borough taking account of:		Score out of 20 =
a	The likely scale and significance of benefit (including borough-wide, and specific geographic areas / communities, and / or groups of people)	
b	Supporting the priorities and objectives in the Council's Five Year Plan 2020-25 (<i>consider flexibly for projects to be delivered 2026 & 2027</i>)	
c	Supporting other R&B Borough Council Strategies (such as its "Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Facilities Study "Stage D" Report 2022"; "Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2020"; "Green infrastructure Strategy 2017"; "Economic Development Framework 2021-26"); and "R&B Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan 2022"	
d	Evidence of community, public and / or business support for the project bid	
3. Deliverability		Score out

Assessment of the feasibility of the scheme and likelihood of timely delivery taking account of:		of 20 =
a	Stage of project development within the organisation - including feasibility and obtaining any internal authorisation needed	
b	If other landowner consents; legal and other consents; planning permissions, and / or public consultations are needed, have these been obtained, sought, neither.	
c	Stage in obtaining any match funding needed - - <i>Project bid already has the other funding it needs, or it does not need other funding sources = Score 5</i> - <i>Project bid has other funding sources needed formally committed = Score 4</i> - <i>Evidence of other funding sources needed having been applied for = Score 2</i> - <i>Stated intention to bid for or apply for other funding needed = Score 1</i> - <i>No information provided on any bids made for other funding needed nor sources of other funding needed = 0</i>	
d	Plans for project management and monitoring and for sustaining the operation of the project and its benefits in the medium term, including maintenance needs	
4. Value for Money and Match Funding Assessment of the “value for money” and the other public and private funding “match funding” that the CIL could lever in for the project “adding value” to the CIL spending, taking account of:		Score out of 15 =
A	Percentage of the project cost sought from CIL funding (specify both maximum and minimum if a range of funding sort.. and take mid-point %) <i>Lower percentage of CIL funding needed scoring</i>	

	<p><i>higher, representing greater value for money from match funding</i></p> <p><i>100% - Score 0</i></p> <p><i>80 – 99% = Score 1</i></p> <p><i>61 – 80% - Score 2</i></p> <p><i>41 – 60% = Score 3</i></p> <p><i>21 – 40% = Score 4</i></p> <p><i>1-20% = Score 5</i></p>	
b	<p>Need for CIL funding – Does the project need CIL funding to be delivered?</p> <p>Yes (5) / No ... and if “No” .. then the “<u>Added Value / Additional Benefit</u>” to the project which CIL would bring to the scheme in <u>scope / quality / timing</u> score 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 (if no evidenced benefits from CIL)</p>	
c	<p>The amount of CIL funding sought against likely benefits and outcomes for the borough’s environment, economy and / or communities</p>	
<p>TOTAL SCORE Out of 75 =</p>		X

Scoring narrative

5 – Excellent Satisfies the requirement and demonstrates exceptional evidence. Evidence provided identifies factors that will offer potential added value.

4 – Good Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average evidence demonstrated by the bidder.

3 – Acceptable Satisfies the requirement. Bidder demonstrated evidence.

2 - Minor Reservations Some minor reservations of the bidder’s submitted evidence, with limited evidence to support the response.

1 – Major Reservations / Non-compliant Major reservations of the bidder’s evidence, with little or no evidence to support the response.

0 - Unacceptable/Non-compliant Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and / or insufficient information provided, with little or no evidence to support the response.

In addition to the scoring of bids, qualitative commentary will also be provided for each project bid where relevant and presented to the head of Planning and Planning Policy Manager for consideration and finalising of SIP(2). Provision of commentary will help to provide a qualitative overview of the relative benefits of each project bid.

Additional Qualitative considerations provided as commentary :

1. Would the project provide a 'quick win' in terms of deliverability taking account of strategic CIL already collected, the amount of CIL requested, and potential impact of the project?
2. Is the project's CIL request too large for the amount of funding available and the anticipated delivery the year CIL would be required?
3. If the project bid is for a large amount of the total anticipated funding available in the 5-year SIP period, how does the potential impact of the project compare to the potential cumulative impact of many other smaller projects, and would allocation of the required amount of CIL prevent support being allocated to other high-scoring projects, which require less CIL funding?

i

Highways and transport - Strategic road network
Highways - Local road network
Public transport
Active transport - Pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure
Off-street parking including public car parks
Electric car charging facilities
Education facilities
Healthcare
Emergency Services
Community and cultural facilities
Digital infrastructure
Security and anti-crime infrastructure
Public realm improvements
Leisure centres
Open space sports and recreation including pavilions
Open space, green infrastructure and allotments
Biodiversity and tree planting
Cemeteries and crematoria
Sustainability and Climate change
Flood risk reduction schemes
Waste and recycling collection and management facilities
More than one: list which infrastructure types

ii

Sustainable locations in the urban area that are:

- The key urban development areas and regeneration areas of: - **Scores 5**
 - Redhill town centre
 - Horley town centre
 - Horley North East and North West sectors
 - Preston regeneration area

-
- Merstham regeneration area
 - Other regeneration areas as identified by the Council and its partners
 - The built up areas of Redhill, Reigate, Horley and Banstead (including Reigate & Banstead Town centres) - **Scores 4**
 - Other sites in the urban area and sustainable urban extension sites allocated in the Development Management Plan (DMP). - **Scores 3**
 - Anywhere else in the borough – **Scores 1**
 - Outside the borough – **Scores 0**