NEIGHBOURHOOD CIL ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE

Eligibility

To be eligible the application must satisfy all the following criteria:

Is the application from a constituted not-for-profit organisation or group?

Will the project provide one or more of the following: provision of new physical or community infrastructure; improvement to, or replacement of, existing physical and community infrastructure; operation or maintenance of existing physical and community infrastructure or other?

Does the application support the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan?

Will there be wider community benefit?

Is there evidence of community consultation?

The project is not for new building or improvements explicitly exempt from Neighbourhood CIL funding.

Full application

Check List

Does the application meet the following criteria:

- Able to start within 12 months
- Long lasting improvement
- Improves quality of life of the community
- Benefit to the wider community, e.g. applications for sports facilities must demonstrate benefit to the wider community (not just for members)
- Tangible – seen and/or felt
- Supports community aspirations in the local Neighbourhood Plan
- Self-sustaining outcome
- Community consulted, ideally approved by Community Partnership
- Improves communication within and/or beyond the community
- Match funding or other funding available for a larger project*
- Does the project reduce carbon emissions or reflect the carbon neutral outcomes?*

Not mandatory but should be considered*

Weighting

Weighting based on need and/or cost effectiveness (high need and low cost/high impact scores highest). Only applications that score 4 or more against need and cost effectiveness will be approved. Applicants scoring 6/7 or more may been considered but will be required to provide more evidence.

Need

Does the application clearly explain the problem, issue or need that the project addresses; does the project clearly address the problem, issue or need identified; does the project clearly explain the likely beneficiaries? Is the project in an area of deprivation, or serve people from an area of high deprivation or other disadvantaged groups? Has the application demonstrated how it will meet the needs of the community? How effectively has the community been consulted on the project?

Score (0-5)

5 – Very strong. Clearly demonstrates need and how this project will benefit the community and who will benefit. Has tangible benefits and will improve the quality of life for people living in the area. People served will be in an area of high deprivation or disadvantaged group.

4 – Strong. Demonstrates need and how the project will benefit the community and who will benefit. Has tangible benefits and will improve the quality of life for people living in the area. People served will be in an area of high deprivation or disadvantaged group.

3 – Meets the objectives. Shows there is a need and benefit to the community; some evidence of it will improve quality of life for people in the community and serve people from an area of high deprivation or disadvantaged group.

2 – Could be stronger. Shows there is a need but not clear on how the project will benefit the community or who will benefit. Not in an area of high deprivation or serve people from a disadvantaged group. Does not have clear benefit, unclear about benefits to the community.

1 – Weak: does not demonstrate need; does not show how the project will benefit the community; does not have tangible benefits or improve the quality of life for people living in the area.

0 – No information has been provided. Gaps in the application form.

Cost effective

Has a clear budget been provided? Is the budget realistic and fully costed? Has the budget factored in all the costs associated with project? Will the project be delivered in the specified timescale? Have the project management arrangements been clearly explained? Will there be on-going maintenance costs? Have these been clearly explained?

Score (0-5)

5 – Very strong. The budget has been fully costed and is realistic and cost effective. All costs have been considered, including on-going maintenance costs. There is clear project plan, management arrangements and timescale for delivery. Match funding has been secured. 3 quotations have been received. Securing CIL funding could lead to further funding/ income generation.

4 – Strong. The budget is realistic and cost effective. Most costs have been considered, including on-going maintenance costs. There is clear project plan, management arrangements and timescale for delivery. Match funding has been identified but not secured. 3 potential quotes have been identified. Securing CIL funding may lead to further funding/ income generation.

3 – Meets the objectives. The budget is in place but costs are not explained clearly. Most costs have been considered, including on-going maintenance costs, but there are inconsistencies. There is a project plan, management arrangements and timescale for delivery but improvements could be made. Match funding has not been identified. Limited indication quotes have been sought for the work. No indication securing CIL funding will lead to further funding/ income generation.

2 – Could be stronger. There is a budget in place but costs are not explained clearly or too high. Costs have been considered, including on-going maintenance costs, but there are gaps. There is a project plan, and timescale for delivery, but significant improvement could be made. Management arrangements are unclear. Match funding has not been identified. Limited indication quotes have been sought for the work. No indication securing CIL funding will lead to further funding/ income generation.

1 – Weak. The budget has not been fully costed. Costs are unrealistic/ too high. The project plan is weak, no clear timeline, unrealistic expectations. Little understanding of project management requirements or other cost/ delivery implications/ on-going maintenance.

0 – No information has been provided. Gaps in the application form.

Neighbourhood CIL Assessment v2

15/09/25