

Key considerations

- 1 The CIL Spending Board's key considerations will be whether there is a public benefit of the proposed scheme for residents in Sevenoaks District and whether the scheme constitutes value for money. In determining this, the spending board will consider the following issues in making its recommendation.
 - a) Whether sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate a strong social, environmental or economic justification for the scheme.
 - b) Whether sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate a strong link between new development and the scheme.
 - c) Whether sufficient evidence has been submitted to show that the project involves partnership working.
 - d) Whether the scheme forms part of a planned, local, economic or community strategy to address the need for local or strategic infrastructure.
 - e) Whether sufficient evidence has been provided to show the clear public benefit to the scheme.
 - f) Whether sufficient evidence has been provided to show that funding has been maximised from other funding sources.
 - g) Whether there is sufficient certainty that the scheme will be delivered, including considering whether the project has all the necessary permissions in place and evidence has been provided to demonstrate that there are sufficient maintenance arrangements in place.
 - h) Whether the scheme has local support.
 - i) Whether the project has already benefited from CIL funding through the CIL Spending Board or the Parish and Town Councils.
 - j) Whether overall the scheme provides a strong community benefit.
- 2 The board may also take into account other factors that it considers relevant.
- 3 As members are aware on this occasion there is limited CIL funding available for the Board to allocate on this occasion. For this Board the CIL money

requested to support all the projects is more than the total amount available to spend.

- 4 On this occasion it is therefore necessary for the Board to choose between schemes that could both be appropriate uses of CIL and only result in the spending of money up to £2,029,008.49.

Types of recommendation:

- 5 The board may make the following recommendations to Cabinet for it to ratify:
 - A. Funding for the scheme is approved subject to a legal agreement being entered into. If no legal agreement is entered into, within 6 months the bid will be reported back to the CIL Spending Board to be reconsidered.
 - B. Funding for the scheme is secured and set aside for this project. The funding will be paid upon the completion of a legal agreement and when planning permission is granted for the project. If planning permission is not granted, the bid will be reported back to the CIL Spending Board to be reconsidered.
 - C. Funding for the scheme is secured and set aside for this project. The funding will be paid upon the completion of a legal agreement and when all the funding sources laid out in the submission documents have been secured. If not all the funding is secured, within 1 year, the bid will be reported back to the CIL Spending Board to be reconsidered.
 - D. Funding for the scheme is not approved on the basis that other proposed schemes have been given greater priority.
 - E. Funding for the scheme is not approved on the basis that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify it.
 - F. A decision of the provision of funding a scheme is deferred. It is considered that further evidence is required to fully show the benefits of the scheme.
 - G. A decision of the provision of funding for a scheme is deferred. It is considered that further evidence is required to indicate whether the project is viable.
- 6 These recommendations should give bidders an indication of whether they should consider bidding for this scheme again and what additional information, if anything, should be provided with any resubmission.

Recommendations to the CIL Spending Board

- 7 On this occasion Members should be aware that there is an insufficient amount of CIL funding to approve all the projects.
- 8 Within each report, Officers have made a recommendation to approve or refuse funding for each individual project put forward. This is purely to reflect whether they meet the criteria by which Officers assess the bids under.
- 9 However, it should be noted that Members have the option to arrive at a different conclusion from the Officer's recommendations in each individual report. Members are reminded of the types of recommendations which are available to them, as set out in paragraph 5 of this Appendix.

Recommendation:

That it be recommended to Cabinet that:

- A. The £900,000 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme Re-provision of "White Oak Leisure Centre" be approved on the following grounds:
 - Strong economic, social and environmental benefits to the community;
 - The project is identified in an adopted strategy/plan;
 - Sufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate a strong link between new development and the scheme.
 - There is strong community support of the scheme
- B. The £252,400 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme "Bradbourne Lakes Landscape Improvement Scheme" be refused on the following ground:
 - Funding for the scheme is not approved on the basis that other proposed schemes have been given greater priority;
 - The need for the scheme (Economic) is not clearly demonstrated in the application;
 - The scheme has not clearly demonstrated whether it has maximised funding sources / CIL funding from the relevant town or parish council(s).
- C. The £1,000,000 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme "Swanley Transport Interventions" be approved on the following ground:

- Strong economic, social and environmental benefits to the community
- The project is identified in an adopted strategy/plan
- Strong evidence has been submitted to demonstrate a strong link between new development and the scheme

D. The £59,975.00 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme “Westerham parking project” be refused on the following ground:

- Funding for the scheme is not approved on the basis that other proposed schemes have been given greater priority.
- The need for the scheme (Economic) is not clearly demonstrated in the application;
- The scheme has not clearly demonstrated whether it has maximised funding sources / CIL funding from the relevant town or parish council(s)

E. The £144,646 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme “Kemsing Surgery Extension” be refused on the following ground:

- Funding for the scheme is not approved on the basis that other proposed schemes have been given greater priority
- The requirement for working in partnership has not been clearly demonstrated in the application;
- The scheme has not clearly demonstrated whether it has maximised funding sources / CIL funding from the relevant town or parish council(s)

F. The £72,211.96 applied for, as set out in the report, for scheme “go 2 - A Demand Responsive Bus Service” be approved on the following ground:

- Strong economic, social and environmental benefits to the community
- The project is identified in an adopted strategy/plan
- There is strong community support of the scheme