

Appendix 2

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Kingsley Hall The Livewell Centre - £300,000 CIL requested

Chris Kapnisis – Kingsley Hall

Planning permission was given in January 2017 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Kingsley Hall site, Parsloes Avenue, Dagenham. This bid is to support the implementation of redevelopment works to deliver 1,530m² of new and improved community facilities that have been given planning permission. Specifically, the bid covers

£75,000 Ground Floor Eden Community Café and Breathe Garden Room

£75,000 1st floor Recreate Fitness / Drama / Dance Theatre

£25,000 2nd floor community roof garden

£50,000 Refurbished sports hall / training kitchen and workshops

£25,000 Installation of new accessible WC and changing rooms

£20,000 New cultural herb / edible garden and micro urban allotments

£30,000 interactive heritage

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Community Facilities

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills and Enterprise, Health and Social Care, Community Cohesion and Arts, Culture and Leisure targets

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The project will satisfy elements of future demand from development in the wider area by providing more and improved community facilities to serve the whole population in a central location

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project is supported by the organisations who use the facility, and a number of funding agencies. The project has also been supported by the council in granting planning permission for the redevelopment

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics
Rate from 1-10 **10**

The community centre is open and accessible to all. The project will include providing accessible changing rooms and WC, and increasing projects for older people, children, and all sections of the community. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

The improved buildings will provide accessible facilities for all groups, and allow more programmes to aid disadvantaged citizens, through enterprise and skills workshops, meeting rooms and opportunities from those suffering from isolation and loneliness

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Total Project Cost £3,150,380

Amount of CIL requested £300,000 (9.5% of total project cost)

GLA Greater Growth Fund	£1,500,00
Big Lottery Reaching Communities	£500,000
Laing Family Trusts	£200,00
Lester Trust	£100,000
Garfield Weston Foundation	£75,000
Hobson Charity	£50,000
Kingsley Hall Centre	£100,000
Others	£6,800

Together, Kingsley Hall and Liveability have raised around £2,531,800 towards the redevelopment, leaving a funding gap of £618,500. CIL would represent almost half the remaining funding gap, and the remainder would come from other bids and public fundraising

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project will result in reduced revenue costs through increased energy efficiency and reduced maintenance and repair costs. Expanded community operations will unlock further revenue

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project sponsor is Tamara Horbacka, Cultural Policy and Commissioning Manager, LBBD. The works to deliver the whole project have been planned in phases to cause minimal disruption to the existing users. The detailed project delivery plan is included in the application

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks are well managed, with input from GLA regeneration team and Liveability financial expertise. Funding shortfall is amber on the risk register, and would be substantially reduced if the CIL funding could be secured

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The aim of evaluation is continual improvement of community services, responsiveness to local need (especially around business and training opportunities for young people) and a long term approach to monitoring. Important milestones are

Young people – providing training opportunities, space to learn, and to support to avoid local crime and gang culture

Families – building strong networks and spaces for families to engage, reducing isolation and improving skills

Employment – building partners / projects to increase skills / employment options eg SME's, training kitchen etc

Growing as a hub for local business-impact of increased space, on number and quality of partners

Total Score 80/90

Appendix 3

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Box Up Crime – refurbishing pavilion in Leys Park - £300,000 CIL requested

Andrew Carr on behalf of Stephen Addison Box Up Crime

This project is to refurbish the pavilion in Leys Park to make it fit for purpose as a boxing gym and centre for mentoring young people and giving them a purpose. It will create separate male and female changing rooms, and accessible WC and showers

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Community Facilities; Community Safety Project; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills and Enterprise; Health and Social Care; Community Cohesion; Crime and Safety; Fairness; and Arts Culture and Leisure targets

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The project will satisfy elements of future demand from development in the wider area by providing improved community facilities to serve the youth population in a central location

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project is supported by the organisations who use the facility, and a number of funding agencies. The project has also been supported by the council in granting the lease and the premises

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The centre will be open and accessible to all youth. The project will include providing accessible changing rooms, showers and WC, and increasing projects for youth from all sections of the community. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

The improved buildings will provide accessible facilities for all youth, and allow more programmes to aid disadvantaged young people, through mentoring, activities and opportunities from those suffering from isolation and loneliness, to break them away from crime and give them a purpose in life

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependant on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **0**

There is no match funding. The council have granted the lease of the premises, and the organisation bidding for CIL to fit it out and bring it up to standard

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project will result in reduced revenue costs for the council, who will no longer have to maintain the building. Expanded community operations will unlock further revenue

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The organisation would use the council to be the sponsor and deliver the works

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be well managed, as it would be the council doing the work on the building

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

It is difficult to quantify, as the project is about changing the life circumstances of young people. By having a fully functioning centre the ambition is that they would be able to guide and mentor many more young people within the borough

Total Score 70/90

Appendix 4

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

East End Women's Museum – £250,000 CIL requested

Rachel Crossley, Museum Director

The East End Women's Museum project has been granted a lease on a ground floor unit of the new residential development of Abbey Retail Park (south). The CIL bid is to fit out the premises as a museum, dedicated to women's histories and voices

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Community Facilities; Education;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills and Enterprise; Education; Community Cohesion; Crime and Safety; Fairness; and Arts Culture and Leisure

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project will directly provide a community and education facility within a new development.

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project is supported by the organisations who use the expertise on offer, and a number of funding agencies. The project has also been supported by the council in granting the lease and the premises

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The EEWM has inclusion and representation at its heart. It will ensure that those who are traditionally marginalised have a voice. This includes women of colour, women with disabilities, lesbian and bi women, trans women, working class women and older women. The aim is to create a space where everyone feels welcome, including men and boys. The site will be fully physically accessible, and free to enter for LBBD residents. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependant on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Funding is being sought from the National Lottery Heritage fund (£100,000), other trusts and foundations (£170,000) , corporate giving (£30,000) and crowd funding (£50,000). The fit out will cost £596,568, and CIL is requested for £250,000 (40% of the cost)

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project will unlock income generating opportunities, from earned income, individual giving, corporate giving and trusts and foundations

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The project sponsor is Tamara Horbacka, Cultural Policy and Commissioning Officer of LBBD. The design phase would begin in January 2020, with handover from the developer in April 2021 and opening in September 2021

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be well managed, through the experienced staff and Board team. The main risk is insufficient funding

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Success will be monitored in a number of ways. Audience feedback will be collected through exit surveys and focus groups, 4000 residents of the Abbey Retail Park will be surveyed, and they will tap in to borough wide surveys about satisfaction with the local area, educational attainment, arts participation and health and wellbeing.

Total Score 84/90

Appendix 5

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Becontree Centenary - £774,789 CIL requested

Hadrian Garrard, Create London

6 projects are proposed as part of this bid to work to restore the character of the Becontree Estate over the next 20 years, as set out in the Better Placed Becontree 2040 Strategy. Specifically, the bid covers

£69,638 desire line lighting pathway through Parsloes Park

£55,154 30 commemorative plaques throughout the estate

£190,160 100 x site specific street furniture

£84,525 100 x positive way finding and information signs

£203,651 greening public amenities and verges

£171,661 new playground in Parsloes Park

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces, Community Safety projects; Community facilities

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Regeneration; Education; Community Cohesion; Environment; Crime and Safety; and Arts Culture and Leisure

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The project will improve the environment throughout the Becontree Estate, improving and upgrading access and facilities for existing and new borough residents, and generate civic pride

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Create London has been working with the local community at the White House for the last 4 years over which time they have built a relationship with residents. The Becontree Group has been formed for the community to be instrumental in shaping the public programme. There has also been extensive discussion with

the Parks Team and Culture Team to help identify areas for public realm improvements

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics
Rate from 1-10 **8**

The Becontree Estate is home to a large number of social housing tenants as well as a rising number of private renters and owners. The population of the estate has become considerably more ethnically diverse with growth in representation from people with Black African, Black Caribbean, Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani heritage. 18.5% of residents don't have English as their first language. The aim of the projects would not be to influence popular taste, but would instead aim to foster a culture of co-design of shared spaces. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Funding of £74,700 has been granted from the National Lottery Heritage fund, and a bid will be made for £373,300 for the Stage 2 bid in November 2019

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **6**

By inviting residents to have a say and take part in the transformation of the estate, the project will contribute to creating a new civic culture which would reduce revenue costs of ongoing maintenance by citizen protection of the projects. Projects that evolve with the community are less likely to require high ongoing maintenance and repair.

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Create London have proven that they deliver projects. They will lead on production and delivery, working with LBBD

9. Risk Management and Constraints
Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be well managed, through the experienced staff and Board team.
Working closely with LBBD stakeholders and local residents

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Success will be monitored in a number of ways. Evaluation will be embedded throughout the project, by collecting feedback and monitoring attendees, reach and project quality

Total Score 74/90

Appendix 6

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

New Tree Planting on Housing Amenity Land – £128,050 CIL requested

Colin Richardson, LBBP Parks and Environment

The proposal is to increase the number of trees in low tree population areas, specifically on housing amenity greens in and around council tenancy blocks and green spaces bordering roads. The bid is for £128,000 split in to £96,850 to plant 650 trees in year one, followed by £31,200 for watering maintenance of the trees the following year

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements including hard and soft landscaping;
Sports, Leisure, parks and open spaces;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **2**
Environment

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The project will not directly address the impact of new development, as it would be located in areas of existing development. However, more tree planting would offset carbon emissions, and this indirectly responds to development

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Whilst there is no direct input from the community for tree planting in these areas, there is general support for planting more trees, such as from the GLA, and the Trees for Cities and Arbor Day Foundation

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **2**

Tree planting would have no direct impact on cohesion and equalities groups, although there would be indirect impact from the shared environmental goal of improving the environment

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **0**

No match funding is identified. However, there may be funding for tree funding from other sources, such as the GLA

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **4**

£31,200 of the bid would be for maintenance of the trees in the year following planting. Following that, the maintenance would be limited, and pruning limited because the trees would be planted in the Right Tree Right Place practice

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The project sponsor is Paul Clark, Head of Parks and Environment of LBBD. The planting would begin in October 2019, in the autumn winter period going through to February 2020. The delivery project will be managed by Colin Richardson. With funding unlikely to be decided until mid October 2019, it is unlikely that this project can be delivered in full in the winter planting period of 2019-20

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **4**

There are risks that the number of trees cannot be planned and purchased and planted within the projected timescale. There are then risks that a proportion of the trees may die or be vandalised

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Monitoring of the success of the project will be through inspections of the trees to confirm that the correct trees have been planted in the correct places and that they can survive

Total Score 35/90

Appendix 7

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Making LBBD Greener – £450,000 CIL requested

Gary Jones, LBBD

CIL is sought to develop a number of projects and initiatives across the borough that focus on improving air quality. These projects include £20,000 for additional air quality monitoring kits, £20,000 for green planting and employing a project officer and environmental protection officer

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; However, it must be noted that the proposal for staffing cannot be supported by CIL

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **2**

Will help achieve the Environment target

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The project will monitor air quality throughout the borough, particularly the air quality management plan areas. The funding would allow a concentration of air quality monitoring in the areas subject to development pressures

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **2**

Air quality is high on the political and public agenda, although there is no direct community involvement in the project.

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **0**

Air quality affects all residents, and this project would not specifically have an impact on one group above another

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependant on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **0**

No match funding has been identified

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **0**

A substantial part of the bid is for staffing costs, which cannot be supported from CIL funding.

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **0**

The air quality action plan will be launched in January 2020. There is no direct delivery plan for the project. It is proposed that a dedicated project officer be employed from the funding, to carry the project through. However, staffing cannot be supported through CIL

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **0**
No risk management has been provided

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

There will be regular monitoring of air quality through the new air monitoring stations

Total Score 20/90

Appendix 8

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Green Spaces -Tackling Litter and addressing infrastructure issues £96,000 CIL requested

Paul Clark, LBBD

The project is to remove all the old dog and litter bins (205) in the council parks, and replace them with larger, dual use units and locate these at entrances and exits, and in high use areas.

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces, Community Safety projects;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Regeneration; Community Cohesion; Environment; Crime and Safety; and Arts Culture and Leisure

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **10**

New development will increase the number of people living in the borough and high-density housing with limited on site amenity space will intensify the use of the public parks in the borough. The project will improve the environment throughout all the parks, reducing tipping and fly tipping, and health hazards from waste being dumped on the ground. It will improve the park facilities for existing and new borough residents, and generate civic pride

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **8**

In the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2017, the consultations revealed that cleanliness, safety and the quality of the facilities for parents and children in parks were identified as the most important issues affecting enjoyment and use of parks and open spaces

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Making the parks cleaner and more attractive will increase their attractiveness to all residents of the borough. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependant on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The total project cost is £116,800, so CIL is being sought for just over 80% of the total cost

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Advertisements on the bins will generate income. Revenue costs of the service should be reduced by collection of refuse being more efficient, and not scattered throughout the parks. Projects that evolve with the community are less likely to require high ongoing maintenance and repair.

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The delivery strategy is planned to be for immediate delivery once funding is allocated

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be well managed, through the experienced staff of LBBD

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **6**

Monitoring will be through collection times, and reports of waste being scattered in the parks.

Total Score 80/90

Appendix 9

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Thames Clipper extension £600,000 CIL requested

David Watkinson, Barking Riverside

The proposal will assist in enabling the development of the required infrastructure and improvement to the existing and currently redundant T jetty to enable use by Thames Clipper river bus services. The required T jetty will support the regeneration of the wider Opportunity Area and enable Creekmouth and Thames View

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Transport Improvements, Environmental Improvements; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills, Enterprise; Housing; Regeneration; Community Cohesion; Environment;

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **10**

This project will directly address development. It will allow infrastructure to be provided to unlock an additional form of access to Barking Riverside. This will remove a barrier to allow the housing and employment opportunities to be developed

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Community engagement has shown a desire for residents of the area to have an increased access to the river and the Thames Clipper will provide a meaningful purpose to the river

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The proposal will open access to the river for all, and provide an additional means of transport for residents to access employment

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The total project cost is £3,000,000 so CIL is being sought for 20% of the total cost

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Barking Riverside Ltd, and thereafter the CIC will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure needed to access the river bus services. The riverbus service will operate commercially and not need further council funding

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

BRL will be responsible for managing and monitoring the installation of required infrastructure. BRL will report progress updates to the Barking Riverside Steering Group. The Steering Group comprises of BRL and stakeholders from LBDD, Be First, Transport for London and an independent chair.

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

There would be minimal risk to project delivery, other than delays in securing planning consents and general construction risks

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Monitoring will be through the BRL steering group

Total Score 82/90

Appendix 10

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Building a green community infrastructure £117,800 CIL requested

Kathrin Bohm, Company Drinks CIC

The CIL bid is for £75,300 to refurbish Barking Pavilion, installing accessible WC, multifunctional classroom and sustainable heating system, £6,500 for a mobile tool kit and £36,000 for 3 annual local food producer markets

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Education facilities, Environmental Improvements; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces; Community Facilities

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills, Enterprise; Health and Social Care; Community Cohesion; Environment; Arts, Culture, Leisure

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **6**

This project will provide a new community facility in Barking Park, close to areas of regeneration and development, that will be accessible to existing residents and all new residents in the development. This will offset the minimal amenity space of the new high-density development.

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Community engagement is ongoing with participants. Demand and need for activities from LBBD partners and schools to run workshops, requests to replicate the Grow Club model elsewhere in the borough with community groups

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **10**

All Company Drinks activities are accessible, open to all ages, and free to participate in. Projects reduce social isolation and encourage intergenerational working. The weekly Grow Club was set up to invite referrals from Vocational Support services and focuses on health and wellbeing, in particular for those needing mental health support

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependant on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **10**

£18,000 funding has been confirmed from Welcome Trust, £18,000 from Parks and Ranger service, £9000 from Big Lottery Community fund and the project is expected to generate income if £24,000 from sales. £72,000 is being sought from the National Lottery Community Fund / Reaching Communities

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Income can be generated from outsourced services for racking, income from venue hire, sales of produce, working with clients to commission workshops throughout London

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The project is sponsored by Tamara Horbacka, Cultural Policy and Commissioning Officer. Delivery of the pavilion refurbishment is programmed to commence in year one, and complete and open in year 2.

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be from delays with contractors, additional building work identified, time taken for additional training of participants

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

There would be pre-agreed measures of success or failure with partners, consultation with participants, continuous reporting and data collection, annual reviews, self-sufficiency and sustainability of groups at the end of year 3.

Total Score 78/90

Appendix 11

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

A Reimagined Eastbury (Orchard) – £114,000 CIL requested

Lisa Rigg, Heritage Properties Manager

The aims of the project are to better connect the Grade 1 listed house and south lawn with the rest of the site, commission archaeological research, commission a landscape artist to provide detailed proposal for the south lawn, install a new boundary on the south side and design a detailed planting scheme for the south moat.

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Will help achieve the Environment; and Arts, Culture and Leisure targets

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The project will improve the historic environment at the house and gardens, improving facilities for existing and new borough residents, and generate civic pride

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Surveys have been undertaken of visitors

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The project will make the south lawn more accessible for those with disabilities. The redesign of the south lawn will attract resident's attention and be an opportunity for residents to be involved in the planting and maintenance of the orchard

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **6**

£87,000 funding from LBBD capital projects has been approved, as has £6000 from LBBD Ranger service

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The orchard maintenance will be undertaken by volunteers and costs will come from existing maintenance budgets

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The delivery plan will be worked up once the funding amount has been finalised. The project will be managed by Lisa Rigg, Heritage Property manager of LBBD, assisted by Gareth Winn (LBBD Ranger Service) and Carolin Gohler (National Trust).

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **6**

Risks are reputational if the works are not done in a way to conserve and better protect the heritage and environmental value of the site.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **10**

There will be regular steering group meetings, quarterly reports, visitor numbers on site will be monitored, incidents of anti social behaviour logged, income and visitor performance review

Total Score 48/90

Appendix 12

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Greatfields School – £2,000,000 CIL requested

Jane Hargreaves, LBBD

Greatfields Secondary School is being built in the Gascoigne Regeneration Area. The CIL bid is being made for £2,000,000 funding to enable the community to use the facilities to the fullest extent. Specifically, money is being sought to provide a MUGA (£750,000), enhancements to the sports hall (£750,000) and community access arrangements (£500,000)

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Community Facilities; Education;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Employment, Skills and Enterprise; Education; Regeneration; Community Cohesion; and Arts Culture and Leisure

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The school is being built to directly address school place provision as a result of regeneration and development.

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **2**

There is support for a school in this location, and this was borne out during the consultation process for the free school. However, the school is being funded by ESFA.

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The school will be fully accessible, as required as a new school.

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **8**

£40 million funding has been provided for the school itself from the ESFA. The funding being sought is for additional facilities for the school. £4 million has been provided from DfE Basic Needs funding.

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **10**

CIL would not be required for maintenance costs. Any maintenance would come from the schools budget. Income would be generated from letting the sports facilities and community rooms

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The project sponsor is Jane Hargreaves, Commissioning Director of Education of LBBD. Phase 1 was delivered in January 2018, Phase 2a was completed in August 2019, and Phase 2b is programmed to be completed in May 2021. The project would be managed by Be First

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would come from the construction project. Existing risks already identified are disconnection and re-routing of existing services, which was not identified until construction was under way. Construction risks for the buildings would be managed by the Local Education Partnership.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The success of the project in terms of construction is monitored by Be First. Quality of teaching is monitored by Ofsted, but there are no proposals submitted as to how the success of the upgraded sports facilities and leasing rooms to the community would be measured.

Total Score 64/90

Appendix 13

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Redressing Valance - – £164,848 CIL requested

Lisa Rigg, Heritage Properties Manager

This is a large-scale project to improve the heritage and environmental value and historic setting of this Grade II* listed building. The application is to help fund the first stage of works required, including a new Vision and Masterplan for the grounds to make changes to the historic moat and lake to improve the overall visitor experience.

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported
Yes Environmental Improvements;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.
Rate from 1-10 **4**
Will help achieve the Environment; and Arts, Culture and Leisure targets
3. Impact from new development that project addresses
Rate from 1-10 **2**
The project will improve the historic environment at the house and gardens, improving facilities for existing and new borough residents, and generate civic pride
4. Support from community and stakeholders
Rate from 1-10 **4**
Surveys have been undertaken of visitors, and specific visitor groups
5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics
Rate from 1-10 **4**
The project will make the northern and southern moats more accessible for those with disabilities and assess important health and safety concerns. There is currently anti-social behaviour on the site affecting community cohesion, and upgrading the moat will seek to address this to improve the visitor experience

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed
Rate from 1-10 **6**
The total cost of Stage 1 of the project is £229,848, and £164,848 CIL is sought. £65,000 funding from LBBD capital projects has been approved for Stage 1, and £315,000 from LBBD Capital Funding for Stages 2 and 3. Up to £3 million could be bid for from National Lottery Heritage Fund.

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The orchard maintenance will be undertaken by volunteers and costs will come from existing maintenance budgets

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The delivery plan will be worked up once the funding amount has been finalised. The project will be managed by Lisa Rigg, Heritage Property Manager of LBBD, and Andy Johnson (LBBD Lead Commissioner - Parks)

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **6**

Risks are reputational if the works are not done in a way to conserve and better protect the heritage and environmental value of the site.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **10**

There will be regular steering group meetings, quarterly reports, visitor numbers on site will be monitored, incidents of anti-social behaviour logged, income and visitor performance review

Total Score 50/90

Appendix 14

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Biodiversity Improvements in Public Parkland – £50,000 CIL requested

Ichettira Chengappa, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage

The proposal is to make new bee meadows across the borough with a focus on increasing plant diversity, wild bee numbers and wildflower interest. £50,000 is sought from CIL, allocated at £20,000 for the first year followed by £10,000 in each of the following years.

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, Leisure, Parks and Open Spaces

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **2**

Will help achieve the Environment target

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The project will provide improvements to habitat and ecology of the area, to offset any loss of open space and habitat from development

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy 2017 showed extensive community support for parks, with higher attention to be paid to wildlife and the natural environment.

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The schemes will provide additional outdoor activities and opportunities for volunteer groups of all kinds, which will improve community cohesion generally

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **0**

No match funding exists

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it

intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **4**

There may be maintenance costs, but these would be absorbed into the Parks and Environment budget, and they would manage this along with other changes to the parks

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **6**

It is planned that the work would be carried out by March 2021. Further progress would then be staged, depending on the success of the initial scheme

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **6**

Minor delivery and reputational risks from changing management practices in some parks.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **2**

To be carried out by Parks Commissioning

Total Score 30/90

Appendix 15

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Room on the Broom Sculpture Trail, Eastbrookend Country Park – £25,000 CIL requested

Andy Johnson, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage

£25,000 is sought from CIL to create an interactive sculpture trail based on the children's book "Room on the Broom". The sculptures would be carved by a chainsaw sculptor and would tell the story through sculptures throughout the country park encouraging families to explore and get active in the park

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, Leisure, Parks and Open Spaces,

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Will help achieve the Environment, and Arts, Culture and Leisure targets

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **2**

New developments at high density will increase the demand for leisure and use of open spaces. This will add an attraction to an existing park.

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The idea of the Sculpture Park came from consultations with the Friends of Eastbrookend Country Park

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The Sculpture Trail would be free to use and would be open to all irrespective of gender, age, ethnic background or religion.

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The project costs £30,000 and there is £5,000 funding from Freedom Group to be used on projects at Eastbrookend Park.

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it

intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The route of the Sculpture Trail is already under grounds maintenance of the park, and any repairs would come out of existing Country Pak revenue budgets

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The project will be managed by the Ranger Service. The sculptures would need to be commissioned and agreed, signage installed and the sculptures installed prior to opening

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

There are no foreseeable risks.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The number of visits to the park will be monitored for the country park 6 months before the installation and again 6 months after to quantify the difference in footfall

Total Score 46/90

Appendix 16

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Safer Parks, Healthier Communities - – £84,000 CIL requested

Andy Johnson, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage

£84,000 CIL is sought to undertake measures to improve safety in parks. This project aims to provide assurance to the public through direct action and various high profile initiatives to solve agreed safety priorities in the boroughs parks and open spaces, and reduce anti-social behaviour. The aim is to take measures to be awarded the Green Flag Award scheme for all 28 of the boroughs parks to take action to address key crime and ASB issues. A large part of the bid will be to develop a ParkWatch scheme for all the borough parks

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, Leisure, Parks and Open Spaces, Community Safety Projects

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Will help achieve the Community Cohesion, Environment, Crime and Safety, Arts, Culture and Leisure target

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **8**

New developments at high density will increase the demand for leisure and use of open spaces. To address the higher levels of use, the project will make people feel safer using the parks.

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The Parks and Open Spaces Study 2017 was preceded by a detailed consultation and engagement process. Less than 50% of respondents considered the parks in Barking to be good, so improvements to parks will address the views of the community

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The parks are free to use for all members of the community. Fear of crime will prevent some groups from using parks, so this project will address this to encourage wider use and community cohesion.

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **2**

The project costs £84,000 and there is no match funding identified.

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **8**

There would be no additional revenue impacts resulting in this initiative. Any related costs would be offset by savings in reduced vandalism and ASB, Safer parks could unlock further income generation opportunities in parks

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Delivery will be managed by Parks Commissioning and in co-ordination with Parks and Environment over a 3-year period in accordance with the delivery plan. The aim will be to achieve several quick wins to build public confidence, and to engage with residents and partners to identify the key areas for action

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

There are a number of risks if this project isn't implemented. These would be reputational, risks to community cohesion, economic and health risks from increased vandalism and damage to play equipment in parks.

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The annual residents survey will monitor the perception of safety in parks felt by all residents across the borough. Award of Green Flag accreditation will also be a measure of success to be monitored against

Total Score 66/90

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Barking and Dagenham Local Football Facility Plan (LFFP) – £160,000 CIL requested

Andy Johnson, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage

The Football Association, the Premier League and Sport England are behind a national initiative to provide direct investment in existing and new football facilities. Local Football Facility Plans guide the allocation of 90% of national funds. The LFFP identifies opportunities to accurately target investment in to football facilities across the local area. This bid is to support 4 of the 12 priority LFFP projects. These are

- Mayesbrook Park football pavilion
- Old Dagenham Park football pavilion
- Valence Park football pavilion
- Pondfield Park – multi use games park.

The cost of the works is £400,000. £160,000 is sought from CIL to be able to support a bid to the football foundation for the remaining £240,000

Section 2

11. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Sport, leisure, parks and open spaces, Community facilities

Section 3

12. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Will help achieve the Community Cohesion; Environment; Health and Social Care; Crime and Safety; and Arts Culture and Leisure targets

13. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The project will improve the football facilities in 4 parks, to provide more active opportunities for the new residents coming into the borough from new development

14. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The LFFP was prepared with support from partners including LBBD, Dagenham and Redbridge Community Foundation, Football Foundation, West Ham United Foundation, Essex FA, Sport England

15. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Parks are free to use and diverse, they are open to all irrespective of age, gender, ethnic background or religion. Upgrades to facilities will improve access for changing facilities for women footballers, and those with disabilities

Section 4

16. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding eg through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The cost of the project is £400,000, and a bid will be made to the Football Foundation for £240,000. This bid will only stand a chance of success if it is part funded, with CIL making up £160,000

17. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Improvements to the facilities will increase the potential for hire of these facilities, and therefore income generation.

Section 5

18. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **10**

The delivery strategy will be in accordance of the specifications of the Football Foundation

19. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

There is risk to reputation if the pavilions are not upgraded and the facilities are not fit for purpose. Without investment, the facilities may have to close if they are not safe for public use

20. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **10**

Success will be monitored in a number of ways. Evaluation will be embedded throughout the project, by collecting feedback and monitoring attendees, reach and project quality

Total Score 82/90

Appendix 18

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Safe Woodlands – £21,000 CIL requested

Andy Johnson, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage

The health, wellbeing and safety of the woodlands within Barking and Dagenham relies on effective management for the woodlands to thrive. A CIL bid of £21,000 is sought, (£7,000 a year over 3 years) for management of the woodlands

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements including hard and soft landscaping; Sports, Leisure, parks and open spaces;

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **2**

Will help address the Environment target

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **0**

The project will not address the impact of new development

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The Friends of Eastbrookend Country Park have full support of the project, as well as the support of the Parks and Environment and the Councils' Tree Officer

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Tree maintenance would have no direct impact on cohesion and equalities groups, although there would be indirect impact from the shared environmental goal of improving the environment

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **2**

£3000 match funding is identified from Land of the Fanns, to be used to train staff and volunteers to manage the woodlands. There is no revenue budget for tree maintenance

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Most of the CIL budget would be used for maintenance or operational costs

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery regarding the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The project sponsor is Andy Johnson, LBBD Leisure, Parks and Heritage. The Parks and Countryside Ranger Service would manage the project

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **4**

There are risks of reputational damage if the trees are not managed correctly and this may incur additional costs of repairs, maintenance, insurance claims etc

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **4**

Monitoring of the success of the project will be through inspections of the trees to remove health and safety hazards

Total Score 26/90

Appendix 19

Strategic CIL Project Appraisal Scoring Criteria

Section 1 – Applicant Information

Greening the Fiddlers – £350,000 CIL requested

Tim Martin, BeFirst

Greening the Fiddlers is a community led transport, environmental and neighbourhood improvements project focused on reducing dominance of vehicular traffic in Becontree Heath. There are 3 core priorities to the work – reducing traffic dominance, transforming the public realm and facilitating active / green travel. £1.35 million is required, and £1million has been committed by TfL. £350,000 is sought from the CIL bid. The project has already commenced

Section 2

1. Does this project support the delivery of infrastructure identified on the Council's Regulation 123 list? If no, project will not be supported

Yes Environmental Improvements; Transport Improvements

Section 3

2. Impact of project on delivering Borough Manifesto targets.

Rate from 1-10 **6**

Will help achieve the Health and Social Care; Environment; Crime and Safety

3. Impact from new development that project addresses

Rate from 1-10 **6**

The borough is subject to growth, with 50,000 new homes targeted for development. This increase in numbers of people living and working in the borough may increase pressure on local roads. This project will indirectly address issues of increased traffic around this junction

4. Support from community and stakeholders

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Some initial public engagement was undertaken in June 2018 which identified issues with transport and air quality in the area. There is financial support for the project from Transport for London

5. Impact on cohesion and equalities groups with protected characteristics

Rate from 1-10 **4**

The overall impact of the project will benefit all groups of society. The investment will help address the needs of those with protected characteristics under the Public Sector Equality duty

Section 4

6. How much match funding does the project have or unlock? If CIL is being used to unlock match funding e.g. through a bid, CIL contribution will be dependent on the match funding being confirmed

Rate from 1-10 **6**

Total project cost of £1.35 million. Funding of £1million has been confirmed from TfL over years 2 and 3, and the project has begun as it has been funded.

7. The revenue impacts and what if any CIL is needed for maintenance and / or operational costs; what are the revenue impacts of the project and how is it intended that this is funded? Is any CIL funding required for maintenance or operational costs?

Rate from 1-10 **6**

If there are any revenue impacts, they will be picked up in the existing highways maintenance budget.

Section 5

8. The robustness of the delivery strategy including how will the project be delivered and the timetable for delivery with regard to the growth impacts the project is meant to be addressing

Rate from 1-10 **8**

The works have already commenced. A project delivery team are already in place to oversee delivery of the project. There will be monthly updates to the steering group and quarterly meetings with the GLA and TfL to report on progress

9. Risk Management and Constraints

Rate from 1-10 (severe to mild) **8**

Risks would be well managed, through the risk register. Delays could occur through cost overruns or lack of community buy in

10. Strength of Monitoring Regime

Rate from 1-10 **8**

Success will be monitored in a number of ways over a 3-year period. Evaluation will be embedded throughout the project, by collecting feedback and monitoring data on reduction in traffic volumes, and corresponding increase in journeys by public transport, cycling and walking.

Total Score 60/90