

| Community Infrastructure Levy Project Evaluation |  |  | SIP1 - Active Travel Links |                |                              | SIP2 - Leapool Roundabout Park and Ride Service |                |                              | SIP3 - Blue / Green Infrastructure Improvement Works |                |                              | SIP4 - Ambition Arnold |                |                              |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
|  |  |  | Score                      | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score   | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score  | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score                  | Weighted Score | Comments                     |
| Criteria   |  |  |                            |                |                              |   |                |                              |  |                |                              |                        |                |                              |
| Relationship to Local Development                |  |  | 17.5                       | 5              | See project tab for comments | 4   | 14             | See project tab for comments | 5  | 17.5           | See project tab for comments | 4                      | 14             | See project tab for comments |
| Public Benefits                                  |  |  | 17.5                       | 5              |                              | 4   | 14             |                              | 5  | 17.5           |                              | 4                      | 14             |                              |
| Deliverability and Sustainability                |  |  | 17.5                       | 5              |                              | 1   | 3.5            |                              | 2  | 7              |                              | 3                      | 10.5           |                              |
| Value for Money                                  |  |  | 17.5                       | 5              |                              | 1   | 3.5            |                              | 1  | 3.5            |                              | 1                      | 3.5            |                              |
| Match Funding                                    |  |  | 30                         | 5              |                              | 1   | 6.00           |                              | 1  | 6.00           |                              | 1                      | 6.00           |                              |
|  |  |  | 100%                       | 100            |                              | 51.50   |                |                              | 51.50  |                |                              | 48.00                  |                |                              |
| Ranking  |  |  |                            | 2              |                              |   | 5              |                              |  | 2              |                              |                        | 4              |                              |

| SIP5 - Carlton Leisure and Community Centre |                |                              | SIP6 - Gedling Country Park Heritage Centre |                |                              | SIP7 - MAS Community CIC HUB |                |                              | SIP8 - Connectivity Between Papplewick & Mansfield |                |                              |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|
| Score                                       | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score                                       | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score                        | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score  | Weighted Score | Comments                     |
| 5   | 17.5           | See project tab for comments | 4   | 14             | See project tab for comments | 2                            | 7              | See project tab for comments | 2  | 7              | See project tab for comments |
| 5   | 17.5           |                              | 3   | 10.5           |                              | 0                            | 0              |                              | 3  | 10.5           |                              |
| 3   | 10.5           |                              | 2   | 7              |                              | 1                            | 3.5            |                              | 1  | 3.5            |                              |
| 2   | 7              |                              | 1   | 3.5            |                              | 2                            | 7              |                              | 1  | 3.5            |                              |
| 1   | 6              |                              | 1   | 6              |                              | 3                            | 18             |                              | 1  | 6              |                              |
|   | 58.5           |                              |   | 41             |                              |                              | 35.5           |                              |  | 30.5           |                              |
|   | 1              |                              |   | 5              |                              |                              | 7              |                              |  | 11             |                              |

| SIP9 - Expansion of Calverton Centre Car Parking |                |                              | SIP10 - New Cemetery at Hollinwood Lane |                |                              | SIP11 - Re-development of William Lee Park |                |                              | SIP12 - Manor Park Infant and Nursery School Play |                |                              |
|--|----------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|--|----------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------------------|
| Score  | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score                                   | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score                                      | Weighted Score | Comments                     | Score   | Weighted Score | Comments                     |
| 4  | 14             | See project tab for comments | 4                                       | 14             | See project tab for comments | 4  | 14             | See project tab for comments | 4   | 14             | See project tab for comments |
| 0  | 0              |                              | 0                                       | 0              |                              | 0  | 0              |                              | 0   | 0              |                              |
| 1  | 3.5            |                              | 3                                       | 10.5           |                              | 3  | 10.5           |                              | 3   | 10.5           |                              |
| 2  | 7              |                              | 2                                       | 7              |                              | 2  | 7              |                              | 2   | 7              |                              |
| 1  | 6              |                              | 0                                       | 0              |                              | 0  | 0              |                              | 0   | 0              |                              |
|  | 30.5           |                              |   | 31.5           |                              |  | 31.5           |                              |   | 31.5           |                              |
|  | 11             |                              |   | 8              |                              |  | 8              |                              |   | 8              |                              |

| Description   | Criteria                                 |
|---|--|
| The nomination is able to demonstrate a direct link between the proposed project and the CIL Liable developments that have been constructed within the locality.  | <b>Relationship to Development</b>       |
| The nomination is able to demonstrate the positive impacts and opportunities the proposed project would create for the users and the wider general public. The project should be able to demonstrate how it contributes to the Councils Strategic Policies for its development plan. Where possible projects must be able to be utilised by all members of the public rather than any specific group/organisation.  | <b>Wider Public Benefits</b>             |
| The nomination demonstrates that the project is deliverable in a timely manner and that steps have been taken to approach and collaborate with any other stakeholders / contractors that would be involved in getting the project off the ground. The nomination should also include evidence to demonstrate that once the project has been delivered, appropriate measures are in place to ensure that the project will be managed / operational in a sustainable manner for the foreseeable future. | <b>Deliverability and Sustainability</b> |
| The nomination demonstrates that the project would provide good value for money and would be good combination of cost, quality and sustainability to meet the needs of the locality. Costs should include and detail ongoing maintenance costs and how these would be covered.  | <b>Value for Money</b>                   |
| The nomination details other revenue sources of Match Funding which have been secured or are in the process of being secured. Match funding is a key consideration when evaluating the suitability of projects to ensure that maximum value can be obtained through the CIL Non-Parish Neighbourhood Receipts.  | <b>Match Funding</b>                     |

| Assessment           | Score | Interpretation   |
|----------------------|-------|--|
| Excellent            | 5     | <b>Exceeds the requirement</b><br>Exceptional demonstration by the nomination that the relevant project will clearly meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria. Submission identifies several factors that will offer potential added value, with substantial supporting evidence.               |
| Good                 | 4     | <b>Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits</b><br>Above average demonstration by the nomination that the relevant project will clearly meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria. Submission identifies factors that will offer potential added value with supporting evidence. |
| Acceptable           | 3     | <b>Satisfies the requirement</b><br>Demonstration by the nomination that the relevant project will clearly meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria.  |
| Minor Reservations   | 2     | <b>Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations</b><br>Some minor reservations of the nominations relevant suitability to meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria with little or no evidence to support submission.   |
| Serious Reservations | 1     | <b>Satisfies the requirement with major reservations</b><br>Considerable reservations of the nominations relevant suitability to meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria with little or no evidence to support submission.   |
| Unacceptable         | 0     | <b>Does not meet the requirement</b><br>Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the nomination would meet the aims/objectives of the relevant criteria with little or no evidence to support the submission.  |

| Final Rating |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>80+</b>   | Likely to be considered essential Infrastructure for the future of the Borough. |
| <b>60-80</b> | Highly desirable and potentially time sensitive Infrasrtructure projects.       |
| <b>40-60</b> | Desireable projects but not considered to be essential.                         |
| <b>20-40</b> | Projects that could have value but fall short on multiple criteria.             |
| <b>0-20</b>  | Projects that are not deemed suitable.  |