

COMMITTEE REPORT

Subject:	CIL Stage 2 Scoring and Project Prioritisation – Current Applications
Committee:	The Communities Committee
Item Number:	16
Date:	12 October 2026
Author:	Andrew Hunt, Corporate Manager
Report status:	Decision
Confidential / Exempt:	No

1.Report Summary

This report presents the three current Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applications that have passed the Stage 1 gateway and asks the Committee to decide which project or projects should receive conditional priority and therefore justify further officer time through the project-assurance stage.

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to show Members what each project proposes, how it has scored at Stage 2, the principal benefits and the main matters still unresolved, so that Committee can decide where limited officer capacity should be directed.
- 1.2 The three applications are Coldharbour Lane Footpath (CIL/2026/001), Harnham Memorial Hall refurbishment (CIL/2026/002) and Making Broken Bridges Accessible (CIL/2026/003). Each application received a PASS at Stage 1. A gateway pass establishes potential eligibility only; it is not a funding award.
- 1.3 This report follows the separate CIL Process Review, Risk and Resourcing report. Under the strengthened process proposed in that report, Stage 2 scoring informs a Committee conditional-priority decision before any detailed project assurance or final funding decision is undertaken.
- 1.4 Committee is therefore not being asked to award CIL at this meeting. It is being asked to decide which projects are sufficiently important to justify further officer work to establish whether they can be safely delivered and funded.
- 1.5 Conditional priority commits officer time only. It does not reserve a final CIL sum, authorise expenditure or guarantee a later award. Any project progressed would return to Communities Committee for a separate final award decision after the full cost, permissions, delivery arrangements and material risks have been resolved and documented.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that the Committee:

- 2.1 Considers the Stage 2 assessment of each current application and determines, separately for Coldharbour Lane Footpath, Harnham Memorial Hall and Making Broken Bridges Accessible, whether the project should receive conditional priority and proceed to officer project assurance.
- 2.2 For each project not given conditional priority, determines whether it should be placed on the reserve list, deferred pending further information, or declined for the current CIL round.
- 2.3 Notes that conditional priority commits officer time only and does not constitute a CIL funding award, reserve a final sum or authorise payment.
- 2.4 Agrees that any project receiving conditional priority will proceed to officer project assurance and will return to Communities Committee for a separate final award decision once the verified full cost, delivery arrangements and material risks have been resolved and documented.
- 2.5 Notes the detailed Stage 2 scoring rationale and project-specific matters to resolve at Appendices A to C.

3. Background

- 3.1 Full Council approved the current CIL allocation framework on 9 March 2026. The framework introduced a Stage 1 gateway, Stage 2 weighted scoring and Stage 3 banding to support the consideration of CIL applications.
- 3.2 The Stage 2 matrix weights development impact at 25%, alignment with the Salisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan at 20%, community benefit at 20%, deliverability/readiness at 15%, value for money at 10% and long-term sustainability/legacy at 10%.
- 3.3 The Corporate Manager completed Stage 1 gateway assessments for all three current applications. Each received a PASS, while the assessments also identified matters that must be resolved before any final funding commitment. The gateway assessments therefore separate potential CIL eligibility from project readiness.

4. Proposal

- 4.1 The Committee is asked to use the Stage 2 score as one part of its judgement about whether further officer time is justified. The score compares strategic merit; it does not remove the need to consider the nature of the project, the evidence available, the scale of community benefit and the extent of the unresolved work.

Adopted Stage 2 scoring matrix

Criterion	Weight	Score	Points allocation
Addresses impact of new development	25%	1–5	1 point for each evidenced factor: environmental impact; traffic/transport; pressure on local services/community assets; strong community voice; citywide impact.
Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan	20%	0 or 5	0 if the project conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan; 5 if it meets its aspirations and does not conflict.
Community benefit	20%	1–5	1 road; 2 Lower-layer Super Output Area; 3 ward; 4 citywide; 5 city and beyond.
Deliverability/readiness to start	15%	1, 3 or 5	1 initial project plan underway; 3 partially developed; 5 fully worked up/ready to go.
Value for money	10%	1, 3 or 5	1 weak; 3 medium; 5 strong.
Long-term sustainability/legacy	10%	1–5	1 point for each evidenced factor: enduring benefits; future maintenance considered; ongoing support clear; adaptable asset; exit strategy.

Adopted Stage 3 banding

Band	Meaning	Decision guidance
Band A – High Strategic Priority	Strong alignment with strategic goals and CIL priorities	Prioritise for CIL funding
Band B – Supporting Priority	Good alignment but lower scale or urgency	May be funded subject to available resources
Band C – Lower Priority	Limited or indirect alignment	Unlikely to be funded from CIL at this time
Band D – Not Suitable	Poor fit or outside CIL scope	Not eligible for CIL funding

- 4.2 The current scores are: Coldharbour Lane Footpath – 64%; Harnham Memorial Hall – 57%; and Making Broken Bridges Accessible – 60%. A summary comparison is included below, with detailed scoring and project-specific risks at Appendices A to C.

Project	What it is	Current figure	Stage 2 score	Main matters still to resolve
Coldharbour Lane Footpath	Formal accessible pedestrian path between Dennis Marsh House and River Park access.	Approx. £35,000	64% – Band B	Width/design; highway crossings; garage access; land/title/utilities; final cost/procurement; maintenance.
Harnham Memorial Hall	Structural repair and refurbishment of the existing community hall.	£90,000 requested	57% – Band B	Asbestos; structural movement; fire/electrical safety; settled scope; complete current costing; consents; maintenance.
Making Broken Bridges Accessible	Upgrade of Public Right of Way NHA M4 to improve accessibility between Lower Bemerton and Harnham.	£50,000 CIL requested; £70,000 estimated total	60% – Band B	EA/Natural England consents; Wiltshire Council commitments; current condition; verified cost; funding gap; delivery agreement.

The detailed scoring rationale and assurance issues are set out at Appendices A to C.

- 4.3 For any project given conditional priority, officers would lead the next assurance stage. This would include resolving scope, land and legal rights, permissions and consents, verified full cost, funding package, procurement, programme, maintenance responsibilities and project-specific risks before the project returns to Committee.
- 4.4 Action is needed now because the applications have completed Stage 1 and have reached the point at which the Council must decide whether further officer resource should be invested in working each proposal up. Without that prioritisation, officer time could be spent on projects that Committee may not ultimately wish to progress.

5. Decision Options

5.1 Decision option A – Conditional priority

The project is sufficiently important to justify further officer assurance work now. No CIL expenditure is approved and no final sum is reserved.

5.2 Decision option B – Reserve list

The project remains of potential interest but does not receive priority officer resource ahead of projects granted conditional priority.

5.3 Decision option C – Defer or decline

Committee may defer a project where it considers more information is needed before deciding whether assurance work is justified, or decline it for the current CIL round.

5.4 Committee should determine the appropriate outcome for each project separately, having regard to the scoring evidence, the benefits claimed, the extent of the unresolved work and the value of committing further officer time.

6. Financial Position

- 6.1 No CIL expenditure is approved through this report. The decision sought concerns whether officer time should be committed to further project assurance.
- 6.2 The current indicative/requested figures are: Coldharbour Lane approximately £35,000; Harnham Memorial Hall £90,000 requested; and Broken Bridges £50,000 CIL requested against an estimated total project cost of £70,000. These figures are not treated as verified final costs.
- 6.3 Any project receiving conditional priority would require a later financial assessment identifying the verified full cost, maximum CIL contribution, contingency, full funding package, payment route and any future maintenance liability.
- 6.4 Value for money is one of the Stage 2 scoring criteria, but a final value-for-money judgement cannot be completed until the scope and costs are sufficiently defined.
- 6.5 Responsible Financial Officer confirmation will be required before any final CIL award is recommended.

7. Legal and Governance Considerations

- 7.1 Neighbourhood CIL may be applied to infrastructure or other measures concerned with supporting development of the area and addressing demands that development places on the area. Each current project has passed the Council's Stage 1 gateway on potential eligibility.
- 7.2 Subject to approval of the strengthened process in the preceding report, the decision at this stage is a prioritisation decision: whether the Council should spend further officer time testing deliverability. It is distinct from the later decision whether to make a final CIL award.
- 7.3 Communities Committee should record the outcome for each project separately. Any later award should return to Committee once the assurance work is complete.
- 7.4 The principal governance risk is treating a Stage 2 score or conditional-priority decision as if it were authority to spend. The proposed approach mitigates this by requiring a separate final award decision after the evidence, costs and risks have been resolved.

8. Consultation and Engagement

- 8.1 The applications contain different levels of community and stakeholder evidence. Harnham Memorial Hall includes user-group consultation; Broken Bridges is supported by comments gathered through a separate Wiltshire Council Asset of Community Value process; and Coldharbour Lane now has additional accessibility advice from the Disability Interest Group in Salisbury (DIGS).
- 8.2 DIGS supports a properly constructed pedestrian path at Coldharbour Lane rather than expecting pedestrians, including disabled pedestrians, to share the roadway. DIGS also identifies the need to consider surface, width, gradients, drainage, crossings/tactile information, maintenance and the involvement of disabled people in the design.

- 8.3 Further engagement may be required during project assurance, depending on which applications Committee chooses to progress.
- 8.4 No separate consultation is proposed on the scoring itself; Committee is applying the adopted assessment framework to the evidence currently available.

9. Strategic and Policy Alignment

- 9.1 The Stage 2 matrix is intended to support evidence-led decisions by considering development impact, Neighbourhood Plan alignment, community benefit, deliverability, value for money and legacy.
- 9.2 The scoring should inform rather than replace Member judgement. The decision at this meeting also determines where limited officer capacity is directed.

10. Implementation and Next Steps

- 10.1 For each project granted conditional priority, officers will open a project-assurance record and identify the evidence, external advice and decisions required.
- 10.2 Officers will work through the outstanding technical, legal, financial, procurement, maintenance and delivery matters identified for that project.
- 10.3 When the assurance work is complete, the project will return to Communities Committee with the verified full cost, recommended maximum CIL contribution, delivery arrangements and residual risk position for a final award decision.

11. Overall Assessment

All three projects have passed Stage 1, but they differ materially in purpose, evidence, readiness and risk. The decision now required is which projects justify further officer time to establish whether they can become deliverable CIL schemes. Conditional priority is therefore a prioritisation of officer resource, not an award of public money.

12. Implications

Implication Area	Impact	Comments / Mitigation
Financial	Medium	No CIL award is approved by this report. Conditional priority commits officer time only. Final costs remain unverified and any later award will require Responsible Financial Officer confirmation.
Legal	Medium	Each project has passed the Stage 1 eligibility gateway. Any final award must still satisfy the neighbourhood CIL spending test and any project-specific legal, land, consent or contractual requirements.
Risk	High	Material delivery risks remain across the three applications. The purpose of conditional priority is to decide which projects warrant further assurance work before any financial commitment.
Personnel	Medium	The decision determines where officer time will be directed. Projects not prioritised will not receive the same assurance resource at this stage.

Environmental Impact	Medium	Broken Bridges has protected-site and floodplain considerations; Coldharbour Lane may have design and highways implications. Project-specific environmental matters will be addressed during assurance.
Equalities Impact Statement	Medium	Coldharbour Lane and Broken Bridges contain significant accessibility considerations. DIGS advice on Coldharbour Lane should be taken into account before and during design development.
Community / Public Impact	High	All three projects are intended to provide community benefit. The evidence differs in scale and type and is reflected in the Stage 2 scoring.
Procurement / Contractual	Medium	Final specifications, quotations/tendering requirements, funding agreements and recovery provisions will be confirmed during assurance before any final award.
Property / Asset	Medium	Land ownership, access rights, building condition, asset responsibilities and future maintenance are relevant to one or more applications and must be confirmed during assurance.
Data Protection	Low	Normal application and consultation records may contain personal contact details. Existing data-protection controls apply; no new high-risk processing is proposed by this report.

13. Appendices / Background Papers

- 13.1 Appendix A – Coldharbour Lane Footpath: Stage 2 scoring and matters to resolve
- 13.2 Appendix B – Harnham Memorial Hall: Stage 2 scoring and matters to resolve
- 13.3 Appendix C – Making Broken Bridges Accessible: Stage 2 scoring and matters to resolve

APPENDIX A – Coldharbour Lane Footpath – CIL/2026/001

Project summary

The proposal is to construct a hard-surfaced pedestrian path along the west side of Coldharbour Lane between Dennis Marsh House and the River Park access. The application describes the existing grass route as narrow, muddy in winter and unsuitable for wheelchair users, people with visual impairments and children in buggies or prams.

Criterion	Weight	Score	Weighted score
Addresses impact of development	25%	3/5	0.75
Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan	20%	5/5	1.00
Community benefit	20%	2/5	0.40
Deliverability / readiness	15%	3/5	0.45
Value for money	10%	3/5	0.30
Long-term sustainability / legacy	10%	3/5	0.30
TOTAL	100%		3.20 / 5 = 64% – Band B

Scoring breakdown against the adopted matrix

Each criterion is assessed against the adopted Stage 2 scoring matrix. For factor-based criteria, one point is credited for each matrix factor supported by evidence. For scaled criteria, the level applied is the highest level the evidence supports.

1. Addresses impact of new development (25%) – 3/5, weighted 0.75

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Environmental impact	No	No environmental impact arising from development is identified.
Traffic/transport	Yes	Pedestrians currently walk in the carriageway. The path supports walking access from the Devizes Road bus route, including for residents of St Peter's Place and Fugglestone Red. No pedestrian count has been provided.
Pressure on local services/community assets	Yes	The application links increased use of the upgraded River Park and Ashley Road Play Area to new development. The number of users coming from new development is not quantified, and much of that development is still to be built.
Strong community voice	Part	Full Council supported the path in principle on 15 September 2025 and on 10 November 2025 resolved that it be assessed against the CIL matrix. The proposal arose from concerns raised by a partially sighted resident and is supported by DIGS.
Citywide impact	No	The application states that the River Park draws users from across Salisbury, but there is no usage evidence showing citywide use of this route.

Points credited: 3 of 5.

2. Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan (20%) – 5/5, weighted 1.00

Matrix test: 0 if the project conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan; 5 if it meets its aspirations and does not conflict.

Assessment: The Salisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan supports safer walking and cycling, and its walking/cycling network identifies Coldharbour Lane as a location for intervention. No conflict has been identified.

2. Community benefit (20%) – 2/5, weighted 0.40

Matrix scale: 1 road; 2 Lower-layer Super Output Area; 3 ward; 4 citywide; 5 city and beyond.

Level applied: 2 – Lower-layer Super Output Area.

Evidence: The path serves the immediate neighbourhood, including the Sarum St Paul's school entrance and the River Park entrance. It gives a clear accessibility benefit for wheelchair users, people with visual impairments and children in buggies or prams, strengthened by DIGS advice.

Not scored higher because: There is no usage count or catchment evidence showing ward-wide or citywide use.

4. Deliverability/readiness to start (15%) – 3/5, weighted 0.45

Matrix scale: 1 initial project plan underway; 3 partially developed; 5 fully worked up/ready to go.

Level applied: 3 – partially developed.

Evidence: The route has been scoped by Council officers, the application states that the land is in Council ownership, and a contractor quotation has been obtained.

Not scored higher because: Final width and design, crossing/highway requirements, private garage access, planning requirements and the final specification remain unresolved.

5. Value for money (10%) – 3/5, weighted 0.30

Matrix scale: 1 weak; 3 medium; 5 strong.

Level applied: 3 – medium.

Evidence: A contractor quotation of £32,966.03 was reported to Full Council on 10 November 2025, supporting the approximate £35,000 figure.

Not scored higher because: The quotation dates from 2025 and has not been competitively tested. Design, crossing and access requirements may add cost, and the applicant has asked for contingency in addition to £35,000.

6. Long-term sustainability/legacy (10%) – 3/5, weighted 0.30

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Enduring benefits	Yes	A hard-surfaced path would be a permanent asset.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Future maintenance considered	Yes	The application states that the Council would maintain the path within normal annual budgets and that a high construction standard should keep costs low. The annual cost is not yet quantified.
Ongoing support clear	Yes	The path would be a Council asset on Council land, and Full Council has twice resolved in support. The responsible service and budget still need to be formally confirmed.
Adaptable asset	No	Not evidenced in the application.
Exit strategy	No	None identified.

Points credited: 3 of 5.

Principal matters to resolve before any final award

- Final accessible design: scaled drawing, finished width and alignment; any departure from normal accessibility guidance should be evidenced and justified.
- Crossings: Wiltshire Council should confirm whether crossing provision, tactile paving or other highway measures are required at the route ends.
- Private garage access: establish legal rights and design any vehicle crossover without undermining accessibility.
- Land/title/utilities: confirm title boundaries, easements/covenants and apparatus before excavation.
- Cost and procurement: settle the specification, obtain current competitive prices, define a capped contingency and confirm the compliant procurement route.
- Maintenance: confirm the responsible service and ongoing budget.
- Evidence: complete a dated site inspection/measured survey and obtain proportionate usage/catchment evidence for the final Committee record.

Project summary

The proposal seeks CIL support for structural repairs and refurbishment of Harnham Memorial Hall, including work to the kitchen and toilets, flooring and associated building, electrical and plumbing works. The applicant reports approximately 250 users each week across 13 user groups.

Criterion	Weight	Score	Weighted score
Addresses impact of development	25%	2/5	0.50
Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan	20%	5/5	1.00
Community benefit	20%	3/5	0.60
Deliverability / readiness	15%	3/5	0.45
Value for money	10%	1/5	0.10
Long-term sustainability / legacy	10%	2/5	0.20
TOTAL	100%		2.85 / 5 = 57% – Band B

Scoring breakdown against the adopted matrix

Each criterion is assessed against the adopted Stage 2 scoring matrix. For factor-based criteria, one point is credited for each matrix factor supported by evidence. For scaled criteria, the level applied is the highest level the evidence supports.

1. Addresses impact of new development (25%) – 2/5, weighted 0.50

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Environmental impact	No	No environmental impact arising from development is established.
Traffic/transport	No	The application notes that many users walk or cycle, but no transport impact of development is evidenced.
Pressure on local services/community assets	Yes	Verified residential growth in East and West Harnham will increase demand on an existing community asset. The applicant reports approximately 250 weekly users and states that no new community facility is planned in Harnham.
Strong community voice	Yes	User group questionnaire (9 of 13 groups responded, identifying concerns about heating, toilets, kitchen, flooring and the Hall's future) and support from East and West Harnham councillors.
Citywide impact	No	The Hall serves Harnham. Citywide impact is not established.

Points credited: 2 of 5.

2. Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan (20%) – 5/5, weighted 1.00

Matrix test: 0 if the project conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan; 5 if it meets its aspirations and does not conflict.

Assessment: The project supports the Plan's community-infrastructure aspirations. No conflict has been identified.

3. Community benefit (20%) – 3/5, weighted 0.60

Matrix scale: 1 road; 2 Lower-layer Super Output Area; 3 ward; 4 citywide; 5 city and beyond.

Level applied: 3 – ward.

Evidence: The Hall is the principal community facility for West Harnham (Harnham West ward), and the applicant reports approximately 250 weekly users across 13 user groups.

Not scored higher because: There is no evidence of regular use from outside the Harnham area to support a citywide score.

4. Deliverability/readiness to start (15%) – 3/5, weighted 0.45

Matrix scale: 1 initial project plan underway; 3 partially developed; 5 fully worked up/ready to go.

Level applied: 3 – partially developed.

Evidence: An independent condition survey (DS Building Consultancy, 10 November 2025), user group consultation and contractor pricing (PT Builders, 26 March 2026) are in place, and the Hall is owned by the charity.

Not scored higher because: The asbestos survey, CCTV drainage investigation and structural solution are outstanding, the works have not been reconciled into one defined scope, and building regulations and any planning requirement are unconfirmed.

5. Value for money (10%) – 1/5, weighted 0.10

Matrix scale: 1 weak; 3 medium; 5 strong.

Level applied: 1 – weak.

Evidence: The PT Builders quotation totals £65,157.60 (£54,298 plus £10,859.60 VAT), including a £10,000 provisional sum for the kitchen. It does not include the main hall floor, asbestos works, roof repairs, a fire alarm system or a replacement electrical distribution board. The application's own estimates are £65,000 to £100,000 for the repair works plus £17,000 to £30,000 for flooring, and the applicant notes that costs could be up to 40% higher than £90,000.

Not scored higher because: There is no reconciled cost plan covering the full scope, and £90,000 would not complete the works described.

6. Long-term sustainability/legacy (10%) – 2/5, weighted 0.20

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Enduring benefits	Yes	The Hall is a long-established community asset and the Harnham War Memorial. The works would extend its useful life.
Future maintenance considered	Yes	The trustees intend to maintain the Hall from its small annual income surplus.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Ongoing support clear	No	The adequacy of the trustees' resources to meet the maintenance liabilities identified in the condition survey, including the likely asbestos cladding, render and external redecoration, is not demonstrated.
Adaptable asset	No	The works restore existing kitchen, toilet and floor functions. Adaptability for different future uses is not demonstrated.
Exit strategy	No	None identified.

Points credited: 2 of 5.

Principal matters to resolve before any final award

- Asbestos: complete the specialist asbestos survey before specification or works are let.
- Structural movement: complete CCTV drainage investigation and establish the underpinning requirement before design and pricing.
- Fire and electrical safety: ensure the funded package leaves the building safe and usable rather than addressing selected works while significant hazards remain.
- Scope: reconcile floor, asbestos, underpinning, fire safety, electrical and other urgent works into one defined project scope.
- Cost/funding: prepare a current reconciled cost plan, contingency and quantified trustee/match-funding contribution; the £90,000 request is not presently a complete cost plan.
- Consents/authority: confirm ownership/title, charity/trustee authority, building regulations and any planning requirement.
- Programme: test the stated timetable against structural, asbestos and approval requirements.
- Maintenance: test the trustees' capacity to meet ongoing maintenance liabilities identified by the condition survey.

Project summary

The proposal is to upgrade the surface of Public Right of Way NHA M4 where it crosses Broken Bridges, improving access between Lower Bemerton and Harnham. The application identifies the route as serving employment, the railway station, schools and recreation, and seeks £50,000 CIL against an estimated £70,000 project cost.

Criterion	Weight	Score	Weighted score
Addresses impact of development	25%	3/5	0.75
Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan	20%	5/5	1.00
Community benefit	20%	4/5	0.80
Deliverability / readiness	15%	1/5	0.15
Value for money	10%	1/5	0.10
Long-term sustainability / legacy	10%	2/5	0.20
TOTAL	100%		3.00 / 5 = 60% – Band B

Scoring breakdown against the adopted matrix

Each criterion is assessed against the adopted Stage 2 scoring matrix. For factor-based criteria, one point is credited for each matrix factor supported by evidence. For scaled criteria, the level applied is the highest level the evidence supports.

1. Addresses impact of new development (25%) – 3/5, weighted 0.75

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Environmental impact	No	No environmental impact arising from development is established.
Traffic/transport	Yes	The route provides an active-travel link between Lower Bemerton, Harnham, the railway station, schools and the Churchfields employment area, as an alternative to driving through the Harnham Gyratory.
Pressure on local services/community assets	No	Supporting comments expect use to increase as new housing at Netherhampton Road is built out, but the application's growth section required officer verification and the pressure is not quantified.
Strong community voice	Yes	The 207 comments received by Wiltshire Council in 2024 in support of the Asset of Community Value application, many referring to the value of the footpath.
Citywide impact	Yes	The route links different parts of Salisbury and serves city destinations, consistent with the citywide community benefit score.

Points credited: 3 of 5.

2. Aligns with Neighbourhood Plan (20%) – 5/5, weighted 1.00

Matrix test: 0 if the project conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan; 5 if it meets its aspirations and does not conflict.

Assessment: The route aligns with Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy 21 on sustainable transport and with Wiltshire Council's Salisbury Transport Strategy measure PC09. No conflict has been identified.

3. Community benefit (20%) – 4/5, weighted 0.80

Matrix scale: 1 road; 2 Lower-layer Super Output Area; 3 ward; 4 citywide; 5 city and beyond.

Level applied: 4 – citywide.

Evidence: The route connects Lower Bemerton and Harnham and serves city destinations including employment, the railway station and schools.

Not scored higher because: The evidence is principally of use within Salisbury. Use from beyond the city is mentioned but not demonstrated.

4. Deliverability/readiness to start (15%) – 1/5, weighted 0.15

Matrix scale: 1 initial project plan underway; 3 partially developed; 5 fully worked up/ready to go.

Level applied: 1 – initial project plan underway.

Evidence: The route and proposed surfacing approach are identified.

Not scored higher because: Environment Agency and Natural England consents, cost evidence, the funding package and written delivery commitments from Wiltshire Council are all outstanding.

5. Value for money (10%) – 1/5, weighted 0.10

Matrix scale: 1 weak; 3 medium; 5 strong.

Level applied: 1 – weak.

Evidence: The application estimates a total project cost of £70,000, of which £50,000 is sought from CIL.

Not scored higher because: No quotation, estimate, schedule of works or measured quantities supports the £70,000 figure, and the £20,000 balance is unfunded.

6. Long-term sustainability/legacy (10%) – 2/5, weighted 0.20

Matrix test: one point for each evidenced factor.

Matrix factor	Credited	Evidence
Enduring benefits	Yes	An upgraded surface would provide a lasting improvement to the route.
Future maintenance considered	Yes	Maintenance is contemplated through Wiltshire Council.
Ongoing support clear	No	Wiltshire Council's maintenance commitment is not confirmed in writing.
Adaptable asset	No	Not evidenced in the application.
Exit strategy	No	None identified.

Points credited: 2 of 5.

Community evidence

The supporting material includes extracts from 207 comments received by Wiltshire Council in 2024 in support of the Asset of Community Value application. The comments describe the route as an important link between Harnham, Bemerton, the station, Churchfields and other city destinations, and include support from a user of a three-wheeled rollator.

Principal matters to resolve before any final award

- Protected-site consents: obtain all necessary Environment Agency and Natural England approvals for works within the River Avon SSSI/SAC and floodplain.
- Highway authority: obtain written confirmation from Wiltshire Council of approval, project-management responsibility and future maintenance.
- Condition/safety: obtain a current path condition assessment and confirm the tree-safety position, including earlier ash-dieback concerns.
- Cost: produce a specification, schedule of works/measured quantities and verified cost plan supporting the project value.
- Funding gap: secure the complete funding package, including the currently unfunded element, before final award.
- Other funding: seek contributions from Wiltshire Council and other bodies with a direct interest before SCC commits the proposed CIL amount.
- Funding agreement: define delivery responsibilities, milestones, evidence for payment, maintenance, change control, suspension and recovery.