

## Appendix 1: Prioritisation Process

- i. The Highway and Planning Funds Group agreed a principle that projects should only be funded from the non-specific grants from Transport for London if they could not be funded (or at least not fully funded) from more constrained sources of funding such as major schemes grants from Transport for London, maintenance grants from Transport for London, the Bridge House Estates, voluntary contributions for enhancements from City firms and contributions from City firms for enhancements as a *quid pro quo* for on-street security measures. This is to ensure that flexible sources of funding, such as these non-specific grants, are not fully committed on projects that may have alternative sources of funding available.
- ii. For example, the effect of this principle is that maintenance of principal roads should only be funded from these non-specific grants if there is no relevant principal road maintenance grant from Transport for London or if there is but it is fully committed. Similarly, the non-specific grants should not be used for strengthening highway structures if Transport for London has made a maintenance grant for that purpose and that grant is not fully committed.
- iii. The Highway and Planning Funds Group also recognised that this principle, though important, would be insufficient for prioritising the projects to recommend to your Committee as being funded (in whole or in part) from the two non-specific grants from Transport for London and, as a result, it also adopted a further three-stage process of prioritising projects.
- iv. This process is that, firstly, all **projects that are committed** be prioritised over those that are uncommitted. This recognises that projects that your Committee has approved (either directly or via a delegation) should proceed unless there are very good specific reasons for them not to, and that they should be prioritised over those projects that your Committee has not yet considered.
- v. Secondly, projects within both of these two broad groups of committed and uncommitted projects should be ranked as **essential, advisable or desirable**. For committed projects, this ranking will have been approved by your Committee through the project approval process. For uncommitted projects the ranking will be that set out or to be set out in the report to be submitted to your Committee. It will therefore be agreed between the Town Clerk, the Chamberlain and the Director of the Built Environment.
- vi. Thirdly, projects within these six groups of committed and uncommitted *essential, advisable* and *desirable* projects should be further ranked according to whether or not the commitment of funding from the grants from Transport for London would serve to **bring in match funding** from a third party, with projects with scope for match funding being ranked above those with little or no potential for this.
- vii. These three factors establish a matrix of twelve ranked groups of projects, which serve to establish priorities to recommend to your Committee, and this process has been followed in determining the projects recommended for funding as set out in Table 1 of the main report.