Town Board – Project Prioritisation

Summary Report

- From a long-list of schemes, proposals were subject to a sifting and prioritisation exercise by the Town Board in July 2020. Only those projects graded 'high impact' were selected for further development (alongside a small number of less well-developed schemes, regarded as worthy of further consideration).
- Proposals were then subject to a further appraisal process utilising the Town Fund Delivery Partner Toolkit, based on project information received as of 8th September.
 This prioritised list was presented at the last Town Board meeting and is as follows:

Table 1: Project List 8.9.20

RANK	PROJECTS	OVERALL ASSESSMENT SCORE	TOWNS SPECIFIC CRITERIA	HMT GREEN BOOK APPRAISAL CRITERIA
1	Drill Hall	87%	87%	88%
2	Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	83%	87%	80%
3	Central Market	83%	87%	80%
4	Sincil Bank	83%	93%	72%
5	Road to Zero	82%	80%	84%
6	Store of Stories	81%	87%	76%
7	Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	81%	93%	68%
8	Health & Wellbeing Centre	80%	80%	80%
9	Tentercroft Street	78%	80%	76%
10	Wigford Way	77%	87%	68%
11	The Hive	77%	87%	68%
12	Lincoln Made Smarter	75%	87%	64%
13	Lincoln Connected	74%	80%	68%
14	Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community HUB	66%	60%	72%

- At the September Town Board meeting it was agreed to carry out a further prioritisation exercise, acknowledging that projects were still being developed and refined and that there was a need to reduce the total town fund 'ask' to come within the total funding envelope (£25m). It was further acknowledged that there was a need to take account of any feedback from BEIS as part of the Check and Challenge process.
- In support of this, it was agreed to appoint a sub-group of non-conflicted members to carry out a final prioritisation exercise in order to determine the selection of projects recommended for inclusion within the Investment Plan. The sub-group members were as follows:
 - Peter Neil (Bishop Grosseteste University)
 - Karl McCartney (MP)
 - Leo Scott Smith (Tended)
 - o Ivan Annibal Facilitator and Independent Chair of the Sub-Group
- Prior to the prioritisation session, further project information was submitted in respect of a number of projects and therefore an updated technical scoring exercise

was carried out by Officers from City of Lincoln Council, the LEP and facilitated by Rose Regeneration. The results of this exercise were based on the following scoring criteria. Importantly, this includes an analysis of risk which is considered to be important to ensuring deliverability. The prioritisation criteria used for this updated technical scoring exercise and the results of this process are shown below. This information, together with the detailed project information, was circulated to sub-group members in advance of a meeting held on Thursday 8th October.

Table 2: Prioritisation Criteria

Prioritisation Tool						
Projects were awarded a score of between 1-5 according to the following key criteria.						
Town Specific Criteria						
Strategic Fit: alignment with vision & key strategies						
Evidence of Need: how the scheme addresses evidence base						
Overall Impact on Growth Programme: outputs, outcomes, Impacts						
Level of Risk to Delivery: funding package, tenure						
Green Book Criteria						
Value for Money (likeliness to deliver social value in terms of costs, benefits and risks)						
Affordability (financing and affordability given existing budgets)						
Achievability (deliverability given organisational capability and skills)						
Commercial viability and feasibility of procurement						
Stakeholder support						

Table 3: Revised Project List: Technical Scoring 5th October 2020

RANK	PROJECTS	OVERALL ASSESSMENT SCORE	TOWNS SPECIFIC CRITERIA	HMT GREEN BOOK APPRAISAL CRITERIA
1	Drill Hall	84%	80%	88%
2	Road to Zero	82%	80%	84%
3	Central Market	81%	83%	80%
4	Sincil Bank	81%	85%	76%
5	HEAT	79%	78%	80%
6	Tentercroft Street	78%	80%	76%
7	Greyfriars	78%	75%	80%
8	Barbican	77%	85%	68%
9	Health & Wellbeing Centre	76%	73%	80%
10	Lincoln Connected	76%	80%	72%
11	LCFC Stadium & Community Project	72%	73%	72%
12	Store of Stories	72%	75%	68%

13	Lincoln Made Smarter	70%	75%	64%
14	The Hive	67%	70%	64%
15	Wigford Way	65%	70%	60%

At the session on Thursday 8th October, chaired by Ivan Annibal, all projects were discussed in detail. It was then agreed that each sub-group member and the chair would individually rank the projects. The rankings are presented below, arranged in priority order according to the mean average. The rank order is based on the mean average but the median score is presented for comparison and transparency given the variation in individual project rankings for certain schemes. Column D represents the rank order put forward by the Chair of the sub-group, reflecting the order derived from the previous technical scoring exercise.

Table 4: Sub-Group Panel Ranking & Averages

Rank (Mean)	Project	A	В	С	D	Average:	Average: Median
1	Wigford Way	5	1	1	15	5.500	3
2	Lincoln FC	2	4	6	11	5.750	5
	Health and Wellbeing						
3	Centre	3	7	5	9	6.000	6
4	Central Market	8	12	2	3	6.250	5.5
5	Tentercroft Street	10	2	7	6	6.250	6.5
6	Road to Zero	7	13	4	2	6.500	5.5
7	Drill Hall	1	15	11	1	7.000	6
8	Barbican	6	5	10	8	7.250	7
9	Store of Stories	4	14	3	12	8.250	8
10	Greyfriars	11	3	12	7	8.250	9
	Hospitality Events						
11	and Tourism	12	6	13	5	9.000	9
12	Sincil Bank	9	9	15	4	9.250	9
13	Lincoln Connected	14	10	8	10	10.500	10
	Lincoln Made						
14	Smarter	13	8	9	13	10.750	11
15	The Hive	15	11	14	14	13.500	14

- In this final table, the moderated ranking from the technical scoring exercise has been given equal weight to the individual sub-group rankings. This is reflected in the ranking applied across columns D-F.
- Again, this is prioritised according to the mean average but the median is shown for comparison.

Table 5: Combined Average Ranking & Prioritisation: Sub-Group and Technical Scoring

Rank (Mean)	Project	Α	В	С	D	E	F	Average: Mean	Average: Median
1	Road to Zero	7	13	4	2	2	2	5.0	5.5
1	Drill Hall	1	15	11	1	1	1	5.0	6
3	Central Market	8	12	2	3	3	3	5.2	5.5
4	Tentercroft Street	10	2	7	6	6	6	6.2	6.5
	Health and Wellbeing								
5	Centre	3	7	5	9	9	9	7.0	6
6	Lincoln FC	2	4	6	11	11	11	7.5	5
6	Barbican	6	5	10	8	8	8	7.5	7
6	Sincil Bank	9	9	15	4	4	4	7.5	9
	Hospitality Events and								
9	Tourism	12	6	13	5	5	5	7.7	9
10	Greyfriars	11	3	12	7	7	7	7.8	9
11	Wigford Way	5	1	1	15	15	15	8.7	3
12	Store of Stories	4	14	3	12	12	12	9.5	8
13	Lincoln Connected	14	10	8	10	10	10	10.3	10
14	Lincoln Made Smarter	13	8	9	13	13	13	11.5	11
15	The Hive	15	11	14	14	14	14	13.7	14

- Whilst there is some variation in the individual project scores, there is consistency in those schemes towards the bottom of the table, which is critical in terms of reaching agreement on the overall portfolio.
- With further savings derived across the programme, it is now possible to include all schemes but with a reduced allocation in respect of the Hive by virtue of its position as a result of this exercise.
- A final summary of projects in rank order, with financials is presented below. Note that project costs now include apportioned programme management fees.

Table 6: Prioritised List with Financials

		Towns Fund	Co-Funding	Total Cost
Rank	Project	£m	£m	£m
1	Climate Commission Road to Net Zero	0.360	0.053	0.413
1	Drill Hall Development	0.455	0.550	1.005
3	Lincoln Central Market and Vibrant Public Realm	6.540	2.000	8.540
4	Tentercroft Street	0.340	0.000	0.340
5	Health & Wellbeing Centre (HWBC)	0.660	0.550	1.210
6	Lincoln City FC Stadium and Community Redevelopment Projects	0.840	2.000	2.840
6	Barbican Production & Maker Hub	1.640	1.000	2.640
6	Sincil Bank Green Corridor	3.040	0.000	3.040
9	Hospitality Events & Tourism Institute (HEAT)	1.240	1.300	2.540
10	Greyfriars	0.540	1.164	1.704
11	Wigford Way/St. Mary's Street	5.040	0.000	5.040
12	Store of Stories (Food Supermarket)	0.205	0.849	1.054
13	Lincoln Connected	1.514	0.542	2.056
14	Lincoln Made Smarter	1.290	1.050	2.340
15	The Hive	1.040	8.800	9.840
	Programme Management	inc.	0.646	0.646
	Total	24.748	20.504	45.252

Recommendation

- The process and outcomes arising from the prioritisation exercise are presented above for transparency and to ensure there is final, collective agreement on the overall portfolio of schemes.
- The final list in Table 6 above is recommended for approval by the Board, subject to any final clarifications or feedback from BEIS, confirmation of commitment from lead partners and agreement on the final funding allocation for the Hive given the position of this scheme relative to the overall rankings.