City of Lincoln Council

Town Deal Programme & Business Case Development, Lincoln

Lincoln TIP Project Assessment Report

April 2021



focus-consultants.com Focus Consultants 2010 LLP, Focus House, Millennium Way West, Phoenix Business Park, Nottingham NG8 6AS T. 0115 976 5050



Create. Deliver. Assess.

Client:	City of Lincoln Council City Hall Beaumont Fee Lincoln LN1 1DD
Client Lead:	Jo Walker
Tel:	07730 585159
Email:	jo.walker@lincoln.gov.uk
Prepared By:	Focus Consultants 2010 LLP
	Focus House
	Millennium Way West
	Phoenix Business Park
	Nottingham
	NG8 6AS
Project:	Town Deal Programme & Business Case Development, Lincoln
Document Title:	Lincoln TIP Project Assessment Report
Date:	April 2021
Focus Contact Details:	Heather.frecklington@focus-consultants.com 0115 9765050
Authorised By:	Heather Frecklington, Partner
Signature:	

Contact Information

H.L. Frecklington

Focus Offices

NOTTINGHAM

Focus House Millennium Way West Phoenix Business Park Nottingham NG8 6AS T: 0115 976 5050 E: enquiries@focus-consultants.com

LEICESTER

Olympus House Unit 1, Main Street Kirby Muxloe Leicestershire LE9 2AP T: 0116 275 8315 E: leicesterenquiries@focus-consultants.com



Contents Page

		Page
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Project Analysis	4
3.0	Programme Analysis	5
4.0	Recommendations	11

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Scoring Framework
- Appendix 2 Project Assessments

1.0 Introduction

Following the submission of the Lincoln Town Deal Heads of Terms Agreement on 22nd March, the Town Deal Board need to confirm by the 22nd May the final selection of projects for inclusion in the Town Deal.

As it currently stands, the total amount required to deliver all 'in scope' projects currently stands at $\pounds 23.24$ m. The total funding envelope is $\pounds 19$ m. Taking programme management costs into consideration¹, the total budget available for projects is $\pounds 18.58$ m. This means that across the programme, savings (or additional funds) of $\pounds 4.66$ m need to be sourced or alternatively, projects to this value need to be removed from the programme.

To assist with this, Focus Consultants completed an assessment of each project with a focus on impact and deliverability. The scoring framework for completing this is included at Appendix 1 and the process for completing the appraisal was as follows:

- Each project was scored independently based on the Town Investment Plan Section 2 and the Project Confirmation Forms by at least two people and ratified.
- Any significant gaps which made it difficult to score a project on a specific criterion were identified and a short list of key questions were provided to the lead applicant.
- Each project was scored again to take account of any additional information.

The assessment is based upon the latest project information submitted, which includes revisions to the Drill Hall project and a small change to the ask for the Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute project. It should be noted that the Health & Wellbeing Centre has been withdrawn, leaving 13 projects 'in scope' and assessed as part of this process.

The assessment aimed to recognise the importance of ensuring an appropriate balance between deliverability and impact in order to achieve the aspirations of the programme. The assessment therefore includes a programme level assessment to ensure the package of projects taken forward is appropriately balanced as a programme. This may mean for example that it may not be seen as appropriate to just remove the lowest ranking projects but a consideration of the impact on the overall programme is needed alongside the individual rankings.

¹ Programme Management costs of 0.42m are included for the 5-year programme to cover due diligence costs for each project, legal drafting and specialist subsidy advice, financial management and monitoring, environmental impact assessments, programme monitoring and evaluation costs. This is just 2.2% of the programme and compares well against other Town Deal programmes.

2.0 Project Analysis

The table below sets out the scores for each project against the agreed criteria.

		Economic vibrancy and recovery	Carbon Reduction	Inclusive Growth	Value for Money	Costs	Funding	Risk	Project Management	Total
Drill Hall	1.000	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	30
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	0.800	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	30
Central Market	5.900	4	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	28
Greyfriars	0.540	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	28
Tentercroft Street	0.340	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	27
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	1.120	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	4	26
Lincoln Made Smarter	1.290	3	3	2	3	4	2	3	4	24
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	1.600	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	23
Lincoln Connected	1.483	4	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	23
The Hive	1.000	4	3	4	3	3	1	2	2	22
Wigford Way	5.000	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	21
Store of Stories	0.165	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	21
Sincil Bank	3.000	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	4	20
Total	23.239									

3.0 Programme Analysis

The table below shows the spread of the total programme as it currently stands. There is a reasonable even split between the Transport and Urban Regeneration themes and between the Digital and Skills themes.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	£1.600				✓
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Connected	£1.483	✓			
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.290	✓			
Sincil Bank	£3.000		✓		
Store of Stories	£0.165				✓
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
The Hive	£1.000				✓
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£23.239	£2.773	£8.000	£2.920	£9.546
Percentage of programme		11.93%	34.43%	12.57%	41.08%

In addition to looking at the impact on the programme of simply removing the lowest scoring projects we have also looked at all projects scoring less than 25 to provide a comprehensive overview of options. By looking at the projects which scored less than 25 points, seven variations have been identified to reduce the programme close to the funding envelope. Each of the variations are set out below and then summarised at the end.

Most options still do not get to the £18.58m target but these are still considered where the savings to be made are less that £500,000. Suggestions for how these savings could be made are included in the recommendations section.

3.1 Option 1

In this scenario, The Hive, Sincil Bank and Store of Stories have been removed from the programme. In terms of the overall funding, this gives a reasonable mix across the programme with circa 15% each for Digital Connectivity and Skills, 26% for Transport and 44% for Urban Regeneration. This option would still require circa £495,000 of savings from the programme to be within the total funding envelope.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	£1.600				✓
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			√	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Connected	£1.483	✓			
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.290	✓			
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				√
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£19.074	£2.773	£5.000	£2.920	£8.381
		14.54%	26.21%	15.31%	43.94%

Projects removed from Programme The Hive Sincil Bank Store of Stories

3.2 Option 2

In this scenario, Wigford Way alone is removed from the Programme. This scenario removes just one project from the programme. It achieved a fairly equal balance between the Digital, Transport and Skills themes. There would be circa £430,000 remaining within the envelope.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	£1.600				✓
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.200			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Connected	£1.483	✓			
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.120	✓			
Sincil Bank	£3.000		✓		
Store of Stories	£0.165				✓
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
The Hive	£1.000				✓
	£18.149	£2.603	£3.000	£3.000	£9.546
	0.42	14.34%	16.53%	16.53%	52.60%

Projects removed from Programme

Wigford Way

3.3 Option 3

In this scenario, Sincil Bank and Lincoln Connected are removed from the programme. This achieves close to the target of £18.58m but the percentage of funding for Digital Connectivity is perhaps disproportionately low although this may be reflective of the nature of the projects under this theme. There is perhaps also a slightly disproportionately high percentage of the funding for the Urban Regeneration Theme when compared to the original programme. This option would still require circa £176,000 of savings from the programme to be within the total funding envelope.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	£1.600				✓
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				√
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.290	✓			
Store of Stories	£0.165				✓
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				√
The Hive	£1.000				✓
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£18.756	£1.290	£5.000	£2.920	£9.546
Percentage of programme		6.88%	26.66%	15.57%	50.89%

Projects removed from Programme Sincil Bank

Lincoln Connected

3.4 Option 4

In this scenario, Sincil Bank and the Barbican are removed from the programme which gets very close to the available funding for projects of £18.58m. In terms of the overall funding, this gives a reasonable mix across the programme with circa 15% each for Digital Connectivity and Skills, 27% for Transport and 43% for Urban Regeneration.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Connected	£1.483	✓			
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.290	✓			
Store of Stories	£0.165				✓
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
The Hive	£1.000				√
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£18.639	£2.773	£5.000	£2.920	£7.946
Percentage of programme		14.88%	26.83%	15.67%	42.63%

Projects removed from Programme

Sincil Bank Barbican

R2473 - Lincoln TIP Project Assessment Report

3.5 Option 5

In this scenario, Sincil Bank and Lincoln Made Smarter are removed from the programme. The percentage of funding for Digital Connectivity is perhaps disproportionately low and the funding for the Urban Regeneration theme disproportionately high when compared to the original programme. This option would still require circa £370,000 of savings from the programme to be within the available funding envelope.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Barbican Creative & Maker Hub	£1.600				√
Central Market	£5.900				√
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Connected	£1.483	✓			
Store of Stories	£0.165				√
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
The Hive	£1.000				√
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£18.949	£1.483	£5.000	£2.920	£9.546
Percentage of programme		7.83%	26.39%	15.41%	50.38%

Projects removed from Programme

Sincil Bank

Lincoln Made Smarter

3.6 Option 6

In this scenario, the Hive, Store of Stories, Lincoln Connected and the Barbican are removed from the programme. This option offers a comparatively less balanced programme and removes the most projects from the programme out of all the scenarios. It is considered this scenario would have the biggest impact in terms of reducing the impact of the programme. This option would still require circa £400,000 of savings from the programme to be within the funding envelope.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			✓	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Lincoln Made Smarter	£1.290	✓			
Sincil Bank	£3.000		~		
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
Wigford Way	£5.000		~		
	£18.991	£1.290	£8.000	£2.920	£6.781
Percentage of programme		6.79%	42.13%	15.38%	35.70%

Projects removed from Programme

The Hive Store of Stories Lincoln Connected Barbican Creative & Maker Hub

3.7 **Option 7**

In this scenario, Lincoln Connected, Lincoln Made Smarter and the Barbican are removed from the programme. This option would still require circa £290,000 of savings from the programme to be within the funding envelope. In addition, under this option there is no funding for the Digital Connectivity theme. There is an equal split between Transport and Urban Regeneration and the proportion for Skills is similar to the original programme.

	Value (m)	Digital Connectivity	Transport Connectivity	Skills	Urban Regeneration, Arts, Heritage and Culture and Enterprise Infrastructure
Central Market	£5.900				✓
Drill Hall	£1.000			✓	
Greyfriars	£0.540				✓
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	£1.120			√	
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community Redevelopment Project	£0.800			✓	
Sincil Bank	£3.000		✓		
Store of Stories	£0.165				✓
Tentercroft Street	£0.340				✓
The Hive	£1.000				✓
Wigford Way	£5.000		✓		
	£18.866	£0.003	£8.000	£2.920	£7.946
Percentage of programme		0.00%	42.41%	15.48%	42.12%

Projects removed from Programme Lincoln Made Smarter Barbican Lincoln Connected

3.8 Summary

The table below summarises the options considered, showing the projects included in each option and the total value for each option including programme management costs.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Barbican	Barbican	Barbican	Central Market	Barbican	Central Market	Central Market
Central Market	Central Market	Central Market	Drill Hall	Central Market	Drill Hall	Drill Hall
Drill Hall	Drill Hall	Drill Hall	Greyfriars	Drill Hall	Greyfriars	Greyfriars
Greyfriars	Greyfriars	Greyfriars	HEAT Institute	Greyfriars	HEAT Institute	HEAT Institute
HEAT Institute	HEAT Institute	HEAT Institute	Lincoln City	HEAT Institute	Lincoln City	Lincoln City
Lincoln City	Lincoln City	Lincoln City	Lincoln Connected	Lincoln City	Lincoln Made Smarter	Sincil Bank
Lincoln Connected	Lincoln Connected	Lincoln Made Smarter	Lincoln Made Smarter	Lincoln Connected	Sincil Bank	Store of Stories
Lincoln Made Smarter	Lincoln Made Smarter	Store of Stories	Store of Stories	Store of Stories	Store of Stories	Tentercroft Street
Tentercroft Street	Sincil Bank	Tentercroft Street	Tentercroft Street	Tentercroft Street	Tentercroft Street	The Hive
Wigford Way	Store of Stories	The Hive	The Hive	The Hive	Wigford Way	Wigford Way
	Tentercroft Street	Wigford Way	Wigford Way	Wigford Way		
	The Hive					
Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme	Programme
Management	Management	Management	Management	Management	Management	Management
£19.49m	£18.57m	£19.18m	£19.06m	£19.37m	£19.41m	£19.29m

4.0 Recommendations

Having reviewed the seven options above, it is our view that there are two potential options which are aligned with the individual scoring of projects, achieve close to the £19m programme, maintain a relatively balanced programme when compared to the original and achieve as much of a balance as possible between impact and deliverability. These are Options 1 and 2

Option 1	Option 2
Barbican	Barbican
Central Market	Central Market
Drill Hall	Drill Hall
Greyfriars	Greyfriars
Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute	Hospitality Events and Tourism Institute
Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community	Lincoln City FC Stadium & Community
Redevelopment Project	Redevelopment Project
Lincoln Connected	Lincoln Connected
Lincoln Made Smarter	Lincoln Made Smarter
Tentercroft Street	Sincil Bank
Wigford Way	Store of Stories
	Tentercroft Street
	The Hive
Programme Management	Programme Management
£19.494	£18.569
Outside the programme	Outside the programme
The Hive	Wigford Way
Sincil Bank	
Store of Stories	

For option one, there would be a requirement for circa £495,000 of savings from the programme. Our recommendation would be that this could be deducted from the Wigford Way proposal as the third lowest scoring project and this would only be a circa 10% reduction in the overall request for this project. If this option was selected, this would need to be agreed with the lead partner for the Wigford Way project.

For option two, there would be circa £430,000 unallocated. Our recommendation would be that this money could be allocated for feasibility and design work in respect of the Wigford Way project, allowing the project to remain in the programme, with additional funding being sought for delivery from other sources.



Appendix 1

Scoring Framework

focus-consultants.com Focus Consultants, Focus House, Millennium Way West, Phoenix Business Park, Nottingham NG8 6AS T.0115 976 5050

Create. Deliver. Assess.





Criteria	Score			
Criteria	1	2	3	4
Impact				
Economic vibrancy and recovery	No clear impact can be identified	Limited direct economic impacts	Identified impacts are reasonable and/or have potential for low levels of scheme additionality.	Strong level of impacts expected to be generated with medium-good levels of additionality. Net impacts will have a measurable impact on the city economy.
Carbon Reduction	The project is likely to have a negative impact in terms of carbon reduction	The project is likely to have a negative impact but with some mitigation potential.	Potential for reasonable carbon reduction benefits identified	Potential for strong carbon reduction benefits
Inclusive Growth	The project likely to have a negative social impact / no consideration of inclusivity	The project is expected to have a negative social impact with some mitigation / limited consideration of inclusivity	The project is expected to have a marginally positive impact on inclusive growth	The project is expected to have a strong positive impact on inclusive growth
Value for Money	Project offers very poor value for money when considering Town Deal Investment v Total Cost v impact as assessed above	Project offers limited value for money when considering Town Deal Investment v Total Cost v impact as assessed above	Project offers reasonable value for money when considering Town Deal Investment v Total Cost v impact as assessed above	Project offers strong value for money when considering Town Deal Investment v Total Cost v impact as assessed above

Criteria	Score				
Griteria	1	2	3	4	
Deliverability					
Costs	Budget appears significantly insufficient for proposed works.	Budget potentially insufficient for proposed works.	Budget broadly looks appropriate for proposed works.	Budget considered robust for proposed works.	
Funding	Full funding package not identified / no evident plan for identification of alternative funding	Potential match funders identified but unsecured and no indicative timescale for securing match	Match funding identified and clear plan and timescale for securing funding	All required sources of funding are identified and are expected to be secured by the time the business case is submitted	
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	Limited risks considered / identified No timescales identified and/or seems unrealistic that project is deliverable by March 2026	High level of risk that project will fail to deliver as outlined. Limited mitigation in place. Some timetable information provided but concerns over deliverability	Moderate level of risk to project delivery identified effective risk mitigation processes in place. Potential risks around achievement of milestones and overall deliverability but mitigation actions in place	The risks to delivery appear minimal and risk mitigations are confirmed. Timescales appear realistic and project can be delivered within Towns Fund timescales. Some delivery risks have been identified but appropriate mitigation strategies are in place.	
Project Management	No project management details identified / no appropriate staffing or resources identified	Limited information on project management / track record provided	Adequate information on project management provided / evidence of track record	Good information on project management provided / evidence of track record / strong capacity to deliver.	



Appendix 2

Project Assessments

focus-consultants.com Focus Consultants, Focus House, Millennium Way West, Phoenix Business Park, Nottingham NG8 6AS T. 0115 976 5050

Create. Deliver. Assess.





Project: The Barbican Projection and Maker Hub for Creative Industries

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	4	Reviving existing, unused city centre building, supporting local businesses plus public access facilities.
Carbon Reduction	3	The building refurbishment will allow for sustainable construction techniques and enhanced building environmental management. Reuse of existing building, city centre location, maximum accessibility very close to Transport Hub.
Inclusive Growth	3	Gallery and events space, potential for café etc, support for start-up creatives. Creates space for local residents / visitors to meet.
Value for Money	3	Value for money is considered reasonable. In terms of capital, it looks like nearly 60% of the funding is coming from the Town Deal. University providing £250K in kind revenue match. Good outputs and potential outcomes for the investment.
Deliverability		
Costs	3	University has a track record but not clear what team on board and therefore basis of the budget estimates. Capital costs at 2020 prices without
		inflation consideration. Opening of facility not projected till 24/45, main spend 23/24. Project appears to have been delayed a year since Investment Plan
Funding	2	Not clear on the timescales for LEP funding. Also some risk associated with future revenue funding but there is time to resolve as project develops

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	2	Risk associated with viability of the public facing cultural elements and demand for workspace in a post covid world. What is the operational model for the hotel element, not clear who will operate this?
Project Management	3	Limited details but likely strong track record with project management procedures in place given University's experience.





Project: Central Market

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	4	Strong in terms of revitalising the market offer-modern offer to increase use. Adding value to an area that has had a lot of investment. Focusing activity in City Centre
Carbon Reduction	3	Limited details given but note it will reduce Co2 emissions and supporting principles of clean growth by safeguarding and modernising an asset to create a more efficient trading environment. In addition, reuse of existing building, city centre location, maximum accessibility very close to Transport Hub.
Inclusive Growth	3	 Fairly limited inclusivity identified. Largely economy driven but includes space for community use. Provides a new market appealing to wider range of people. Increased use / activity. Creates jobs for local people Creates space for local residents / visitors to meet.
Value for Money Deliverability	3	Town Deal is the major funder, largely supported by prudential borrowing. Good outputs in terms of floorspace, potential to support local businesses and therefore wider additionality. However, 24 of the 30 businesses are relocating rather than new.
Costs	4	Considered likely to be robust based on
00315	4	track record of the Council. PM/QS in place, options study and budget prepared by professional team.
Funding	4	Majority of match coming from prudential borrowing which is confirmed by CLC. HAZ grant offer expected within the next month.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Biggest risk considered to be the operational model in light of city centre trends. Planning already submitted and professional team on board. Business case in development
Project Management	4	Professional team on board. Good track record





Project: Development of the Drill Hall Arts Centre

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	4	Visitor economy, evening economy, focusing activity in City Centre, support local food and drink businesses, supporting learning.
Carbon Reduction	3	Commitment to work being carried out in an environmentally considerate way, working with Gusto Group. Plus reuse of existing building, city centre location, maximum accessibility. Retrofit should be encouraged but limitations of a listed building?
Inclusive Growth	4	Skills, retraining, learning activities for students, mental health / wellbeing activities for young people, social / community space
Value for Money	3	VFM seems reasonable. Request is for around 65% of the total cost, although College also supporting with revenue funding. Good level of outputs and outcome for the investment. Outcomes are well articulated / understood.
Deliverability		
Costs	4	Considered likely to be robust based on track record of the College in delivery of similar projects. Feasibility work completed, but would be helpful to have update on design proposals
Funding	4	No reliance on external funders as remaining funding coming from College reserves
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Procurement and delivery timescales both appear tight especially as listed building consent will be required. Assume this is driven by academic year opening. Although relatively minor refurbishments work. However, this is an operational issue for the

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		College rather than a major risk to the programme.
		Some risk to sustainability given previous closure but underpinned by teaching activities making much more use of the building
Project Management	4	Strong track record. Good details on team and experience.





Project: Reimagining Greyfriars

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	3	Economic use of unused building. Visitor income, new jobs. Only 1,000 more arts / culture visitors so impacts economically may be slightly limited
Carbon Reduction	3	Use of technology and green energy specified. Reuse of existing building, city centre location, maximum accessibility
Inclusive Growth	4	Education programme, volunteering reducing anti-social behaviour, spreading economic benefits across more of the city centre. working with Lincoln University's architecture, conservation and design courses to promote inclusion and equality
Value for Money	3	VFM is strong. Town Deal request is around 30% of the total costs. Good leverage. Outputs are fairly modest but value for money in terms of outcomes considered reasonable
Deliverability		
Costs	3	Professional team on board including Project Manager and QS. Costs likely to have been scrutinised and be on sound basis. However, risk associated with listed
		building and project at very early stage
Funding	4	Good amount of match in place particularly from NLHF, although there is still competition at Round 2 stage for final confirmation of NLHF funding CLC funding confirmed
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	4	Risk is considered relatively low. Business Plan being developed which will address sustainability.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		Timescales for contractor procurement and delivery look challenging but not likely to be a big risk in terms of Town Deal funding.
Project Management	4	Strong track record. Professional team on board.





Project: HEAT College

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	3	Supporting local visitor economy, important as part of covid recovery. Helps mitigates risk of Brexit and tourism staff returning to the EU. Creating training and employment routes for local people.
Carbon Reduction	3	The use of digital learning will support clean growth principles, reducing the need to travel in order to access quality training provision. Also, commitment to adhere to the clean growth principles.
Inclusive Growth	4	Skills, retraining, employability workshops, creating employment routes
Value for Money	3	VFM seems reasonable in terms of the learner outputs and the outcomes for the sector. Request is for around 50% of the total cost. Outcome reach will be much wider than just Lincoln City
Deliverability		
Costs	4	Considered likely to be robust based on track record of the College in delivery of similar projects and involvement of Perfect Circe consortium via Scape Framework. Milestones suggest scheme has been designed to RIBA Stage 4.
Funding	3	States Co-funding provided by Lincoln College cash reserves and contributions from partner organisations. Match funding from the College is confirmed
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	2	Not clear if site identified or requires purchase. Planning timescales seem tight and no indicative dates given post planning. An update on timescales would be helpful as information suggests already at RIBA 4.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Project Management	4	Strong track record. Good details on team and experience. Utilising Perfect Circle consortium via Scape Framework





Project: Lincoln City Community Skills and Education Hub

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	4	New jobs, apprentices, local supply chain, local economy spend, direct and indirect employment. Already undertaken a BCR calculation which looks strong
Carbon Reduction	2	Not identified but use of existing space within the stadium. Focusing activity within existing Lincoln City Stadium close to town centre.
Inclusive Growth	4	Being developed in one of most deprived areas of the City. Learning opportunities and community engagement through expansion of the education programme.
Value for Money	4	Good Value for Money. Town Deal request is approximately 30% of the costs. Considered good value for the outputs and outcomes being delivered.
Deliverability		
Costs	4	Considered likely to be robust based on having professional team on board and planning permission already in place. Phase 1 already delivered
Funding	4	All other funding is secured
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Risk is considered low. Planning permission already in place Timescales seem appropriate Long term sustainability to be achieved through increase in education provision. Unclear of demand but limited risk. Question around how sustainability achieved in long term.
Project Management	4	Look to have professional team on board. Working Group to be established and professional team to be appointed.





Project: Lincoln Connected: People and Place

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact	Score	ASSESSITEIR
Economic vibrancy and recovery	4	Improved vibrancy through signage, creative illumination programme, public realm investments and lead to more visitors to the City. Creative illumination programme feasibility funding only so risk outcomes will not be delivered beyond the two pilot projects.
Carbon Reduction	2	Nothing specifically identified. Potential positive impact through increased use of digital channels?
Inclusive Growth	2	Improved city centre environment for local residents as well as visitors. Limited social / inclusivity considered.
Value for Money	3	Limited leverage, Town Deal request is nearly 70% of the total costs and match appears to be revenue / staff time largely. Potential to add value to overall programme and potentially good outcomes for the investment. Proposals already scaled back. Further match being sought to further scale up the programme.
Deliverability		
Costs	3	Breakdown of costs provided with some rationale. Given nature of works, cost slippage is probably less risky than others.
Funding	3	Match funding as presented appears to be largely staff time although potential for additional cash to extend the programme. Limited leverage presented but means no reliance of external match providers to deliver core offer as presented.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Some questions around future proofing risk around the resource required to maintain and constantly update the CRM. Also, consideration of costs associated with maintaining the signage art works in future – e.g., cleaning/ vandalism etc. Creative illumination programme feasibility funding only so risk outcomes will not be delivered. Limited programme information provided. Given nature of capital works, risk is probably less than others from this perspective.
Project Management	3	Limited details provided but organisations should have the capacity to deliver based on track record.





Project: Lincoln Made Smarter

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	3	Supporting businesses resulting in raised levels of GVA and business growth, productivity and innovation. Potential to add value to wider portfolio of projects. Limited impact in respect to TIP aspirations around city centre/ visitors/ vibrancy
Carbon Reduction	3	Good potential for carbon benefits given implementation of industrial digital technologies. No capital construction.
Inclusive Growth	2	Limited impacts identified. Limited impact in the short term, but could have longer term implications for society
Value for Money	3	Reasonable value for money with potential to add value to the overall programme of investment. Number of outputs are relatively low for the investment compared to other projects and leverage is also lower than others with 55% of costs requested through Town Deal.
Deliverability		
Costs	4	Based on similar programmes. Strong track record of delivering similar programmes.
Funding	2	It is not clear if the match funding is confirmed or its source – response stated match is in kind contributions and services procured and delivered through the Think Tank
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Revenue only project and therefore somewhat less risky than other projects. Programme unlikely to be significantly constrained by as revenue only. Support likely to end once funding spent and therefore the support might not be

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		available for capital projects which are delivered later in the programme.
Project Management	4	Strong track record of delivering similar programmes.





Project: Sincil Bank Regeneration - Transport Improvements

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	2	Some but limited impact on city centre vibrancy. Supports regeneration of Sincil Bank. Potential to increase footfall for local businesses on Portland Street.
Carbon Reduction	3	Investment to increase walking a cycling as a natural choice for short journeys. Creating parklets and street trees and planting.
Inclusive Growth	3	Some social benefits in terms of improved safety for residents, and improved environment for pedestrians in an area with relatively high numbers of homes with no car ownership. Creating playstreets and parklets – improved environment for residents.
Value for Money	2	Significant ask and currently no match funding but Town Deal investment might unlock further investment. Limited direct outputs but good potential outcomes for residents
Deliverability		
Costs	2	Limited information as project is at concept stage. County Council has a strong track record of delivering projects of this nature. But given early stage, significant scope for cost increases or need for value engineering
Funding	2	No reliance on external funders currently as all funding coming from the Town Deal. Potential from Heritage Action Zone, County Council and City of Lincoln Council.
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	2	 Given early stage of project, risk remains high as detailed design required. This does allow opportunity to help shape project and help minimise risk to the programme. Ongoing maintenance responsibility of the County Council.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		Highways 2020 Professional Services contract and partnership with WSP limits risk in terms of business plan and concept design delivery but overall risk remains relatively high.
Project Management	4	Strong track record or delivering transport infrastructure project. Detailed steps and actions set out by applicant





Project: Store of Stories

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	2	Likely to be making use of an existing building in the city centre, increasing footfall. Supporting individuals with economy recovery. Limited impact in terms of economic / city centre vibrancy. Potential to be part of the overall HIVE project which appears a good fit.
Carbon Reduction	3	Re-use of existing building likely, plus contributing to a reduction in food waste.
Inclusive Growth	4	Addressing food poverty, poverty generally, volunteering opportunities. Significant social impact
Value for Money	3	Request from Town Deal is low and good value for money in terms of social impact. Leverage looks good too although looks like match is largely revenue to support operations. Genuine additionality – unlikely to proceed without town deal investment.
Deliverability		
Costs	2	Based on national models, but it is not clear if premises been identified or secured, and therefore the basis for the budget is not clear.
Funding	2	Appears that only 40k is secured, the rest in forecasted profits and projected donations. This might not impact on capital delivery but potential impact in terms of long term sustainability.
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	2	Site not secured. Currently reliant on the HIVE project which arguably presents a bigger risk. Although alternative site could be identified. Some risk in terms of securing match to support operation but based on national model so perhaps limited.
Project Management	2	Limited details provided but states partnership approach and based on national models of delivery. If part of the HIVE project, it will likely be delivered as part of that project.





Project: Tentercroft Street Live-Work Hub

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	3	Request for funding is for feasibility only and therefore direct impact is limited. If the project progresses it could lead to jobs, and bring people into the town centre. Supporting shops, restaurants and the evening economy.
Carbon Reduction	3	Detail suggests low carbon will be built into design. Brownfield site, city centre location, maximum accessibility direct access to Transport Hub.
Inclusive Growth	3	Housing in city centre with direct access to the transport hub. Will play a role in connecting a deprived neighbourhood to the core of the city centre. Funding will support stakeholder engagement including the local community.
Value for Money	3	No leverage as all funds are sought from the Town Deal although could unlock significant future investment following completion of the feasibility study. No short-term outputs but significant potential for longer term outputs.
Deliverability		
Costs	4	Feasibility funding and therefore limited unknown costs at this stage
Funding	4	No reliance on external funders as all funding coming from the Town Deal. Therefore, not constrained. Subject to securing funding post development – prudential borrowing
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	3	Limited risk for feasibility but significant risk that the project does not proceed.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		From a programme management
		perspective having a fully prepared and
		viable business case completed makes
		sense in case other schemes are unable to
		proceed for whatever reason.
Project Management	4	Feasibility study so project management
		requirements are less onerous than full
		capital delivery. Likely strong track record
		with project management procedures in
		places.
		Procurement will be through a framework
		plus CLC would appoint a project manager
		to give internal capacity





Project: HIVE

tre who will shop
ing of the urban
reen spaces built
asures
ng opportunities
or Money. Town
et of circa £10m.
outcomes being
emand for office
olar in terms of
nt buildings.
er m2 is tight, as
ware of this and
to deliver within
ant risk Funding
unders it will be
s and funding
ted.
isk assessment place. Appears
i place. Appears
sk the elemente l
sk, the elements learning facility.
learning facility,
,
learning facility,

Criteria	Score	Assessment	
		Contracts would need to be robust in terms of social outputs to stop	
		this just being a housing project.	
Project	2	Limited details provided. Difficult to assess or understand track	
Management		record of delivery	





Project: Wigford Way/St Mary's Street Walking, Cycling and Public Realm Improvements

Criteria	Score	Assessment
Impact		
Economic vibrancy and recovery	3	Contributes to city centre vibrancy by creating an improved environment for cyclist and pedestrians. Will create a better environment, encouraging more people to the city centre. Improved connectivity between key town centre locations and increase footfall to support local businesses.
Carbon Reduction	3	Investment to increase walking a cycling as a natural choice for short journeys and between key city centre sites.
Inclusive Growth	3	Some social benefits in terms of pedestrianisation, improved access to open space, health benefits of increased walking and cycling, improved pedestrian and cyclist safety.
Value for Money	2	Significant ask and currently no match funding but Town Deal investment might unlock further investment. Limited direct outputs but good potential outcomes
Deliverability		
Costs	2	Limited information as project is at concept stage. County Council has a strong track record of delivering projects of this nature. But given early stage, significant scope for cost increases or need for value engineering
Funding	2	No reliance on external funders currently as all funding coming from the Town Deal. Potential from Heritage Action Zone, County Council and City of Lincoln Council.
Risk Assessment and Mitigation including long term sustainability and timescales	2	Given early stage of project, risk remains high as detailed design required. This does allow opportunity to help shape project and help minimise risk to the programme.

Criteria	Score	Assessment
		No third party land requirements.
		Ongoing maintenance responsibility of the County Council.
		Highways 2020 Professional Services contract and partnership with WSP limits risk in terms of business plan and concept design delivery but overall risk remains relatively high.
Project Management	4	Strong track record or delivering transport infrastructure project. Detailed steps and actions set out by applicant

Questions

Has there been any progress in securing any match funding?

Are the resources in place within the County Council to undertake the Feasibility and Concept Design work, within the timescales required to feed into the Business Plan

Is there a confirmed Stakeholder Engagement Plan in place to meet the required timescales?